

Minutes of the 2023 World Science Fiction Society Business Meeting

Held in Meteor Hall, Chengdu Science Fiction Museum

81st World Science Fiction Convention
Chengdu, Sichuan, China (中国四川成都)
19-21 October 2023

Donald E. Eastlake III, Luo Yanli (罗妍莉), Presiding Officer
Kevin Standlee, Deputy Presiding Officer & Videographer
Ann Marie Rudolph, Huang Yiyang (黄亦杨), Secretary
Linda Deneroff, Assistant Secretary
Yang Xiaoliao (杨小嫖), Timekeeper
Yao Xue (姚雪), Zhou Bo (周博), Floor Manager

Table of Contents

19 OCTOBER 2023, PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING	2
20 OCTOBER 2023, MAIN BUSINESS MEETING	9
21 OCTOBER 2023, SITE SELECTION MAIN BUSINESS MEETING.....	20
Report of the F.9 Committee	30

19 OCTOBER 2023, PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING

[These minutes should be read in conjunction with the [WSFS Business Meeting Agenda](#).]

The Chair called the meeting to order at 10:11 am.

The Business Meeting Head Table Officers introduced themselves with their roles, as did the Floor Manager Xao Yue.

The Chair notified members that the meeting was being recorded and asked all to list their attendance on the attendance sheets. The lectern for speakers was pointed out, and the availability of microphones for those who need them.

The Chair presented a summary of the overall agenda for the session: today is the Preliminary Business Meeting, where we will receive committee reports, set time limits for discussion. Tomorrow will be first Main Business Meeting. Also today will be nominations for the Mark Protection Committee (MPC), election for that will be tomorrow, as well as finishing any business left over from today.

Saturday the main topic will be the Site Selection results. The winner for 2025 will be announced and may make a presentation. The 2024 Worldcon, Glasgow, may present. Five minutes will be allotted for Worldcon bids for future years. The results of the MPC election will be announced. And we will continue work on motions for Constitutional Amendments. If we are not finished on Saturday, we can continue with an additional session on Sunday.

The Annual Meeting of the Mark Protection Committee (MPC) will take place in this room as well, 15 minutes after the end of the Business Meeting, or at 10:00 am Sunday if there is no Sunday Business Meeting. Any member of the convention may attend the MPC meeting.

The two constitutional amendments passed on from last year and up for ratification this year cannot be changed at this Preliminary Business Meeting. We can change any new amendments that are presented today. We can consider changes to standing rules and resolutions. Postpone indefinitely can be used to kill a motion, which requires 2/3 vote and has 2 minutes debate time. The other way to kill a new main motion is Object to Consideration, which only applies to new business, takes 3/4 vote, is not debatable, so the vote is taken immediately.

[The "A.1.1" below and similar notations further below refer to items in the Business Meeting Agenda.]

A.1.1 Report, Mark Protection Committee (MPC)

Kevin Standlee, current chair of MPC, introduced the MPC function. The report is attached to the agenda, and he will not review it unless questions are raised, except for one important

action taken late in the year: effective at the end of August, the MPC formally transferred title of the WSFS service marks to Worldcon Intellectual Property (WIP), which is incorporated in California, USA. The service marks are registered under this name in the UK and legal counsel advised that the name should be made consistent in order to prevent confusion. Some mark renewals are due to be done with Patent and Trademark Office in US.

Kevin asked for questions; hearing none, he relinquished the floor.

A.1.1.A Set Time

Donald described the Marks Authorization Amendment, set out in the MPC report, Agenda Appendix A. It concerns use of the WSFS Marks and sets down existing practice. Chair suggested 4 minutes for Marks Authorization; hearing no objections, time was set to 4 minutes for debate.

Next item is nominations for MPC elected slots. Three people are elected each year to staggered three-year terms. Joni Dashoff, Mike Willmoth, and Judy Bemis are the retiring incumbents. Others who wish to be on the ballot need to submit a written consent to be on the ballot. Chair called for nominations. Dave McCarty nominated the three members who are retiring to stand again. Hearing no other nominations, Chair declared nominations closed. One can also run as a write in candidate, but you still need to submit the consent form.

Next item – A.2.1 - Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee (NP&FSC).

Donald Eastlake, Chair, recuses himself in favor of Kevin Standlee, Vice Chair, to preside since Donald is the chair of that committee. NP&FSC had a motion referred to it from last year's Business Meeting, Business Not for Final Passage, which was a change to the Standing Rules to allow committees to be able to ask a question of the Business Meeting in order to get an answer without bringing a formal motion in order to hear debate. It was proposed as Rule 2.5, see Agenda Appendix Item 1 page 3. The NP&FSC proposes a modification of this motion, short title Discussion Items, as a change to the Standing Rules, to allow such questions.

The Committee also studied the Constitution to see if improvements can be made – see Agenda Appendix Page 4 and 5, item 2, Business Meeting Contingencies, and page 5, item 3, Consistent Change. Business Meeting Contingencies addresses procedures if Business Meetings cannot be held because a Worldcon cannot be held or a quorum cannot be met. It allows for business to be deferred. The convention can decide to postpone ratification if they want to. Second one, item 3, is Consistent Change: a number of small changes to make the Constitution more consistent with changes to WSFS Membership and Attending Supplements.

The Chair proposed time limits: 6 minutes for the changes to the Standing Rule, A.2.1.A, asked for objections, none heard, using 6 minutes. A.2.1.B Business Meeting Contingencies,

suggests 6 minutes asked for objections, none heard, using 6 minutes. A.2.1.C Consistent Change, 6 minutes suggested; asked for objections, none heard, using 6 minutes.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the A.2.1.A Discussion Items proposal is a change to Standing Rules and therefore can be considered immediately. The proposed rule is read. Chair asked for any discussion or objection – none being heard, it is adopted by unanimous consent, and will take effect at the end of the current years' meeting.

Point of order is called by Ben Yalow. Since it was adopted by unanimous consent, it could take effect immediately. Chair ruled parliamentary point well taken and asked for any objection to it taking effect immediately which requires at least 2/3 in favor; since there were none, it takes effect immediately.

Ben Yalow moved to amend A.2.1.B Business Meeting Contingencies: Add to Section 6.6 Amendment, amend to read:

.... at which ratification is not postponed per 5.1.1.and 5.1.5.

Ben spoke in favor of the amendment. Does not believe it is suitable for BM to postpone due to tactical reasons, but it is appropriate to postpone for lack of quorum. This amendment will avoid the possibility of someone postponing in order to move to a more favorable year.

The Chair asked for speech against. Donald Eastlake spoke to situations where a vote is being taken on a regional matter at a Worldcon not in that region, where postponing would allow the vote to be done in a more relevant location.

The Chair asked for additional speeches for or against; hearing none, he called for a vote for the change to the proposal. Affirmative has it, the change is made to the Amendment.

There are no more changes to NP&FSC motions. The Deputy Chair turned the gavel back to the Chair.

A.2.2. - Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee (WCRG) guide editorial report is in the agenda – half a page. This Committee works on a written document to help run Worldcons. There are no proposed actions in the report, so unless there are questions, we can accept the report and re-appoint the chair with authority to appoint new members. There being no objections, the WCRG Chair was so re-appointed.

The Vice Chair brings attention to the omission of the reappointment of the NP&FSC. It is then, without objection, reappointed as constituted.

A.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries Committee. Without objection, the Chair re-appointed committee as constituted.

Section B.

Financial Reports: are on the website, paper copies are available if needed. Chair asked if representatives of the reporting Worldcons are present:

2013 – LoneStarCon 3 – no representative

2015 - Sasquan – no representative

2016 - MidAmercon2 no representative

2018 - WC76 - Kevin Standlee representing as a member of corporation BoD. Nothing additional to be reported beyond the written report. Asked for questions; there were none.

2019 - Dublin – Vince Docherty representing. Chair called for questions, none heard.

