

**MINUTES OF THE 2011 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING
RENOVATION, THE 2011 WORLDCON
Thursday August 18, Friday August 19, and Saturday August 20, 2011**

All meetings were held in room A02 of the Reno-Sparks Convention Center, Reno, Nevada. In the absence of Chairman Kent Bloom, Deputy Chairman Donald E. Eastlake III presided over the preliminary meeting. The head table officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Warren Buff

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

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

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

Preliminary Business Meeting, Friday, Thursday, August 18, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Donald Eastlake III, Presiding Officer Pro Tem, presiding; Linda Deneroff, Secretary, and Warren Buff, Timekeeper.

1. COMMITTEE REPORTS

1.1 Mark Protection Committee (Including Nominations for MPC)

The Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) met on Wednesday evening of the convention to ratify their report to the Business Meeting. It is attached and incorporated into the minutes of these proceedings.

Mark Protection Committee members are:

- **Elected 2008, term ending in 2011:** Stephen Boucher (RoTW), Mark Olson (East), Linda Deneroff (West).
- **Elected 2009, term ending in 2012:** Scott Dennis (Central), Donald Eastlake III (East), Ruth Sachter (West);
- **Elected 2010, term ending in 2013:** Ben Yalow (East), Kevin Standlee (West), Tim Illingworth (Central);
- **Worldcon Representatives:** Chicago 7 – Sandra Levy (until 2014);
Aussiecon 4 – Mark Linneman (until 2012)
Renovation – Ian Stockdale (until 2013)
Anticipation – Adrienne Seel or René Walling (alternate), (until 2011)
ReConstruction – Dina Krause (Mike Willmoth, alternate), (until 2012)

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

The members whose terms of office expire at this Worldcon are: Stephen Boucher (RoTW), Mark Olson (East), and Linda Deneroff (West). Ruth Sachter has resigned as stated below. Due to zone residency restrictions, we can elect at most two persons from the Western zone, one from the Central zone, one person from the Eastern zone, or four people from the Rest of the World, but not more than four people overall. The person replacing Ruth will serve for a one-year term; the other three will serve for three years. Write-in votes are allowed, but write-in candidates must submit their

consent to election by the close of balloting. (See the head table staff for a nomination acceptance form.)

The HAMC report was submitted separately, but should be considered a part of the MPC report. Additionally, after the MPC report went to press, Ruth Sachter resigned from the Mark Protection Committee with one year remaining on her term.

Stephen Boucher; Kate Kligman; Mark Olson; Dave McCarty; David Gallaher; Warren Buff; Adina Adler; and Linda Deneroff were nominated for the MPC.

There were no new motions submitted.

The Hugo Awards Marketing Committee (“HAMC”) members are René Walling (Chair), Kevin Standlee, Kate Kligman, Craig Miller, Mark Olson. An error on page 1 of the business meeting agenda listed Cheryl Morgan as being on HAMC, but she was not on this year’s committee. HAMC is a subcommittee of the Mark Protection Committee, and their report was made to the MPC and is attached to these minutes.

1.2 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members are Don Eastlake, Tim Illingworth, and Kevin Standlee. Kevin Standlee gave their report.

The chair pointed out that Ruling CH-2010-1 in the committee report is in conflict with Section 1.8.4 of the WSFS constitution, which authorizes the MPC to fill vacancies in elected positions until the Business Meeting can do so. Mr. Standlee agreed that the body of CH-2010-1 would be replaced with a notation to that effect.

The Chair requested that the name and title of the Presiding Officer and Secretary of the MPC be inserted into the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee report just before the list of MPC resolutions, in the same manner that the Business Meeting Officers are listed at the beginning of that report.

The report, with the above changes, is attached and incorporated into these minutes.

1.3 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners’ Guide Editorial Committee members are Mike Willmoth (Chair), Bill Taylor, John Hertz, Sharon Sbarsky and any others appointed by the Chair of the committee. Bill Taylor made the report. The site of the Worldcon Runners Guide has been ported to new site, www.wcrg.conrunners.net. The committee needs to finish its corrections and do whatever else is appropriate to publish the guide.

1.4 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

The HEROW Committee members are: Ben Yalow (Chair), Perrienne Lurie, Robert MacIntosh, Cheryl Morgan, Howard Rosenblatt and Kevin Standlee. Their report this year consists solely of the two motions in Sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 of this agenda. The “We Need Another Hero” resolution to continue the committee was adopted, and those wishing to join this committee were instructed to see Don Eastlake (“the Chair”) after the meeting.

1.5 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

The Formalization of Long List Entries (“FOLLE”) Committee members are Mark Olson (Chair), Kent Bloom, , Dave Grubbs, Colin Harris, Tim Illingworth, Richard Lynch, Craig Miller, Joe Siclari, Kevin Standlee, and Ben Yalow. Their report is attached and hereby incorporated into these minutes.

1.6 Semi-Prozine Committee

The Semi-Prozine Committee members are Chris Barkley, Seth Briedbart, Warren Buff, Neil Clarke, Gary Farber, David Hartwell, Saul Jaffe, Perianne Lurie, Kevin Maroney, Mark Olson, Stu Segal, Ben Yalow. Their report is attached and incorporated into these minutes. There are two motions contained in this report and the accompanying minority reports that will be discussed as new agenda items 4.3.5 and 4.3.6.

2. WORLDCON REPORTS

The secretary would like to thank and commend all the committee for having submitted these reports in sufficient time to collate and release them in advance of the meeting.

2.1 Past Worldcons & NASFiC

2.1.1 Millennium Philcon (2001)

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

Expenses – July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

Bank Services Charges	\$ 432.25
Equipment Rental	<u>\$ 322.71</u>
Total Expenses	\$ 754.96
Surplus Distributions	
Renovation – Reimbursement Mailing for A4	\$ 1,896.59
Total Surplus Distributions	1,896.59
Surplus Balance July 31, 2010	\$48,490.75
Expenses Paid August 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	754.96
Surplus Distributions – 8/1/10-6/30/11	<u>1,896.59</u>
Surplus Balance June 30, 2011	\$45,839.20

Note:

The committee agreed to cover the cost of mailing the program books to those members of A4 who were unable to attend the convention. This includes the cost of shipping the books to whatever site is chosen to fulfill the mailing of the books.

After holding funds for ten years, Millennium Philcon was encouraged to disperse their funds more quickly.

2.1.2 LACon IV (2006)

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

LACON IV Funds

08/06/11

9/1/2006	Opening		\$75,000.00
9/8/2006	Rotsler Award	2006 Winner	(\$300.00)
10/11/2006	Equipment	Reg system	(\$300.00)
2/3/2007	LACon Masque Photo Exhibit	display expenses	(\$27.71)
2/3/2007	LACon Masque Photo Exhibit	display expenses	(\$21.08)
4/25/2007	Worldcon History	Worldcon History	(\$20.00)
5/17/2007	Worldcon History	Worldcon History	(\$913.00)
6/14/2007	Donations – TAFF	report published	(\$100.00)
6/24/2007	Octavia Bulter Fund		(\$1,500.00)
6/30/2007	Worldcon History	Worldcon History	(\$45.00)
8/20/2007	Donations	Nippon Worldcon - Hugo Party	(\$5,000.00)
10/1/2007	Donations	ISL	(\$3,000.00)
10/28/2007	Rotsler Award	2007 Winner	(\$300.00)
12/9/2007	Local Fandom	Storage Shed Rental	(\$935.00)
2/18/2008	Local Fandom	Cell Phone Booster	(\$327.00)
3/17/2008	Local Fandom	Cell Phone Booster	(\$150.00)
3/17/2008	Local Fandom	Master Card Machines	(\$1,685.00)
5/2/2008	Donations – TAFF	con report	(\$62.77)
5/9/2008	Projects – Photos		(\$468.71)
5/21/2008	Donations – TAFF	Report	(\$500.00)
6/18/2008	Misc.	memory for computer	(\$69.00)
6/18/2008	Projects – Photos		(\$106.09)
7/13/2008	Projects – Photos		(\$205.68)
7/13/2008	Donations	Seattle Worldcon	(\$500.00)
7/13/2008	Worldcon History		(\$1,429.00)
8/21/2008	Projects – Photos		(\$254.39)
10/2/2008	Projects – Photos		(\$207.84)
10/11/2008	Storage		(\$120.00)
10/11/2008	Storage		(\$510.00)
10/11/2008	Storage	WC History	(\$292.00)
11/20/2008	Donations	Nippon	(\$10,000.00)
12/4/2008	Projects – Photos		(\$339.43)
12/4/2008	Worldcon History		(\$17.30)
12/23/2008	Worldcon History		(\$17.30)
2/3/2009	Donations	Eaton Conference	(\$1,500.00)
2/3/2009	Storage	SCIFI Shed	(\$3,223.00)
2/27/2009	Donations	Shed rent	(\$935.00)

2/27/2009	Donations	75th Anniversary	(\$500.00)
3/14/2009	Admin	Paper for large printer	(\$75.96)
3/17/2009	Equipment	Large cutter	(\$311.00)
4/15/2009	Donations – DUFF	Duff Report	(\$500.00)
5/4/2009	Projects – Photos	Moffatt picture transfer	(\$308.51)
5/19/2009	Donations - TAFF 2005	TAFF Report	(\$500.00)
7/14/2009	Projects	Hugo Award Contest	(\$500.00)
7/16/2009	Projects	Worldcon History	(\$16.00)
9/17/2009	Projects	reg; wc history	(\$512.80)
10/10/2009	Projects	Con Registration	(\$1,700.00)
11/4/2009	Donations	Archive fanzines at Riverside	(\$2,500.00)
11/19/2009	Projects	Registration	(\$175.00)
11/24/2009	Rotsler Award	Plaque	(\$66.80)
11/24/2009	Rotsler Award	Honor	(\$300.00)
12/7/2009	Projects	Registration	(\$1,700.00)
12/10/2009	Projects	Registration	(\$1,700.00)
12/17/2009	Projects	Registration	(\$500.00)
1/1/2010	Storage	WC History	(\$2,930.00)
1/22/2010	Projects	Registration	(\$1,521.80)
2/1/2010	Storage		(\$3,223.00)
2/1/2010	Projects	WC History	(\$35.00)
4/14/2010	Donations – GUFF	2004	(\$500.00)
5/1/2010	Storage	WC History	(\$255.00)
8/7/2010	Donations – GUFF	2009	(\$500.00)
8/13/2010	Projects	Art show update	(\$92.00)
8/16/2010	Projects	Art show update	(\$153.00)
8/21/2010	Projects	Art show update	(\$685.00)
2/8/2011	Donations	UCR - Eaton Conference	(\$1,500.00)
5/2/2011	Donations	RCFI	(\$1,000.00)
7/15/2011	Rotsler Award	Shiffman	(\$300.00)
			\$15,057.83

The report was accepted without discussion.

2.1.3 Anticipation (2009)

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

**Financial Report
Cansmof, Inc.
For July 31, 2011**

Opening Balance	\$101,106.00
Anticipation expenses	\$2,657.91
Administrative Fees	\$517.66
Black Box Fringe Production	\$600.00
Nippon 2007	\$5,000.00
SFSF Boreal Writer's Workshop	\$1,500.00
Smofcon Scholarship	\$1,500.00
Wondercon Book Project	\$1,000.00
Total expenses	\$12,275.57
Balance on July 31 st , 2011	\$88,830.43

NB: all amounts in Canadian Dollars

2.1.4 Aussiecon 4 (2010)

Aussiecon 4 has not yet disposed of its surplus, and therefore this is not its final report.