2020 - ConZealand no representative

2021 – Discon 3 Ann Marie Rudolph, Member of corporation BoD - no questions.

2022 - Chicon submitted a long and detailed report. Dave McCarty representing – no questions.

2023 - NASFIC Pemmicon – Kevin Standlee representing as Member of corporation BoD. He comments that generally when a committee shows a loss, that is the end, however the report was compiled shortly after the con ended, and they expect a more detailed final report for next year's Worldcon including any additional income or expenses. Vince Docherty comments that income and expense does not add up to the deficit, is this an oversight, can it be corrected? Kevin says he will ask the treasurer to make the numbers add up.

2023 - Chengdu – Financial Report – representative Joe – no questions.

2024 - Glasgow – Rep Vince Docherty – no questions.

Section C – Standing Rule Changes, Agenda page 36.

C1 - Bilingual Debate at Business Meeting, new standing rule, make English standard language, with second language in local languages if translation equipment is available. 6 minute debate time proposed by Chair. No objection noted, so time is set at 6 minutes.

Chair calls for debate – Speech in favor, to formalize English is positive in order to account for future foreign language conventions.

Against, need not be formalized, it is ok as it is. Having it in the Constitution would be confusing. Chair explains that this is not a constitutional change but would be a Standing Rule.

Dave McCarty – it is good to keep a common language.

Vote – passes on a vote by an uncounted show of hands; takes effect immediately.

D. Resolutions

Extension of eligibility – three cases Agenda pages 13 and 14, D1, D2, D3. Chair explained that these are usually not controversial and asked if there are any objections to adopting these resolutions. Hearing no objections, we will expedite and consider all three adopted and extend eligibility in those three cases.

E. Business passed on

E.1 The Zero Percent Solution, Chair suggests 6 minutes time limit, asked for objections; no objections, 6 minutes debates time set.

E.2 Best Game or Interactive Work – adds a new category of Hugo. Chair suggests 6 minute time limit, asked for objections; none heard, set at 6 minutes.

F. New Constitutional Amendments

F.1 Convention Time Bracket – To add calendar constraints for scheduling a Worldcon unless deviation otherwise allowed in the Constitution. Ben Yalow moves to delete the “preferably” phrase. Chair asked for second, none heard, so amendment fails. Chair suggested 6 minutes debate time. No objection; time is set for 6 minutes.

Yassar Bahjatt spoke against setting time frames, due to different geographic considerations. Kevin Standlee suggests that it is better to address the substance at the Main Business Meeting, unless this is a motion to Postpone Indefinitely. Chair hears no postponement motion; there is no further debate, so we will move on.

F.2 Bid Committee Contactability – Bidders to provide postal and email address to appear on ballots. Chair proposes 4 minutes; asked for objections; none heard; set at 4 minutes.

F.3 Site Selection Ballot – There are two proposals which conflict, which would be best addressed at the Main Business Meeting. Chair proposes overall 14 minutes to debate and possibly amend them separately, then select one to vote on. Time limit set at 14 minutes overall, 5 minutes each item, then combined discussion. Will be considered at main business meeting.

F.4 Eligibility Criteria for Non-English Work – Adds provision that Worldcon committee can establish a word conversion ratio for non-English language word count. Chair proposes 6 minutes, asked for objections; none heard, debate time is set to 6 minutes.

F.5 Best Fancast Not Paying Compensation – To amend the Best Fancast category definition in several areas, limiting it to those who are not monetarily compensated. Chair proposes 8 minutes, asked for objections, none heard, debate time is set to 8 minutes.

F.6 Best Young Writer New Hugo Category – Chair suggests 8 minutes, no debate or motions, 8 minutes is set.

F.7 Clarifying Language Requirements – To explicitly specify that there are no language requirements for Hugo eligibility. Chair proposes 6 minutes, asked for objections. Yassar Bahjatt suggests that it will need more time. Chair asked for a vote in favor of the 6 minutes time, it is defeated. Chair asked for other values, Yassar Bahjatt suggests 12 minutes. Chair takes vote for 12 minutes, it is defeated. Another vote is taken for 6 minutes, it passes so 6 minutes is set. Ben Yalow moves to postpone indefinitely. No second heard.

F.8 Remove Regional Limitations – To strike a section from the Constitution. Chair suggests 6 minutes. Objection raised, vote taken for 6 minutes. Ayes have it, set to 6 minutes. Vince Docherty asked if might be referred to committee for re-phrasing. Several seconds. Vote taken, ayes have it. People interested in being on the committee should come to the head table after the meeting adjourns to record that. The committee will consider changing phrasing to specify that the work was published outside the country of the administering Worldcon. Committee to report back to the Main Business Meeting.

Yassar Bahjatt suggests that we re-address F.7 as well and asked for clarification of process, how to refer to committee. Chair asked for any objections if both are referred to the same committee. Hearing none, both F.7 and F.8 will be referred to same committee.

F.9 Establishment of ASFiC – Establishment of Asian convention analogous to the NASFiC. Chair suggests 14 minutes, no objection, time is set at 14 minutes. Comment is made that it should be considered in conjunction with NASFiC. Chair suggests that this is a motion that it be referred to committee – it is seconded. Referred to committee to report back to the main Business Meeting to improve wording and consider NASFiC in conjunction with it.

F.10 Best Game Category New Hugo Award – Point of Information from Ben Yalow: Since we have a Best Game Hugo up for ratification this year, would this replace the current Best Game Category under consideration? Chair's opinion is that it would be a second one. Chair suggests 6 minutes, no objection heard, so set at 6 minutes.

F11 Independent Film – For 2 new Hugo categories. Short and feature. Chair suggests 10 minutes, no objections heard, time set at 10 minutes.

This is the end of the pre-announced agenda, but there is one more item of business, to add a Standing Rule.

Super Late Business, not in the agenda, to Amend the Standing Rules, admitted at the end of the agenda by permission of the Chair. Text is presented on a slide:

C.2 Clarifying proxy and remote voting [6 min]

- **Moved:** To Amend the Standing Rules by adding:

[7.x: Proxy and remote voting. Only WSFS members physically present at the Business Meeting shall be recognized for purposes of debate, or may move, second, or vote on motions on the floor of the meeting. Proxy voting is not permitted.](#)

- **Mover:** Dave McCarty **Second:** Bill Fawcett

This motion codifies current practice and is implied in the Constitution. Chair sets 6 minutes for debate, no objection heard. We can vote on it now since it is a Standing Rule change. Sun Wanshun asked if online voters can participate, or if they could at least vote on-line. Chair clarifies that this is not currently allowed. Kevin Standlee spoke in favor, key point in favor, our current rules and practice have never permitted remote participation. We have no rules to govern the process. Vote is taken, Standing Rule is adopted unanimously.

This concludes the Preliminary Business Meeting.

Chair asked those who wish to serve on the new committees formed to come up to head table to volunteer.

Chair adjourns meeting at 11:30am.

20 OCTOBER 2023, MAIN BUSINESS MEETING

[These minutes should be read in conjunction with the [WSFS Business Meeting Agenda](#).]

A video outlining meeting procedures was played.

Chair called the meeting to order at 10:08 am.

Yasser Bahjatt asked a parliamentary procedure question – if F.7 and F.8 vote and discussion, could be deferred until tomorrow, since he will not be available today. No discussion. A hand vote was taken and the ayes had it to postpone until Saturday meeting.

Chair – This is the first session of Main Business Meeting. Tomorrow will be second session, mainly for Site Selection, a third session if necessary on Sunday.

Head table introductions. Chair noted that the meeting is being recorded and others may record if they wish. He asked for attendees to record their attendance on the attendance sheets on entry.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

A.1 Standing Committee of WSFS

[The “A.1.1” below and similar notations further below refer to items in the Business Meeting Agenda.]