AUSSIECON 4 - Financial Report to Renovation

Period : August 2008 to June 2011

INCOME	A\$
Memberships – attending	\$438,205.19
Memberships – supporting	\$60,633.86
Memberships - child & daily	\$8,335.08
Total Memberships	\$507,174.13
Advertising	\$10,541.99
Hucksters	\$7,297.21
Artshow	\$1,058.12
Bank Interest	\$5,283.72
Donations	\$31,696.43
Grants	\$4,700.00
Pass Along Funds	\$76,674.81
Sponsorship	\$28,136.36
Sundry	\$1,304.50
Estimated Currency gain (loss)	(\$18,917.02)
Total Income	\$654,950.25
EXPENSES	
Logistics Division	\$6,619.55
Chair Division	\$11,475.40
Facilities Division	\$456,206.34
Finance Division	\$25,538.12
Exhiits & Functions Division	\$17,256.66
Program Division	\$3,319.92
Events Division	\$1,164.65
Publications Division	\$44,732.83
Commuications Division	\$16,421.42
WSFS Division	\$4,716.91
Total Expense	\$587,451.80
SURPLUS	\$67,498.45
Less Pass Along funds to Renovation (US\$8,4000)	(\$7,820.00)
NET SURPLUS	\$59,678.45
Represented By	
ASSETS	
* Bank Account	\$41,905.46
* US Bank (convert A\$)	\$21,212.98
Total Assets	\$63,118.44
LIABILITIES	
* Accrued Expenses	\$4,000.00
* GST Payable	(\$560.01)
Total Liabilities	\$3,439.99
NET ASSETS	\$59,678.45

Treasurer – Carey Henfield

The treasurer's name was inadvertently listed incorrectly and is corrected in these minutes.

Colin Harris questioned the timeliness of pass-along fund dispersals to Renovation. Chicon 7 confirmed they had not received pass-along funds in February 2011; it received the site selection fees. The delay in funds to Renovation may have something to do with statutory authorities' audit requirements. Currently Aussiecon 4 funds are involved in an audit. Mark Olson reported he sent a check to Renovation in February being for reimbursement of VAT paid by Reno on behalf of Aussiecon 4. A check to Renovation in the amount of \$8,400 being pass-along funds was sent in July.

Colin stated that it is important that all Worldcons going forward receive at least an indication as to what amount they may expect.

2.1.5 ReConstruction, the 10th NASFiC (2010)

The report from ReConstruction will be distributed at the business meeting. Recontruction is in the process of distributing reimbursements. There will be one more report next year.

ReConStruction Financial Report

As of August 15th, 2011

INCOME

Voting Fees		
Memberships (in process of verification)		\$56,000.00
Comped Memberships		\$ (1,000.00)
Transfer from Bid		\$24,901.17
Advertising		\$ 1,000.00
Art Show		\$ 1,042.00
Artists' Fees	\$ 1,042.00	
Sales Receipts	\$ 4,478.00	
Payments to Artists	\$(4,478.00)	
Dealers' Room		\$ 6,250.00
Chesley's Art Show Reception		\$ 1,000.00
<hr/>		
TOTAL INCOME		\$89,193.17

EXPENDITURES

Chairman		\$13,650.20
Mark Protection Committee		\$ 276.00
Guest Expenses		\$ 7,039.20
Guests of Honor		
Hotel	\$ 3,139.20	
Per Diem Allowances	\$ 1,200.00	
Travel	\$ 2,700.00	
Reimbursements (tentative)		\$ 6,335.00
Events		\$15,201.00
Opening Ceremonies		\$ 500.00
Tech		\$12,000.00
Dance DJ		\$ 300.00
Masquerade		\$ 2,186.00
F&B in masquerade green room	\$ 950.00	
Masquerade Ribbons	\$ 486.00	
Certificates	\$ 80.00	
Supplies	\$ 670.00	

BMI, ASCAP, etc Royalties		\$ 215.00
Exhibits/Fixed Functions		\$ 4,000.00
Art Show		\$ 3,750.00
Art Show Reception (Chesley's)	\$ 2,000.00	
Supplies	\$ 150.00	
Power Drop - Electric	\$ 1,500.00	
Award Ribbons	\$ 100.00	
Dealers' Room		\$ 250.00
Dealer's Mailings	\$ 150.00	
Administrative	\$ 100.00	
Facilities		\$38,287.00
Insurance		\$ 1,000.00
Convention Center Space		\$25,000.00
Convention Center Equipment		\$ 1,350.00
Tables	\$ 900.00	
Tens-a-barrier	\$ 450.00	
Sheraton Space		\$ 4,287.00
Marriott Space		\$ 5,000.00
Security		\$ 1,650.00
Bonded Security	\$1,650.00	
Member Services		\$ 2,960.00
Handicap Services		\$ 200.00
Registration		\$ 960.00
Badges	\$ 520.00	
Office Supplies	\$ 200.00	
Info Desk	\$ 240.00	
Con Suite		\$ 1,800.00
Room (Raleigh Suite)	\$ 1,200.00	
Supplies	\$ 600.00	
Operations		\$ 1,650.00
Truck		\$ 100.00
Truck Rental	\$ 100.00	
Truck Rental Insurance	\$ 100.00	
Print Shop		\$ 850.00
Small Copier	\$ 100.00	
Signage	\$ 250.00	
Out of House Print Shop	\$ 500.00	
Office Supplies		\$ 300.00
Staff Lounge		\$ 400.00
Programming		\$ 1,260.00
Programming Operations		\$ 500.00

Green Room		\$ 550.00
Official Ribbons		\$ 200.00
Writers' Workshop		\$ 10.00
Photocopying/Administrative	\$ 10.00	
Publications		\$ 5,334.00
PR1		\$ 1,856.00
Printing	\$ 880.00	
Postage	\$ 976.00	
PR2		\$ 128.00
Printing	\$ 40.00	
Postage	\$ 88.00	
Pocket Program		\$ 600.00
Program Book/Souvenir Book		\$ 2,500.00
Newsletter		\$ 250.00
Publicity		\$ 2,040.00
Advertising		\$ 200.00
Parties		\$ 800.00
Flyers		\$ 1,000.00
Domain name		\$ 40.00
Treasurer		\$ 4,810.97
Credit Card Machine		\$ 980.00
Supplies		\$ 220.00
Postage	\$ 100.00	
Calculators	\$ 10.00	
Cash Boxes	\$ 50.00	
Lock Bags	\$ 50.00	
Bins	\$ 10.00	
Paypal fees		\$ 1,329.61
Credit Card Service		\$ 1,080.00
Taxes		\$ 1,201.36
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		\$89,193.17
 (Income Less Expenditures)		 \$.

Anticipation and Millennium Philcon donated funds to Reconstruction but there is no line item for it in the report.

2.2. Seated Worldcons & NASFiC

2.2.1 Renovation

The report from Renovation was distributed at the business meeting and is incorporated in these minutes.



Renovation Financial Report

As of 30 June, 2011

This is the second Financial Report of Renovation, the 69th Worldcon, to the WSFS Business Meeting. It covers all convention activities through to 30 June, 2011.

INCOME	to 30 June 2010	to 30 June 2011	TOTAL
Voting Fees	\$34,560	\$0	\$34,560
Memberships	\$126,895	\$366,422	\$493,317
Transfer from Reno in 2011 Bid	\$24,000	\$2,435	\$26,435
Bank Interest	\$1	\$555	\$556
Exhibits - Dealers' Room Fees		\$25,650	\$25,650
Exhibits - Art Show Fees		\$7,095	\$7,095
Art @ Renovation Sponsorship		\$2,250	\$2,250
Publications – Advertising		\$3,581	\$3,581
Passalong – Denver	\$26,315		\$26,315
Passalong – Anticipation	\$22,500	\$10,162	\$32,662
Passalong - Aussiecon 4		\$8,400	\$8,400
Other Donations & Miscellaneous	\$575	\$1,117	\$1,692
TOTAL INCOME	<u>\$234,846</u>	<u>\$427,667</u>	<u>\$662,513</u>

EXPENDITURE	to 30 June 2010	to 30 June 2011	TOTAL
Chair's Office:			
Committee Meetings	\$1,021	\$1,295	\$2,316
Aussiecon - Hugo Nominees Party/Gifts		\$6,293	\$6,293
Finance:			
Bank & Credit Card Fees	\$3,372	\$7,863	\$11,235
Corporation Costs	\$245	\$399	\$644
Insurance		\$7,442	\$7,442
Office / PO Box Costs	\$341	\$399	\$740
US Bulk Mail Fees	\$370	\$185	\$555
Membership Forms	\$560	\$0	\$560

EXPENDITURE		to 30 June 2010	to 30 June 2011	TOTAL
WSFS:	Hugo Rockets	\$190	\$6,423	\$6,613
	Hugo Bases		\$4,799	\$4,799
	Web Domain Registration	\$190	\$0	\$190
Facilities:	Convention Center Hire	\$35,534	\$65,991	\$101,525
	IT Support	\$179	\$97	\$276
Exhibits:	Art Show (Construction / Lighting)		\$3,060	\$3,060
	Logistics - Reno Storage		\$275	\$275
Program:	GoH / Special Guests		\$4,016	\$4,016
	Program - General		\$50	\$50
Events:	Music Night		\$1,750	\$1,750
	Film & Anime - MPLC Licenses		\$3,500	\$3,500
	Performance Fees - BMI		\$210	\$210
Services:	Childcare - Kiddiecorp		\$5,595	\$5,595
	Info Desk		\$28	\$28
Publications:	Progress Report 0 (Anticipation)	\$5,643	\$0	\$5,643
	Progress Report 1 (Spring 2010)	\$3,354	\$122	\$3,476
	Progress Report 2 (Fall 2010)	\$440	\$3,713	\$4,153
	Progress Report 3 (New Year 2011)		\$6,186	\$6,186
	Progress Report 4 (Spring 2011)		\$6,368	\$6,368
	Progress Report 5 (Summer 2011)		\$1,398	\$1,398
Promotions:	Outbound Advertising	\$1,620	\$1,995	\$3,615
	Convention Activities	\$1,922	\$2,672	\$4,594
	Promotional Materials (Flyers)	\$3,267	\$1,285	\$4,552
	Promotional Materials (Other)	\$1,434	\$2,092	\$3,526
TOTAL EXPENDITURE		<u>\$59,682</u>	<u>\$145,501</u>	<u>\$205,183</u>
NET INCOME FOR PERIOD		<u>\$175,164</u>	<u>\$282,166</u>	<u>\$457,330</u>

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS

Bank Accounts	\$467,796
Paypal	\$842
Credit Cards Pending	\$4,940
Art Show	\$7,714
Payments in Progress	(\$23,963)
CURRENT BALANCE	<u>\$457,330</u>

Report by
John Lorentz, Treasurer
 17 August 2011

2.2.2 Chicon 7



Chicon 7

Financial Statement

1 August, 2010 thru 31 July, 2011

ASSETS

Associated Bank (acct 1)	\$41,026.65	
Associated Bank (acct 2)	\$250.00	
Bank of America	\$90,060.00	
PayPal	\$48,316.33	
Total Assets		\$179,652.98

Opening Balance 1 September, 2010

Transfer from Bid **\$17,349.68**

INCOME

Anticipation Pass Along Funds	\$32,661.66	
Memberships	\$149,837.20	
Total Income		\$182,498.86

EXPENDITURES

Chairman's Division		(\$7,399.77)
Committee Meetings	(\$2,885.32)	
Credit Card/PayPal Fees	(\$3,640.19)	
Other Bank Fees	(\$109.26)	
Bad Debt	(\$95.00)	
Corporation Costs	(\$670.00)	
Marketing Division		(\$5,372.70)
Advertising	(\$1,590.82)	
<i>Fan Advertising</i>	(\$1,210.00)	
<i>Misc Advertising Costs</i>	(\$380.82)	
Convention and Open Events	(\$554.60)	
Promotional Materials	(\$3,227.28)	
<i>Flyers</i>	(\$718.17)	
<i>Mailing Costs</i>	(\$452.11)	
<i>New Initiatives</i>	(\$2,057.00)	
Publications Division		(\$3,256.85)
PR (Spring)	(\$3,256.85)	
<i>Production</i>	(\$2,485.25)	
<i>Mailing Costs</i>	(\$771.60)	