A.1.1 Mark Protection Committee Election

No other written authorizations to run for the Mark Protection Committee, besides the three incumbents, have been received by the Secretary. Chair asked if there is any objection to declaring the reelection of the incumbents, since there are no additional candidates. No objection is heard, the three incumbent committee members are declared elected.

A.1.1.A Short Title: Marks Authorization Amendment

Discussion: Chair asked if there was any debate. Kevin Standlee spoke in favor of the motion. Clarified the intent of the motion in that it covers all committees selected by WSFS. Chair asked for additional comments. None heard. Chair asked if there are any objections to adopting: no objections, so it is passed for this year and will be passed along to next year’s Business Meeting for ratification.

A.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

A.2.1.B Short Title: Business Meeting Contingencies

Kevin Standlee, the Deputy Presiding Officer, assumed the chair, to allow Donald Eastlake to speak on behalf of the NP&FSC.

Discussion: the Chair clarified the motion up for discussion, which is Agenda Item A.2.1.B. There was a short discussion to correct the slide which notes the section number being affected.

The text of the proposed Amendment for Section 6.6 was changed in the Preliminary Business Meeting and so should now read as follows with the remainder of A.2.1.B unchanged from the Agenda:

Section 6.6: Amendment.

The WSFS Constitution may be amended by a motion passed by a simple majority at any Business Meeting but only to the extent that such motion is ratified by a simple majority at the Business Meeting of the [next](#) subsequent Worldcon [at which ratification is not postponed per 5.1.1.and 5.1.5.](#)

Donald Eastlake spoke in favor: this Constitutional amendment handles cases where a Worldcon cannot be held or if there are insufficient WSFS members in attendance for the Business Meeting to have a quorum. The Chair asked for anyone who wishes to speak against, or any speaker, then asked for any objections.

A speaker suggests that the number of members required for the quorum be increased above 12 to better reflect the number of members in the society. The Chair rules the speech out of order (not germane) as the proposal is not in regard to the number for the quorum. A proposal to change the quorum would be a separate proposal.

The Chair asked for objections to adopting the Amendment: none heard, therefore it is adopted and passed forward to next year's Business Meeting for ratification.

A.2.1.C Short Title: Consistent Change

Discussion: The Chair clarified the motion. Donald Eastlake spoke in favor of the motion, explaining the content of the details that are being proposed for changes, and how this will just make the wording consistent throughout the entire WSFS Constitution on the distinction between attending membership and WSFS membership. They will make the constitution consistent and in alignment with changes that have been made in recent years. Chair asked if there are any other comments: there are none. Asked if there are any objections. None heard, this is adopted and will be passed forward to next year's Business Meeting for ratification.

The gavel was returned to Donald Eastlake.

C. STANDING RULE CHANGES

Chair mentions the Standing rule changes that were adopted yesterday – C1, and C2 which was a last-minute change. He will move forward unless someone asked for explanation.

Nicholas Whyte asked the chair what the additional item was that was passed, and if the text was published. Chair explains it was displayed on a slide and finds the slide again, Nicholas took a picture of it. Chair mentions it was also published as a supplement to the Agenda with the text.

A supplement was distributed to the members, which was the report of the F.7 and F.8 Committee that was appointed yesterday at the Preliminary Business Meeting. Chair commented that those proposals will be addressed tomorrow along with the reports.

Two Constitutional Amendments are up for ratification this year. Refer to the Agenda. Debate time limits have been set by the Preliminary Business Meeting to 6 minutes each.

E.1 Short Title: The Zero Per Cent Solution

Discussion: Ben Yalow spoke in favor of this proposal, noting that he was the maker of the original motion that is proposed to be stricken from the Constitution by this ratification. He believes he made an error in proposing it originally and thanks the makers of this motion for convincing him of the issues. No speech against ratification. Chairs asked for objections to ratification. No objections. Declared ratified. It will be deleted from Constitution at the end of this convention.

E.2 Short Title: Best Game or Interactive Work

Discussion: Chair introduced it with short explanation of intent. Asked for comments. Ben Yalow has a Parliamentary inquiry – how would a choose-your-own-adventure book be considered? He wants it on record. Chair opines that a primarily written work requiring input from consumer driven choices would count as an interactive work and therefore would not be eligible in written categories. Comment in Chinese regarding definition of what a game is. How can they be defined? Thinks we need more accurate definitions for both terms.

Chair explained that many interpretation questions are left up to the Hugo Administrator of each Worldcon and they decide for that year. Chair asked for further debate. Chinese question regarding year 2028 in the proposal. Chair explained how the sunset provision in this proposal would work, with re-ratification automatically scheduled for the 2028 Business Meeting.

Yang Xu spoke about the definition of game, how it is a very complex term. Chair takes this as a speech against. Sanjay has a question regarding interactive work, brings in independent games vs commercial games. How can you evaluate them based on the same criteria? Asked if the award is for the developer of the game or for the game itself? Chair clarifies it is for the game itself. Chair asked if there is any other discussion. None heard, Chair calls for serpentine vote. Those in favor asked to stand. Ten in favor. Those opposed stand: Three opposed. Vote carries. Constitutional amendment ratified, becomes effective at end of this convention.

F. NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

F.1 Short Title: Convention Time Bracket

Discussion: Chair clarifies the content. Maker Kevin Standlee spoke in favor especially as related to Hugo Administration requirements and the interdependencies of Worldcon Committees.

Ben Yalow moves to amend to delete the “preferably” clause and replace it with “Should consult with your successor if you are moving to later than 30 September”. An inquiry is brought about changing the date, and that in addition to consulting with the next convention, that those who have already bought membership should be consulted. The Chair ruled that this would be a second order amendment, which is not allowed under our rules but must be proposed separately after the amendment on the floor is disposed of.

Chair asked for any additional comments about the amendments. Ben Yalow spoke to agree with Kevin Standlee’s comment that you cannot move it earlier than the proposed June 20. But supports the mandatory wording about consulting with successor and it is important to support that it is important to not hurt the next Worldcon.

Inquiry from Kevin Standlee about wording, asked for exact wording, it was read as follows; “Should consult with your successor if you are moving to later than 30 September”. Spoke against the amendment as maker of the main motion. Because it is authorized under Section 2.6, they should consult with the successor anyway. But technically a speech against. Chair asked for other comments, none heard. Vote on amendment In Favor - 12 – opposed - 0.

Revert to discussion of Main motion as amended. Time available to speak against the Main motion. Parliamentary inquiry from Kevin Standlee: inquired if the other amendment foreshadowed earlier is in order at this time. The Chair said that it is. Kevin Standlee moved to amend by inserting “and should consult with the members of the current Worldcon”. Debate time is exhausted. Chair asked to extend debate time by 4 minutes, gets unanimous consent.

Original proposer spoke for amendment that when there are changes in dates, people may not be able to attend. They should be consulted so they would be able to participate. Ben Yalow spoke against. Discusses the practicalities of organizing Worldcon and how the only alternative might be to cancel Worldcon and rely on 2.6 which would allow the successor Worldcon to set a date and location.

Chair asked for another speech in favor, none heard. Asked for additional speakers about the amendment to consult with members if date goes beyond Sept 30. One speaker talks to the amendment, but time runs out. Chair calls for vote on the amendment. Aye – 1, Nay 4. Amendment fails

Vote on main motion as amended. Chair called for serpentine vote. 12 in favor. – opposed - None. Motion carries. F1 adopted as amended and forwarded to next year's Worldcon Business Meeting for ratification.

F.2 Short Title: Bid Committee Contactability

Discussion: Chair explained the amendment and calls for discussion. No discussion. Proceed to vote by show of hands. In favor – unanimously adopted. Will be forwarded to next year's Worldcon Business Meeting.

F.3 Short Title: Site Selection Ballot Provisions

Discussion: Chair summarized amendment. Explained that there are two competing proposals. First, we will discuss F.3.A, then discuss F.3.B, then vote to choose one of them.