Services Division		(\$405.81)	
IT Support		(\$340.67)	
<i>Artistic Director IT</i>	(\$101.11)		
<i>Hardware Purchased</i>	(\$109.09)		
<i>Internet Services Hosting etc</i>	(\$130.47)		
Office Pre and at Con		(\$65.14)	
<i>Office Supplies</i>	(\$65.14)		
WSFS Division		(\$3,081.72)	
Hugo Rockets		(\$3,081.72)	
Current Miscellaneous Costs		(\$678.71)	
General Misc.		(\$678.71)	
		Total Expense:	(\$20,195.56)
Closing Balance, 31 July 2011			\$179,652.98
Treasurer – Joyce Hooper			

3. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM AUSSIECON 4

The following Constitutional Amendments were approved at Aussiecon 4 and passed on to Renovation for ratification. If ratified, they will become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Renovation.

3.1 Short Title: Change the Membership Rate Limitations

Moved, to modify Section 1.5.5 of the WSFS Constitution to replace “two (2) times the site-selection fee” with “four (4) times the site-selection fee”.

Section 1.5.5: Voters have the right to convert to attending membership in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed ~~two (2)~~ four (4) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the difference between the site-selection fee and the fee for new attending members.

Commentary. *The current rules limit the rates that voters can be charged to convert their supporting memberships to attending memberships. This means that the voting fees, and therefore the supporting memberships, are forced higher to keep the initial voter attending rate from being too low. Also the maximum initial voter attending membership rate may be sufficiently below the required average membership rate that it forces conventions to have higher attending rates for members who join later, which discourages people, particularly people who are becoming interested in Worldcons, and who might want to join. Committees want the flexibility to tailor membership rates to accomplish those goals without being constrained by the low initial voter attending membership limitations.*

Time set is 5 minutes.

3.2 Short Title: Electronic Voting

Moved, to amend Article 6 of the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of clarifying the status of electronic voting on the Hugo Awards and Site Selection, by adding a new section after existing Section 6.2 as follows:

6.3: Electronic Voting. Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted to prohibit conducting Hugo Awards nominating and voting and Site Selection voting by electronic means, except that conducting Site Selection by electronic means shall require the unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon committee and all bidding committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. Valid paper ballots delivered by any means shall always be acceptable. This section

shall not be interpreted to require that such elections be conducted electronically, nor shall it be interpreted to allow remote participation or proxy voting at the Business Meeting.

Commentary. The phrase “Voting shall be by written ballot cast either by mail or at the current Worldcon” in section 4.1.2 has been held to prohibit conducting any portion of Worldcon site selection electronically, such as through a web site in the same manner as most recent Hugo Award elections. The word “mail” and “written ballot” has been interpreted to only allow paper ballots delivered by postal mail, private delivery, fax machine, or personal delivery by the voter or an authorized representative. This proposal would broaden the existing interpretation to require that “mail” be interpreted to include “e-mail and other electronic means” such as voting through a web site. It does not specify a specific technology for e-voting. It says that the constitution should be interpreted to allow electronic voting for both the Hugo Awards and Site Selection, but it does not require that such elections be held electronically, and it specifically requires that such elections must always have a paper-ballot/by-mail (or other delivery method) option.

Worldcons could unilaterally decide whether to conduct Hugo Award nomination and voting through electronic means. The decision to use e-voting for Site Selection would initially be in the hands of the individual Worldcon committee conducting the particular site selection, but a final decision to actually do so would require the agreement of all bidding committees who filed in time to appear on the Site Selection ballot.

In addition, this proposal explicitly excludes electronic voting, proxy voting, or other forms of remote participation at the Business Meeting. Voting at the Business Meeting shall continue to be in person only, including any votes held there such as constitutional amendments and elections to the WSFS Mark Protection Committee.

Time set is 4 minutes.

3.3 Allow Electronic Distribution of Rules

Moved, to amend Section 2.4 and Article 1 of the WSFS Constitution by striking out and adding words as shown, with the intention of requiring Worldcon committees to publish copies of the WSFS rules without requiring that such publication be in the form of printed documents, except for distribution “at con.”

2.4: Distribution of Rules. The current Worldcon Committee shall ~~print copies of~~ publish the WSFS Constitution and Standing Rules, together with an explanation of proposed changes approved but not yet ratified, ~~and copies of the Standing Rules~~. The Committee shall

distribute these documents to all WSFS members at a point between nine and three months prior to the Worldcon, and shall also distribute them on paper to all WSFS members in attendance at the Worldcon upon registration.

Amend Article 1 by adding a new section after existing Section 1.5.2 as follows:

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

Commentary on the changes in Section 2.4: *This revision permits Worldcons to distribute copies of the documents on paper or electronically. “Distribute” does not mean merely placing copies of the documents on the convention web site, the convention must notify its members of the availability of these documents.*

Commentary on the change to Article 1: *This makes it clear that Worldcons may distribute publications electronically, provided that members receive them on paper unless they choose otherwise.*

Commentary on both changes: *These changes allow for the Constitution and Standing Rules to be distributed electronically ahead of time, and requires them to be distributed on paper at the convention. This does not affect the inclusion of Article 3 and extensions as provided in Section 3.7.2.*

Time set is 4 minutes.

3.4 Expand Hugo Nominations Eligibility

Moved, to amend Section 3.7.1 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the nominees for the final Award voting. Each member of ~~either~~ 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 five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

Commentary. *Increasing the potential pool of people eligible to make Hugo Award nominations would be a good thing. When Hugo Award nomination forms are distributed at the start of a calendar year, there is actually another standing Worldcon in existence – the following Worldcon.*

Time set is 4 minutes.

3.5 Run-Off References

Moved, to amend portions of the WSFS Constitution by inserting text to clarify the relationship of “No Award” and “None of the Above” to the “Run-Off Candidate” rule, as follows:

- (a) Amend Section 3.11.3 as follows

3.11.3: “No Award” shall be the run-off candidate for the purposes of Section 6.4.

- (b) Amend Section 4.5.3 as follows:

4.5.3: “None of the Above” shall be treated as a bid for tallying, and shall be the run-off candidate for the purposes of Section 6.4.

Commentary. *The 2010 Hugo Award Administrator, Vincent Docherty, approached the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee questioning the way in which Section 3.11 is worded. The committee determined that previous constitutional revisions may have made it less than obvious that the wording at Sections 3.11.3 and 4.5.3 refers to the “Run-Off Candidate” rule at Section 6.4. This includes an explicit cross-reference in both cases to make it more obvious that these sections are related to each other.*

Time set is 2 minutes.

3.6 Mark Notice Revision

Moved, to amend the standard service mark notice in Section 2.2 of the WSFS Constitution by ~~striking out~~ and inserting words as shown:

Section 2.2: Marks. Every Worldcon and NASFIC Committee shall include the following notice in each of its publications:

“World Science Fiction Society,” “WSFS,” “World Science Fiction Convention,” “Worldcon,” “NASFIC,” ~~and~~ “Hugo Award,” the Hugo Award Logo, and the distinctive design of the Hugo Award Trophy Rocket are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society.

Commentary. *Two new service marks have been created for the World Science Fiction Society. This adds those marks to the required notice that every Worldcon is to include with its publications.*

Time set is 2 minutes.

4. NEW BUSINESS

4.1. Motion of Continuing Effect

Items under this heading may be voted upon and final action taken by the Preliminary Business Meeting.

4.1.1 Short Title: WSFS Domains

RESOLVED, that the Mark Protection Committee is instructed to take reasonable steps to protect likely internet domain names of future Worldcons for years not yet selected, and to turn over control of such domain names to Worldcons as they are selected.

Proposed by: Warren Buff

Seconded by: Kevin Standlee

No commentary was provided.

Time set is 4 minutes.

Discussion: Warren Buff reported that since we discovered a website named worldcon2011.org this year, it might be in order to register similar type domains protect ourselves in future years. However, Ben Yalow said it could cost thousands of dollars to speculatively register names. The key names, absolutely. When it was pointed out that the resolution says “reasonable,” it was countered that “reasonable” can sometimes be subject to unreasonable interpretation. It was suggested that we could put a limit on the amount of money to spend in this endeavor, and Mike Glycer suggested that convention committees themselves should be responsible for this. The question was asked, is it relevant to continue registering a domain with a year once that year has expired?

A motion was made to postpone discussion until the resolution could be further refined. A motion to postpone was made, but it was defeated by a vote of 35 to 41. A motion was then made to refer the item to the Mark Protection Committee for further refinement. This motion was accepted without discussion.

4.1.2 Short Title: MPC Eligibility Rules

After a vote in favor, the discussion of this item was postponed to after discussion of item 4.1.6. See the minutes there.

4.1.3 Short Title: This Year's Model

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

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

3.2.4: A work shall not be eligible if in a prior year it received sufficient nominations to appear on the final award ballot. This motion extends eligibility for the Hugo Award; therefore, it requires a 3/4 vote.

No commentary was provided.

Proposed by: the HEROW Committee

This motion passed by a majority vote without discussion.

4.1.4 Short Title: Another Year, Another HEROW

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

No commentary was provided.

Proposed by: the HEROW Committee

This motion passed by a majority vote without discussion.

4.1.5 Short Title: Extension of Eligibility of *Summer Wars*

Moved, to extend the eligibility of the English-language translation of the movie *Summer Wars* per section 3.4 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by Petrea Mitchell
Seconded by Kevin Standlee

Commentary: Section 3.4 states, “In the event that a potential Hugo Award nominee receives extremely limited distribution in the year of its first publication or presentation, its eligibility may be extended for an additional year by a three fourths (3/4) vote of the intervening Business Meeting of WSFS.”

Summer Wars was officially released in English in December 2010. However, its theatrical release within 2010 consisted of single-theater, single-week runs in a total of 5 cities. It was released on DVD in North America in February 2011, and in Australia and Europe in March 2011.

In its original language, *Summer Wars* won both a Seiun for Best Media (the Japanese equivalent to a Hugo, approximately the same as the old Best Dramatic Presentation Category), and a Japan Academy Award for Animation of the Year (the Japanese equivalent to an Oscar for Best Animated Picture). Given that, it seems worth the trouble to give it a fair shot at consideration.

This motion passed by a majority vote without discussion.

4.1.6 Short Title: Renewal of the Formalization of Long List Entries Committee

The Formalization of Long List Entries (“FOLLE”) Committee requested extension of another year. This motion passed by acclamation and without discussion.

4.1.2 Short Title: MPC Eligibility Rules

Proposed resolution regarding Mark Protection Committee eligibility rules.

RESOLVED, that the Mark Protection Committee is hereby instructed that it may not adopt membership eligibility requirements for itself or any of its subcommittees that are more stringent than those imposed by the WSFS Constitution; and

RESOLVED, that any eligibility restrictions previously adopted by the MPC affecting itself or any of its subcommittees are declared void.

Proposed by: Johnny Carruthers (#584)
Seconded by: Chris Barkley (#3386)

Commentary: Somewhat after the fact, I read about certain actions that the MPC took last year at Aussiecon 4. My initial reaction on reading about those actions was that the actions taken were clear and blatant violations of both Section 3.12 of the WSFS Constitution and Standing Rule 7.6. The intent of this resolution is to reverse the violations, and to ensure that similar actions do not take place in the future.

Time set is 8 minutes.

Discussion: The chairman of the WSFS Business Meeting (“BM”) made a written ruling against the motion and felt no need for further comment. The Ruling is attached to these minutes and made a part hereof.