Chair asked for discussion on F.3.A, none offered. Ben Yalow inquired if there is no discussion on F.3.A then the proposed wording will stand as written? Chair confirmed. Asked again for comments, none heard.

Next is F.3.B. Yao Chi says spaces should provide for at least country, province, and city. No need for more. Another Chinese comment no name, believes don't need too many details. Another commenter says there is an inconsistency between the Chinese and English language versions of the written proposals. Dave McCarty calls a point of order – Chair hears no objection to making a change to be consistent between Chinese and English, Country and Province/State, and City settled on. Kevin Standlee, Parliamentary Inquiry – that they don't have to be in this exact order, and that elements need not be entered in areas where they do not apply but can be left blank. Can those assumptions be made or do they need to be specifically stated?

Chair ruled that order is immaterial, but it may be up to the site selection administrators, and that a blank need not be filled in if it is meaningless for the voter. Alexia Hebel inquired if

signature implies that written signature is required or can it be an electronic signature. Chair explained that is addressed by other areas of the constitution. An electronic signature can be accepted if agreed to by administering and affected conventions.

Question called to vote between F.3.A and F.3.B, Chair asked if there is anyone to speak between the two. Ben Yalow spoke, preferring the first alternative. Key is that top halves of ballot containing the address fields are the only record of the current address of the voter. If we adopt B, we have the voter and we don't have current address and can't send a postal communication. Older addresses from prior conventions mean lost addresses for memberships passed on from prior conventions for voting, etc. We get latest address by having voter's address on the form. As listed in F.3.A.

Tang Bing spoke in favor of B, that as a member we do not need more information and she has the info she needs so doesn't need info mailed to her. Dave McCarty, as a past Worldcon Chair, spoke for A, required to identify unique individuals and need the info to do so, sometimes there are two individuals with the same name. Time in favor of A expires.

Chair asked for speeches in favor of B. Joe Yao: He does not need to have the detailed address info, there is no need to mail information, and his membership already has his mailing address.

Dave McCarty asked to extend debate time by 4 minutes: no objection, debate extended 4 minutes. Alexia Hebel spoke in favor of 3.A, she has dealt with registration at several Worldcons and does not have the current info until the Site Selection ballot appears at the convention. Sun Wan Chen spoke to B: there are other ways to identify people, such as a phone number, you don't need an address. Song Mingcan spoke, neither for A or B. Chair rules out of order. Chair asked for speech in favor of 3.A – Chinese speaker supports 3.A. Chair calls for serpentine vote for choice between A and B. 11 in favor of A. 8 in favor of B. Alternative F.3.A is selected.

Kevin Standlee: Parliamentary Inquiry. How much debate time is left? Proposes to set remaining time to 4 minutes. Chair asked for objections. None heard, remaining time is set to 4 minutes to debate whether to adopt this proposal.

Speech in opposition Physical mail is no longer popular. Need to provide alternatives. Email should be an option. Dave McCarty In favor, selected alternative actually just codifies existing practice, needed to identify members. And we need to identify those who get the benefit of the memberships. Chair calls for additional debate, none heard. No more debate. Vote on adopting the previously selected alternative, F.3.A. Serpentine vote taken. In favor 11 Opposed 6. Adopted to pass through to next year's Business Meeting for ratification.

The meeting recessed at 11:25 and reconvened at 11:51.

Member asked for item F.11 be moved to be current because they have another commitment. No objection, F.11 moved to be next.

F.11 Short Title: Independent Films

Discussion: Chair summarized F.11. A speaker made the point that current films already have recognition, there are a lot of indie films, very popular among SF fans and they need more recognition. They merit the encouragement of a Hugo Award. If it is an SF genre film then they are a win-win for the genre.

Chair asked for speech against, none heard.

Louis Savvy spoke in favor of the proposal. The Hugos are great for TV and film but have an opportunity to help people starting on careers, which are not funded by commercial entities. The prestige of a Hugo will recognize exceptional works in the area. Independent Film would be analogous to Fan Writer and Artist and will encourage people to seek out the works because they hear of them through the Hugos.

Dave McCarty moves to amend to condense categories to one category, no time length limitation, Seconded by several, to remove time limit and have one award. Dave McCarty spoke in favor of the amendment: if we want to recognize, to do it as one category to see if there is enough interest to support both time frames. Against the motion Yao Shi spoke against complication of a film category. Dave McCarty against, this debate is not for the main motion. Tang Bing Ying supports the amendment, to see if there is support for the future split. Chair asked for further discussion on amendment. Mou Zi Yuan does not want to merge into one to streamline the awards. Louis Savvy spoke against amendment, spoke of separation of the two types of staffing for short and long films. Feels that since Best Dramatic Presentation (BDP) Long and Short are separate that it shows the difference. Ben Yalow answers comment made by previous speaker of comment about BDP Short and long, commenting that it is effectively a split between TV Series and feature films.

Time for debate is finished. Vote on Amendment - Aye 9 Opposed 12. Categories are not merged.

Back to main question debate, 2 minutes time left. Ben Yalow moved to amend, to replace wording making it a Constitutional amendment to instead recommend the next three Worldcons adopt one or more of them as their optional Hugo Category. He will defer the exact wording to the Head Table. Ben Yalow. speech in favor: when new categories are proposed we generally recommend trying it out at first temporarily, because testing it out first is easier, and avoids having to amend the Constitution again. Testing out will give us some history so we don't have to unwind the constitution if it fails. Alexia Hebel: we should not delay this, it is different times now, we can unwind if needed. Alan Bond against motion, already has special category planned for optional category for presumptive Seattle Worldcon. Chair calls for any more speech in favor or any more comments. Vote on the amendment to change to a

recommendation to ask that next three cons use this as optional. In favor – 4 Opposed. 9. Amendment defeated.

Kevin Standlee, Parliamentary Inquiry: This does not include a sunset clause – would adding a sunset clause at the ratification stage be acceptable? Chair believes that it would be a lesser change and thus would be allowable.

Out of time for debate, Dave McCarty moved to extend debate two minutes. No objection heard, time is extended.

Dave McCarty moves to amend to adopt a sunset clause, Ben Yalow seconds for sunset unless re-ratified in the 2027 Business Meeting. Dave McCarty comments that it is common practice for new categories to add a sunset clause so there is less process in order to rescind it. Chair asked if assembly will allow the Chair to add standard sunset clause wording, there is no objection. The vote is called, Aye 10 Nay 0. Sunset clause added.

Alan Bond rises to amend proposal to eliminate BDP Long and BDP Short form Hugos and replace them with this. Second from Nicholas Whyte. Kevin Standlee raises two points of order, first that debate time is expired, also believes motion is not germane. Timekeeper says that minimal debate but still some time remains. Chair declines to rule on germaneness, defers to vote of assembly. Calls for vote, the assembly votes that this amendment is not germane to the main motion. Debate time left is 40 seconds.

Request to amend word ‘Film’ to ‘Dramatic Presentation’. Dave McCarty seconds. A speech is made in favor. Kevin asked to extend time 30 seconds so there can be a speech against, which is granted. Louis Savvy spoke against amendment to Dramatic Presentation. That it should be film specifically. Time is expired. Vote on amendment is taken, Aye 4 nays many; The amendment is defeated.

Chair calls for vote on F.11 Ayes 7, opposed 5. To be passed on for potential ratification at the next Worldcon Business Meeting.

Motion to Reconsider the adoption of C.2

Nicholas Whyte moved to reconsider Standing Rule C.2 as he was not present and it was not on the agenda. Chair states that someone who was not present is not eligible to move for reconsideration. Chair solicited someone in the room qualified (was present and who voted in favor) to make a motion to reconsider and heard such a motion.