The ruling of the Chair was appealed and discussion ensued. Kevin Standlee spoke against the chairman’s ruling because he felt it overturns the rules of our society. The ruling says the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) is not accountable to anyone, but the MPC *is* accountable to the BM. Mark Olson contended that the BM may not by resolution instruct the MPC to do anything. Jo Rhett and others said the BM *has* given instruction to the MPC, including instruction to create the HAMC, and the MPC cannot be order to do something against the constitution. If the BM created the MPC, it can dissolve the MPC. Chris Barkley proposed this resolution because he felt an injustice had been done at Aussiecon 4. Don A Timm said this is a jurisdictional issue: who has authority and what authority exists over MPC. It was his belief that MPC is answerable to the BM, and that there are two issues involved: an accountability issue and a hierarchy issue. René Walling reminded the BM of the sections of the WSFS constitution that created the MPC. Marjene Baum asked what happened at Aussiecon to instigate this resolution.

By a vote of 26 to 46 the assembly judged that the original motion (made by Mr. Barkley) was in order. Debate time on the resolution was extended by 5 minutes by unanimous consent.

Mr. Barkley then explained the history behind his motion [for the motion it was in response to, please see rule MPC 2010-01 in the report of the Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee]. He felt that at Aussiecon 4, Cheryl Morgan was expelled from the HAMC without cause. If that ruling stands, he contended, the WSFS constitution means nothing. Ben Yalow, speaking not to the motion itself, but as the current MPC presiding officer, stated for the record that no statement concerning Cheryl Morgan was made at Aussiecon 4. She was invited to stay on the HAMC by a vote of MPC. Mr. Standlee agreed that Ms. Morgan was not named, but that the rule

that was adopted could apply *only* to Ms. Morgan. René Walling pointed out that any contest excludes employees and their families.

A motion to extend debate by two additional minutes was approved. Lisa Padol pointed out that we have a constitution. If we want this proposal to be part of it, we should amend the constitution. Margene Bahm emphasized that it is the *perception* of impropriety that is at stake here. Dave McCarty said it is disingenuous that it applies only to a subcommittee and not to MPC itself. Linda Deneroff noted that we are marketing items that have already won Hugos, not items up for Hugos [which she was later informed is incorrect].

An amendment was proposed to strike the words “or any of its subcommittees” from the two places where it occurs in this motion. The amendment failed in a show of hands.

The vote was then taken on the original resolution and passed by a vote of 45 to 26.

Without objection, the Chair recessed the meeting for 10 minutes.

4.2 Standing Rules Amendments

4.2.1 Short Title: All the Time in the World

Moved, that Worldcon convention committees should seek to improve the quality of scrutiny and debate at the WSFS Business Meeting through the advance publication of WSFS Committee Reports, Worldcon financial reports and (as far as possible) New Business items.

Standing Rule 2.1: Deadline for Submission of New Business

Amend as follows:

The deadline for submission of non-privileged new business to the Business Meeting shall be ~~two (2) hours after the official opening of the Worldcon or eighteen (18) hours~~ fourteen (14) days before the first Preliminary Meeting, ~~whichever is later~~. The Presiding Officer may accept otherwise qualified motions submitted after the deadline, but all such motions shall be placed at the end of the agenda.

Standing Rule Group 4: Official Papers

Insert new Rules 4.4 and 4.5 as follows:

Rule 4.4: Submission Deadlines: Reports. All WSFS Committee Reports and all Worldcon Annual Financial Reports (see Constitution

Section 2.9.1) shall be submitted to the Business Meeting by no later than fourteen (14) days before the first Preliminary Business Meeting.

Rule 4.5: Availability of BM Materials. All WSFS Committee Reports, Worldcon Annual Financial Reports, and New Business submitted to the Business Meeting before the 14-day deadline (see Rules 2.1 and 4.4) shall be made generally available to WSFS members (e.g. via publication on the host Worldcon’s web site) by no later than ten (10) days before the first Preliminary Business Meeting.

Commentary: *The papers covered by this motion (WSFS committee reports, Worldcon financial reports and new business) are often only available to WSFS members at the BM itself. Publishing these papers earlier would improve the level of scrutiny and the quality of debate. BM attendees will hopefully come prepared with better questions – and those providing the materials should have a better sense of what those questions will be, and can prepare their responses. Advance publication will also enable individuals not attending the BM to have visibility of the upcoming business and to contribute to the debate.*

Proposed By: Colin Harris (Membership # A47)
Seconded: Deb Geisler, Mark Olson

Time set is 10 minutes.

Discussion: Colin Harris pointed out we do ourselves a disservice by not having the papers submitted earlier. Relevant later material can be accepted, but by getting the material earlier, we get the information out to everyone, regardless of whether they choose to attend the business meeting.

Beth Moursund made an amendment to change “may” to “shall” in the sentence “The Presiding Officer may accept otherwise qualified motions submitted after the deadline. . .”

Bill Taylor spoke against Ms. Moursund’s amendment, arguing that new business should be able to get on the agenda. With a change to “shall,” all new business would have to be accepted. Christopher Hensley said the current wording reduces the ability to get new business before the committee because the acceptance would be at someone’s whim. Mark Olson said the amendment would defeat the purpose of the motion, and that it is a bad thing to have no time to reflect on a motion. Bobbie DeFault said we need to better communicate where to find the reports. Lew Wolcuff said it would be a more onerous process. There is no idea so terrible that we cannot talk about it. Elspeth Kolvar said making a 14-day rule means a rebuttal made seven days before the meeting would not get on the agenda. The vote to accept the amendment to the motion failed on a show of hands.

Back to the original motion made by Mr. Harris, Ben Yalow spoke against the motion. He said while following these guidelines is a good thing, the motion should be changed to a sense of the meeting resolution and that the underlying standing rule be left as is. He then made a motion to refer the motion to a committee to report back at the Friday meeting. However, the motion to commit failed. Ben then raised a point of order that this motion is beyond the scope of resolution and requires a constitutional amendment. The chairman ruled Ben's point of order not well taken, but Ben appealed this ruling of the chair.