Nicholas Whyte spoke in favor of reconsideration (and against the original motion): As head of WSFS at Glasgow Worldcon, he will be most affected by this change to the Standing Rules, and was not consulted or part of the debate. Glasgow has been looking at creative changes in

running the Business Meeting, and this makes it harder to make these changes. Better to do things in good faith. Ben Yalow raises a Point of Order: the implication that this was not done in good faith is not appropriate in debate. Chair finds this point of order well taken. Nicholas continues: Better to have it referred to a subcommittee if possible for the reconsideration and if not, referred to next year. Chair states that it could be referred to a subcommittee if motion for reconsideration is adopted.

Dave McCarty spoke against reconsideration. Putting it in a Standing Rule that way is not really a change since it just codifies the existing constitution and practice. No additional time for speeches against reconsideration. A speech is made for reconsideration, saying that Roberts' Rules of Order Newly Revised (RRONR) does address remote participation since 2015. Time runs out. Chair notes that while RRONR does address remote participation, it states that it is not allowed unless explicitly permitted, and rules established to govern it. This Standing Rule does not change what RRONR includes, only codifies it. The WSFS Constitution states it is run under RRONR, which incorporates and discusses remote participation but requires rules be established to control it.

Dave McCarty asked to extend speech by two minutes, and without objection, debate was extended. Kevin Standlee spoke against reconsideration, says that nothing in our Constitution or Standing Rules allow remote participation and so the default RRONR takes control. Nicholas Whyte spoke how he is dismayed and disappointed how the Constitution is being represented here and states that each individual Worldcon is allowed to choose their governing authority, that individual Worldcons are free to choose RRONR but not required to do so by the Constitution. And we are now sneakily hardwiring it into the Constitution. Chair admonished speaker for his use of the word "sneakily." Dave McCarty asked the speaker to be removed for making an obscene gesture which Nicholas admits. Nicholas offered an apology to Dave and it was accepted. Vote to reconsider is taken, Aye 4, Nay 6, reconsideration is defeated.

F.4 Short Title: Hugo Awards Criteria for Non-English Works Eligibility

Chair summarized Amendment about setting ratios for language conversions. Huang Jin, who is a translator, spoke against, he understands the motion but does not wish the ratio to be fixed because it may influence artistic decisions. Chair calls for additional comments, Ben Yalow spoke for it: Hugo Administrators need to deal with many problems, need to remove obstacles and we need to have some ruling on it. Tang Bing Ying: Shall we consult with non-English-speaking countries in order to set the rates? Chair comments that Worldcons can consult with other Worldcons and also Hugo Administrators can move works between categories based on length within a margin specified in the Constitution. Calls for additional comments, hearing none, vote is taken, Aye 7 Opposed 3 This amendment is adopted and will be passed on to next year's Worldcon for ratification.

F.5 Short Title: Best Fancast Not Paying Compensation

Chair summarized amendment, which adds a rule that the Best Fancast maker not be paid monetarily. Mao Zedong makes a speech in favor, Fancast makers should not be eligible for the Hugo Award if they are paid.

It was pointed out that the wording and translation is different in English and Chinese. This was originally proposed in Chinese. The original interpretation is said to be if the fancast receives income, the English version states if the contributors receive income. Several comments are made regarding the difference in language and translation.

Ben Yalow moved to send this to committee headed by the two Presiding Officers, one for each language, to be returned tomorrow with consistent wording. No objection to sending this to committee, this is effectively delayed until tomorrow. The maker of the motion is present, and Dave McCarty asked if it is order for them to amend the language. Chair responds that it has already been submitted and so is in the control of the assembly.

F.6 Short Title: Best Young Writer

Discussion: Chair summarizes proposal for a new Hugo Category. Carolina Gomez Lagerlof spoke against this since we already have many categories including the Astounding Award for Best New Writer. A university student and young writer spoke in favor, feels that this would encourage writers from this age group, they have different knowledge and experience level. Would give a fairer opportunity for younger writers. Xue Ye is opposed to the age range, they are two totally different groups, under 18 and 18 - 24. For Chinese, publication is a very high barrier. and does online publication count as published? The next speaker wants to encourage this group, they are the future of SF and are very imaginative. A speaker against says that the younger writers are very imaginative, but they need to produce quality work.

Kevin Standlee: Regarding online publication, it is pretty clear that on-line is eligible. He then proposed an amendment to remove the lower age limit: Strike out 'between 15 and 24' and insert 'less than 25'. A speech against amending to remove lower age limit because it would make it much more complicated and would put in competition works from 24 and 6 year olds. The next speaker was out of order according to the Chair as they addressed the main motion, not the amendment on the floor. Speaker continued that he is against the amendment. Vote is called, in favor of the amendment, 9, opposed, 3. Amendment adopted. The proposal to read 'age less than 25'.

Discussion on F.5 as amended. Ann Marie Rudolph spoke in opposition, overlaps with many other young writers' competitions in the US and elsewhere, and a writer of this age can be a professional, and this would make these writers ineligible for the other written work Hugo

Awards, because of the overlap. Chair asked for speech in favor, none heard. Calls for other comments. Dave McCarty opposed, due to unacceptable overlap with Astounding Award.

Over time for debate, Chair calls for a vote. In favor 2 , Opposed many. F.6 is defeated.

The meeting adjourned at about 13:26.

Saturday Site Selection meeting will be called to order at 10:00, after which we will take up any business remaining.

21 OCTOBER 2023, SITE SELECTION MAIN BUSINESS MEETING

[These minutes should be read in conjunction with the [WSFS Business Meeting Agenda](#).]

The Chair called the meeting to order.

Business Meeting Preliminaries will be skipped as this is the Site Selection meeting. The agenda slide was displayed and summarized by the Chair, who invites Helen Montgomery to announce the results.

Helen Montgomery, Site Selection Administrator, announces the Site Selection results.

168 valid ballots.

1 Peggy Rae's House

2 Xerxes in 2012

2 No Preference

163 Seattle

Vice Chair Kevin Standlee reminded the Chair to instruct the Administrator to destroy the vote portion of the ballots to make the results final. Chair asked for unanimous consent, which was granted to do so.

Seattle presented their convention in a slideshow. Alan Bond and Kevin Black are here on behalf of co-chairs of the bid, Kathy Bond and Sunny Jim Morgan. Kathy will Chair Worldcon and Sunny Jim will be Program Division Head. They extend their thanks to Chengdu Worldcon and artist Lee Moyer for their logo design and bid artwork.

Guests of Honor

- Martha Wells
- Donato Giancola
- Bridget Landry
- Alexander James Adams

Hosts

- K. Tempest Bradford
- Nisi Shawl

Information and slides about Seattle and the venue were presented. The convention theme is "Building Yesterday's Future – For Everyone".

Kevin Black and Alan Bond opened the floor for questions.

A question was raised regarding membership sales and discounts: Any pre-support or voting fees will be credited dollar for dollar toward membership purchase. Those who already have WSFS memberships (from voting) can upgrade to Attending for \$125 until the rate increase. Xia Zijian asked question regarding WSFS membership and attending membership: WSFS membership is required in order to get an attending membership (supplement).

Helen Montgomery asked: How people can volunteer to help the con? They need a lot of help, many Division Head on down positions to fill. Speak to Kevin or Alan if you want to volunteer.

Presentation for 2024 Worldcon - Vincent Docherty representing Glasgow. Wi-fi has been upgraded, facility has been expanded since last Worldcon held there. There are eight on site hotels, booking to open next year. Info about the various categories of memberships and forms to volunteer are on the website at Glasgow2024.org.

James Stiles asked if hotels are close? One is physically attached; the others are close by. Some are across the river, accessible by two footbridges. The ground is all flat and accessible.

2026 LA presentation: Helen Montgomery represented the LA in 2026 bid: She reads a message from Joyce Lloyd, bid chair. Dates are to be August 27 – 31, 2026. Venue to be the Anaheim Convention Center and the Hilton Anaheim. Same as LA in 2006. Using the North facility of convention center and space in the Hilton. Negotiated for \$179 room rate plus tax. Also Marriott is \$199 plus tax currently. Using about 100 rooms at Hilton plus 500 at Marriott with room for expansion. Easy walk to convention center. Very flat plaza. Disneyland is close enough to walk to. A 15-minute walk. Also, there is a shuttle to Disneyland from the hotel. More info to follow.

Cairo 2026 (Pharohcon) – or wherever. Yassar Bahjatt, bid chair for what was Jedicon (Jeddah, Saudi Arabia), but the bid is not currently active. He is having a hard time getting permission from local governments to host the con. So, they are looking at other Arabian venues or other years if needed.

Since we are ahead of time, Chair asked if there are any other future bids who would like to speak. None answer. Helen Montgomery mentions that Uganda is bidding for 2028, they have a booth, they may not have known there was a chance for them to speak, so they are not here today.

Chair calls for a 15-minute recess at 10:30, to reconvene at 10:45.

The meeting was called back to order at 10:46. Head table introductions are done. Announcement was made that the meeting is being recorded, so you might be in that. Recordings will be posted to WSFS Events channel on YouTube.

F.10 Short Title: Best Game Category

Discussion: Introduction to the amendment was done by the Chair with debate time set to 6 minutes. He invites the makers to speak to amendment and asked for debate. Dave McCarty spoke: we ratified a best game Hugo yesterday. He believes this amendment represents an improper overlap. Chair asked for further debate. None offered. Chair calls for a vote on the Amendment.

Vote: In favor 1, Nay many,

Kevin Standlee: point of order, states that many did not understand what was being voted on. Chair walks back vote. Chair clarified what was being voted on and asked if there is any more discussion. None presented. He asked for votes: in favor 1, opposed many. F.10 is defeated.

F.5 Short Title: Best Fancast Not Paying Compensation

The meeting is re-addressing this, as the Chinese and English versions did not seem to match, and a committee was formed to make them more consistent. The proposed version in English is

Best Fancast Not Paying Compensation

“3.3.15: Best Fancast. Any generally available non-professional audio or video periodical devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects that by the close of the previous calendar year has released four (4) or more episodes, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and that does not in the previous calendar year met either of the following criteria:

- (1) qualify as a dramatic presentation, or
- (2) was a paid professional creation.”

Discussion:

Dave McCarty moved to amend to undo the change in English and change “was a paid professional creation” back to “paid its contributors or staff monetarily.” and make the Chinese version consistent with that wording. He believes the replacement would better reflect the wording in other Fan categories. Chair calls for speech against, there is none. Chair calls for a vote on the amendment: it passes unanimously. Chair calls for discussion on the amended constitutional amendment. No discussion is offered. Question is called: passes unanimously and F.5 as originally printed in the Agenda will be passed on for possible ratification in Glasgow.

The next item is to re-address F7 and F8, which were referred to a committee on Friday.

F.7 Short Title: Clarifying Language Requirements

F.8 Short Title: Remove Regional Limitation

“On F.7 and F.8, the committee recommends, as an alternative, the following replacement for F7 and F8:

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows: (~~Red~~ means it is stricken, blue replaces it).

3.4.1: A work originally appearing in a language other than ~~English~~ the main languages of the countries of the administering and previous year Worldcons shall also be eligible for the year in which it is first issued in ~~English~~ translation to a main language of the countries of the administering and previous year Worldcons.

3.4.2: Works originally published outside the ~~United States of America~~ countries of the administering and prior year Worldcons and first published in ~~the United States of America~~ a country of the administering or prior year Worldcon in the previous calendar year shall also be eligible for Hugo Awards.”

Discussion:

Chair explained that there was a change in the proposed language in the version of the committee report that was printed and distributed since it referred to “language of the administering country” and it is more properly referred to as “the language of the country of the administering Worldcon”.

The Secretary asked for clarification that this one Constitutional amendment is meant to replace both F.7 and F.8, and the answer is affirmative.

Yassar Bahjatt, who was on the committee, spoke in favor of the revision, states that the re-worded language is more inclusive of other countries and languages. Ben Yalow calls for point of information: Chair provides clarification that it replaces all four instances of “language of the administering country” in 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 Dave McCarty spoke in favor: as a Hugo Administrator, some works were not eligible due to prior publication in Chinese, and he encourages all to vote for this. No speeches against. Chair calls for vote. Kevin Standlee: Parliamentary Inquiry. Asked if we are voting to accept this substitution or are we voting on it as a constitutional amendment. Chair responds that we are voting on it as a constitutional amendment. Carolina Gomez Lagerlof: For the motion, but questions what would be the case if there were two non-English-speaking countries involved? Yassar clarifies that if it is re-published in the language of the host country it would extend eligibility. Chair asked for additional comments or questions, none heard. Calls for a vote. Unanimously passed, it will go to Glasgow for possible ratification.

F.9 Short Title: Establishment of ASFiC

[See report of the “F.9 Committee” appended to these minutes.]

Discussion: Chair recuses himself because he was on the committee to revise the proposal Kevin Standlee, Deputy Presiding Officer, assumed the Chair. He asked if those who want to speak will come to the lectern to do so. The F9 Committee report and an accompanying minority report have been received and are included as an attachment to these minutes. Each

replaces the original proposal that was in the original agenda. The papers are distributed to the meeting attendees. There is no Chinese translation.

There are two versions in the new proposal. The first debate is to decide on which version is preferred, then that version shall be voted on against the original version in the agenda. Then a vote up or down. Total 14 minutes debate time is allocated.

Donald Eastlake, as Chair of the Committee, described at a high level the material: the committee report adds a general facility for regional conventions to the Constitution. It reduces references to NASFIC. If this is adopted it would allow the creation of a new regional convention based on a vote of the Business Meeting and allow the definition of countries in specific regions. This would allow the creation of an ASFIC by a vote of the Business Meeting. The alternative minority report also amends the constitution, but it is closer to the wording in the original proposed F.9. The first part of the minority report motion would change the wording to generalize the constitution to replace “Worldcon or NASFIC” with the words “Selected Conventions”. This would accommodate the removal of NASFIC or addition of a regional convention without the detailed addition and subtraction of wording since the specific references would be removed. The second part of the minority report motion would change the purpose of the society to include ASFIC and would change the originally proposed ASFIC material to define Asia and would add a sunset proposal.

The Chair ruled that if the Minority Report versions moves forward, the second provision would not just apply to 4.x.5 but would also apply to section 1.2 for the sake of consistency, and all would be subject to the sunset clause.

The Chair explained that we will first consider the F.9 Committee Report and see if the meeting wants to make any changes to it, then will address the Minority Report to see if any changes are proposed. Then we will vote on which of the two of them should move forward. Then we will consider the originally proposed amendment, and the next vote will be between the selected Committee output and the originally proposed Amendment. After that vote we will again vote to decide if we should adopt it as constitutional amendment.

The Chair encourages members to interrupt and ask questions if they are confused.

The Chair asked for discussion of the first two pages of the Committee document.

Carolina Gomez Lagerlof asked about the definition of region, if there is a limit or minimum in the number of countries in a region. Chair explains that the Business Meeting could define that. Yassar Bahjatt clarifies that a region must be more than one country. Ben Yalow asked if two small countries can combine to consider themselves a region, and therefore have a permanent position on the Mark Protection Committee (MPC). Chair asked the meeting if there are additional members who want to ask questions, there are no more. Yassar responds, technically yes, but they have to have passed the Business Meeting vote. We could

amend to add a similar vote to remove regions, but that could cause issues. Or amend to remove the regional representation from the MPC.

Chen Shi comments: For definition of Regional it is not very definite or clear. Can we change this to Continental?

Xia Zijian – This proposal to change regional to continental is not appropriate. Region is less than continental. If we make it continental it makes it more restrictive. He wants the definition of regional clarified.

Chair asked if Chen Shi wanted to move to amend to change regional to continental? He withdrew the proposed amendment.

The Chair rules that the definition of Regional must be at least two countries.

Yassar addresses the questions about not being specific about defining region, but 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 define the process of what a region is.

Carolina Gomez Lagerlof asked if it is possible to change a region once one is established.

Yassar and the Chair respond that it is defined in 4.8.1 and 4.8.2.

Ben Yalow asked if Australia would not qualify as a region since it is one country according to the Chair's interpretation. Chair agrees: it must be two or more countries.

The Chair asked for any changes. Hearing none, the wording for the Committee Report is settled.

Next we will move to the Minority Report. The Chair asked if there are any questions or proposed changes to the Minority Report. No changes are proposed. Chair closes that discussion, the wording is settled.

Next question is to decide which version moves forward – the Committee Report or the Minority Report. Chair asked for speech in favor of the Committee Report.

Yassar Bahjatt said he wanted to make it more inclusive for the world, not just the Asia format. This does not deprive NASFIC but allows other areas to participate. As far as concerns regarding the MPC, more countries could be added to a region to expand the representation.

Donald Eastlake stated that the Minority Report takes a more cautious approach, allowing an additional regional convention for Asia, and does not include a MPC representative. It would move more slowly. It is a more targeted and cautious approach.

Chair asked for speech in favor of the F.9 Committee Report version.

There was a neutral inquiry regarding the voting process.

Carolina Gomez Lagerlof believes that this is a good alternative to the NASFIC approach.

Chair asked for speech in favor of the Minority Report.

Dave McCarty spoke to unwinding NASFIC itself from the constitution and believes that overall at least the second solution is more clean.

Chair asked for any more speech in favor of the Committee Report, and after some confusion Xia Zijian spoke. We already have Asia Pacific SF con. Another Planet SF convention. If we have Worldcon it has created an example for this region, He does not feel it is necessary to set up another ASFIC, Promote SF culture around the world, encourage Worldcons in different regions so more fans can participate.

Ben Yalow spoke in favor of the Minority Report. As seen from earlier discussion. the F.9 Committee Report proposal will allow people to game the system. The second alternative is clean and will not allow people to game the system. He believes having the second alternative is better so it cannot be gamed. Prefers to have an ungameable process.

Wesley spoke in favor of minority report. If we want to expand the system we need to be cautious, a large community of SF fans have been meeting in many ways. They want to attend World SF system. They don't want to wait long for another Asian Worldcon they want to borrow from the idea of NASFIC and want to have ASFIC, The way Asia Pacific Worldcon is organized very differently from Worldcon.

Yassar Bahjatt spoke in favor of the Committee Report. It allows for ASFIC. This proposal allows for ASFIC, but does not limit it to ASFIC.

Tang Bingying spoke in favor of the Minority Report. Regional con, will it cause issues for Worldcon continuity.

Chair asked for speakers for F.9 Committee Report; there are no more.

Liu Hangxuan spoke for Minority Report. Need to be cautious, based on experience there are disputes in this convention, and not so satisfactory to him. If holding cons in different regions what will impact experience of SF fans. The F.9 Committee Report option will cause problems if organization is not good. Minority is more cautious and will promote more responsible regions to hold conventions.

Chair clarifies that no convention selected under either version would be a Worldcon and cannot be considered a Worldcon.

Chair calls for vote between the two alternatives.

Ben Yalow asked for clarification that this is a vote to amend by substitution. If the Minority Report ties with the F.9 Committee Report on the vote, it fails, the F.9 Committee Report wins. The Chair agrees with Mr. Yalow.

Xia Zijian Procedural question, suggests using serpentine vote. Chair agreed. Chair asked for those who prefer F.9 Committee Report to stand for serpentine vote. In favor: 5. In favor of Minority Report: 27. The Minority Report is adopted as the proposal from the committee.

Debate time has run out, Chair proposes additional 10 minutes debate time. Asked for objections, none are given, time is extended.

The F.9 Committee proposes to substitute the Minority Report for the original Agenda item.

Ben Yalow asked a procedural question. Since F.9 was turned over to committee, it no longer exists on the Agenda, and therefore the Minority Report is substantially substituted for it. The Chair recognizes the point but believes the Committee proposed this as an alternative rather than as a replacement, and we will choose between the two versions.

We now will choose between original F.9 and the Minority Report .

Yassar brings point of order. Since it passed the previous phase he believes there needs to be changes made at this point to the Minority Report. Chair responds that there may be amendments to the agenda version. Usually amendments to this version would have already been done, but since we are re-addressing the Minority Report he would allow proposals for amendments. Yassar states that NASFIC is mentioned a few times in the Constitution, such as in the financial reporting section, and if this creates an ASFIC then there should be parallel mentions for the ASFIC. Don Eastlake responds that this should be taken care of in the first part of the Minority Report proposal, where there is mention of the generalization of the changes.

Chair asked for speech in favor of original version in the agenda. No response.

Chair asked for speech in favor of the Minority Report.

Tang Bingying proposed the original version in the Agenda, she withdraws that proposal and supports the Minority Report. However, the original version was already before the meeting and the maker cannot unilaterally withdraw it.

Chair asked for additional comments, none offered.

Chair calls the question, should we keep the original amendment proposal or replace it with the committee report?

Show of hands. Original proposal: 0. Minority Report: unanimous. Minority Report proposal moves forward.

Consideration will now be given to the Minority Report as a Constitutional Amendment.

Since there are two items in the adopted proposal they can be separated, a request was made and the Chair will separate them since they are sufficiently different.

F.9.A Will change specific references to Worldcon or NASFIC to refer to any conventions selected by WSFS.

Secretary queries, Can we reverse the order of the questions? Chair says no. Chair stands corrected on the basis of financial report required in the first part.

Yassar Bahjatt in favor – is more inclusive and gives the Business Meeting the opportunity to add more events worldwide.

Chair asked to proceed to a vote for F.9.A. Aye: Many. Opposed: none. F.9.A is adopted unanimously and will be passed forward to next year for possible ratification.

F.9.B Establishment of ASFIC, establishing an Asian SF convention. Chair asked for technical questions first rather than debate.

Xia Zijian asked if he can he add text to the proposal 4.x.1, 4.x.2 Chair clarifies that this is not an addition to the old proposal but it will be substituted for the original proposal even though it says “add” in the new proposal. 4.x.1 – 4.x.4 will go away and be replaced by 4.x.5.

Donald Eastlake states that F.9.B says that the 4.x.1 – 4.x.4 should be considered as part of the new proposal. Chair stands corrected.

We are voting on 4.x.1 – 4.x.5.

Kia Zijian wanted to ask about the wording of the 4.x.1, “members of the administering convention” and can it be changed.

The Chair expands on the use of the term “administering convention” rather than specifying Worldcon or ASFIC or NASFIC. Yassar uses the example of a Worldcon in the US where a NASFIC would be chosen for the following year if the Worldcon was outside of North America. Kia Zijian moves to amend 4.x.1 to replace administering with ASFIC, to clarify. Chair ruled the motion as out of order since it could cause there to be no administering ASFIC in any given year.

Chair asked for any further comments or proposed changes.

Dave McCarty moved to call the question. In accordance with the Standing Rules, Chair asked for those still wishing to speak. A speaker in favor – Yassar has already spoken. Chair asked for anyone to speak, no answer, Chair asked for objections to bringing to a vote, there are none. The question is, if we should adopt the revised F.9 sections 4.x – 4.x.5 and to add section 1.2.

Chair asked if anyone needs clarification about what we are voting on.

Kia Zijian spoke against the amendment. In the original motion it emphasizes that Asia has a large community of SF fans and population but we see that China has already held large scale fan activities, so these conventions already have their systems in place. They are different from Worldcon but they are enough for Asia. Another convention may cause conflict with existing conventions. There is already a large community if we hold ASFIC here, This Business Meeting is not representative of the total Asia community, they cannot represent the Asia point of view. Some cities may not be ready to hold an ASFIC. If ASFIC is established, it may be limited to a small number of cities such as Chengdu. Staff is exhausted from Worldcon. So, this may become a burden on the local communities.

Sun Wan Chun spoke in favor. Does not believe that there are too many activities and thinks activities should be improved and ASFIC will improve for the SF fans. Also, it will encourage more activities.

Donald Eastlake notes that ASFIC does not need to be a giant con. There are many cons in Asia but they could be combined with an ASFIC and run as a joint convention. This does not require a new or huge conventions. Also, there is a distance limitation. If Chengdu was the voting location, then the new location needs to be at least 800 kilometers from Chengdu.

Dave McCarty moved to call the question. Chair asked if anyone else wants to speak. Needs a 2/3 vote to close debate. A vote is called as more than 2/3 voted to close debate. Vote on Amendment. By an uncounted show of hands, the constitutional amendment is adopted and F.9.B will be forward to next Worldcon for possible ratification.

End to F.9 consideration, gavel is passed back to Donald Eastlake, who thanks Kevin for presiding.

Announcements.

MPC will meet at 10 am tomorrow in this room. Any member of the convention can attend. Thanks Head table and Support staff.

The meeting adjourned *sine die*.

Report of the F.9 Committee

20 October 2023

Alexia Hebel, Yasser Bahjatt

Short Title: Establishing RSFiC

Commentary: This generalizes the Constitution to accommodate the addition of conventions in the future wither that was ASFiC or any other regional convention.

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

Section 1.2: Objectives. WSFS is an unincorporated literary society whose functions are:

- (1) To choose the recipients of the annual Hugo Awards (Science Fiction Achievement Awards).
- (2) To choose the locations and Committees for the annual World Science Fiction Conventions (hereinafter referred to as Worldcons).
- (3) To attend those Worldcons.
- (4) To choose the locations and Committees for the occasional ~~North-American~~ Regional Science Fiction Conventions (hereinafter referred to as ~~NASFiCs~~ RSFiCs).
- (5) To perform such other activities as may be necessary or incidental to the above purposes.

1.8.1: The Mark Protection Committee shall consist of:

- (1) One (1) member appointed to serve at the pleasure of each future selected Worldcon Committee and each of the two (2) immediately preceding Worldcon Committees,
- (2) One (1) member appointed to serve at the pleasure of each future selected ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committee and for each Committee of a ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC held in the previous ~~two~~ years, and
- (3) Nine (9) members elected three (3) each year to staggered three-year terms by the Business Meeting.

Section 2.1: Duties. Each Worldcon Committee shall, in accordance with this Constitution, provide for

- (1) administering the Hugo Awards,
- (2) administering any future Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC site selection required, and
- (3) holding a WSFS Business Meeting.

Section 2.2: Marks. Every Worldcon and ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC 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.

Section 2.8: Financial Openness. Any member of WSFS shall have the right, under reasonable conditions, to examine the financial records and books of account of the current Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committee, all future selected Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committees, the two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees, and the Committees of any ~~NASFiCs~~ RSFiCs held in the previous two years.

Section 2.9: Financial Reports.

2.9.1: Each future selected Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committee shall submit an annual financial report, including a statement of income and expenses, to each WSFS Business Meeting after the Committee's selection.

2.9.2: Each Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committee shall submit a report on its cumulative surplus/loss at the next Business Meeting after its convention.

2.9.3: Each Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committee should dispose of surplus funds remaining after accounts are settled for its convention for the benefit of WSFS as a whole.

2.9.4: In the event of a surplus, the Worldcon or ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committee, or any alternative organizational entity established to oversee and disburse that surplus, shall file annual financial reports regarding the disbursement of that surplus at each year's Business Meeting, until the surplus is totally expended or an amount equal to the original surplus has been disbursed.

Section 4.8: ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC.

4.8.1: Any WSFS member can file a motion at The Business Meeting to form a RSFiC, such filing must have a clear list of the countries served by that specific RSFiC, the proposed name and mark for the proposed RSFiC.

4.8.2: Any WSFS member can file motion at The Business Meeting to rectify the countries of a RSFiC, such filing must have a clear list of the countries to be served by that specific RSFiC.

4.8.3: RSFiC motions that pass at the Business Meeting, take effect the following year.

4.8.4: The Mark Protection committee shall add the mark of new RSFiC to the list of marks that it protects under section 1.7.1.

4.8.5: If the selected Worldcon site is within the region of any RSFiC, no RSFiC can be selected for that same year.

4.8.6: ~~not in North America, there shall be a NASFiC in North America that year.~~ Selection of the ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiCs shall be by the identical procedure to the Worldcon selection except as provided below or elsewhere in this Constitution.

4.8.17: Voting shall be by written ballot administered by the following year's Worldcon, ~~if there is no NASFiC for the RSFiC not running in that year,~~ or by the following year's ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiCs running in that year, if there is one, with ballots cast at the administering convention or by mail, and with only members of the administering convention allowed to vote.

4.8.28: ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC Committees shall make all reasonable efforts to avoid conflicts with Worldcon dates.

4.8.39: The proposed ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC supporting membership rate can be set by unanimous agreement of the administering Committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. If agreement is not reached, the default fee shall be the median (middle value) of the US dollar fees used in the previous three (3) Worldcon site selections.

4.8.410: For any RSFiC, If "None of the Above" wins, or if no eligible bid files by the deadline, then ~~no NASFiC that RSFiC~~ shall not be held and any supporting membership payments collected for ~~the NASFiC that RSFiC~~ site selection shall be refunded by the administering convention without undue delay.

4.8.511: In the case the administering convention is a ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC, it shall hold a Business Meeting to receive the results of the site selection voting and to handle any other business pertaining directly, and only, to the selection of ~~the its~~ future ~~NASFiC~~ RSFiC convention. This meeting shall have no other powers or duties.

4.8.612: For the purposes of this Constitution (unless otherwise changed by a motion as described in section 4.8.2), NASFiC shall include the following countries: ~~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.

MINORITY REPORT

Donald Eastlake

The minority proposes a substitute as below. This consists of two parts, F.9.A and F.9.B as below. The first generalizes the Constitution to accommodate the addition and removal of regional conventions. The second establishes the ASFiC.

Short Title: F.9 Minority Report

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution as follows:

Part F.9.A Convention Generalization

Replace all occurrences of “Worldcon or NASFiC” and all occurrences of “Worldcon and NASFiC” with “selected convention”.

Change Section 2.8 as follows:

Section 2.8: Financial Openness. Any member of WSFS shall have the right, under reasonable conditions, to examine the financial records and books of account of the current ~~Worldcon or NASFiC Committee~~ selected conventions, all future selected ~~Worldcon or NASFiC Committees~~ conventions, ~~the two immediately preceding Worldcon Committees, and the Committees of any NASFiCs held in the~~ and all previous selected conventions back through the most recent two years.

Part F.9.B Establishment of ASFiC

Add text to Section 1.2 point 4 as follows:

Section 1.2: (4) To choose the locations and Committees for the occasional North American Science Fiction Conventions (hereinafter referred to as NASFiCs) and Asia Science Fiction Conventions (hereinafter referred to as ASFiCs).

Make the changes in item F.9 in the agenda.

Also add the following material:

4.X.5 For the purposes of this Constitution, Asia is defined as the area bounded to the north by the Arctic Ocean, to the east by the Pacific Ocean, to the south by the Indian Ocean, and to the west by the Ural Mountains, the Ural River, the Caspian Sea, the Caucasus Mountains, the Black Sea, the Aegean Sea, the Mediterranean Sea, the Red Sea, and the Arabian Sea.

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2029 Business Meeting, this Section shall be repealed effective with the end of the 2029 Worldcon but any previously selected ASFiC will remain an ASFiC; and

Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2029 Business Meeting.