Petrea Mitchell then asked if the entire standing rule was invalidated, but the chairman said not. Don Timm pointed out that the WSFS constitution does not say when the financial reports need to be submitted and supports the ruling of the chair. Ben Yalow pointed out that Article 1.6 says authority and responsibility for **all** matters not reserved to WSFS shall rest with the worldcon committee. Since the time of the report is not covered in the constitution, it is not in the purview of the business meeting by resolution. The ruling of the chair that 4.4 is in order was affirmed by a hand vote.

By a show of hands the motion carried and 4.2.1 passed.

4.3 Constitutional Amendments

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage, and will become part of the constitution only if passed at Renovation and ratified at Chicon 7. 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.

A procedural discussion ensued as to how best to handle amendments 4.3.1 and 4.3.2. The chair stated that the change to Section 3.3.12 Point (2) of the Constitution is unrelated to the rest of the motions and should be split off and considered with the motions of the semiprofessional amendments. The Chair also indicated that he planned to treat item 4.3.2 as an amendment by substitution of item 4.3.1.

Rich Lynch objected and preferred to keep 4.3.1 whole, without splitting anything off.

Mark Olson did not think there was an easy way to do this. He proposed going into a committee of the whole, rather than discussing each item point by point. An objection to consider was raised to item 4.3.1, but the objection to consideration was defeated.

A motion by Mark Olson was adopted that we go into a Quasi Committee of the Whole for no longer than 30 minutes.

The Quasi Committee of the Whole returned with a recommendation that the business meeting direct the makers of items 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 to come up with a single motion to be presented at Friday's meeting. The Business Meeting adopted this recommendation and the makers of 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 were so directed.

4.3.1 Short Title: Keep the Fanzine Hugo Non-Professional and Limited to Words on Paper or Video Screen

Proposed WSFS Constitutional Amendments to keep the Fanzine Hugo non-professional and limited to words on paper or video screen.

3.3.12: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available ~~non-professional~~ periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (~~or the equivalent in other media~~), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which in the previous calendar year met at least ~~two (2)~~ one (1) of the following criteria:

- (1) had an average press run of at least one thousand (1000) copies per issue,
- ~~(2) paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,~~
- ~~(3)~~ (2) provided at least half the income of any one person,
- ~~(4)~~ (3) had at least fifteen percent (15%) of its total space occupied by advertising,
- ~~(5)~~ (4) announced itself to be a semiprozine.

Audio and video productions are excluded from this category.

3.3.13 Best Fan Audio or Video Production. Any generally available non-professional audio or video production devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has had four (4) or more episodes or podcasts, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year.

~~3.3.13~~ **3.3.14: Best Fanzine.** Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (~~or the equivalent in other media~~), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a

semiprozine. Audio and video productions are excluded from this category, as are publications that pay their contributors and/or staff monetarily.

Commentary: *The “Best Fanzine” paragraph has an additional sentence at the end that specifically excludes any publication that is “professional” (i.e., monetarily pays contributors and/or staff workers) and also excludes any audio or video production (e.g., audio podcasts, videocasts and other video productions, YouTube series, recordings of filk songs, etc.). This change defines fanzine as a non-professional production that is meant to be read (i.e., words on paper and/or words on a video screen). For the purpose of this proposed change, “non-professional” is defined as only monetary payments FROM the publication to contributors and/or staff; monetary payments TO the publication (e.g., from subscribers and/or advertisers) do not necessarily result in the publication being defined as a “professional” one. There is also the addition of the word “periodical” as a descriptor of “publication” and a deletion of the parenthetical “or the equivalent in other media”. These changes reinforce the concept that a fanzine is a production that is published in discrete, individual issues (similar to a magazine); the intention of these two changes is that blogs and websites would be excluded from eligibility in this category.*

A new Hugo category is proposed in the “Best Fan Audio or Video Production” paragraph. This would specifically include the podcasts, videocasts, etc. that are excluded by the changes proposed for the “Best Fanzine” category. The wording that defines this proposed new category parallels the language for “Best Fanzine”.

The “Best Semiprozine” paragraph also has an additional sentence at the end that specifically excludes any audio or video production, in the same manner as described in the proposed changes for the “Best Fanzine” category. Semi-professional productions of this nature would be eligible either in the new “Best Fan Audio or Video Production” category, the existing “Best Dramatic Production, Long Form” category, or the existing “Best Dramatic Production, Short Form” category. There is also the addition of the word “periodical” as a descriptor of “publication” and a deletion of the parenthetical “or the equivalent in other media”; the reasoning for these proposed changes is the same as described in the proposed changes for the “Best Fanzine” category. Additionally, the second criteria that defines a Semiprozine is deleted; it is no longer needed, as it is incorporated into the proposed change to the “Best Fanzine” category.

This proposed amendment was previewed at the 2011 Midwestcon and has been signed by 10 members of Renovation, the 2011 World Science Fiction Convention.

Proposed by: Richard W. Lynch

Seconded by Gary Robe, Nicki Lynch, Roger Sims, Patricia Sims, Julie Hanslip, Mike Resnick, Corlis Robe, Ian Stockdale, Chris Barkley

4.3.2 Short Title: Best Fancast

Moved, To amend the WSFS Constitution to revise the Hugo Award category for Best Fanzine and create a new Hugo Award category for non-professional audio-visual periodical works, including podcasts, by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

(a) Amend existing Section 3.1.13 to remove non-print (where “print” includes paper and digital print publications) works from the Best Fanzine category’s scope:

3.3.13: Best Fanzine. Any generally available non-professional publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (~~or the equivalent in other media~~), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine.

(b) Insert a new section after existing Section 3.1.13 to create a new category:

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

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2016 Business Meeting, Section 3.3.X shall be repealed, and

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

Commentary: *It has been argued that the skills required to write, produce and present an audiovisual fan periodical is substantially different than the skills required to write, edit and publish a print (paper or digital) fanzine.*

It has also been argued that the experience of listening to a podcast (or watching a vidcast) is substantially different than the experience of reading a fanzine.

Finally, it has been pointed out that, among award-granting bodies (including WSFS, where fiction categories are segregated between printed fiction and dramatic

presentation), it is extremely rare to consider both print/text publications and audiovisual productions for the same award.

For these reasons, we propose removing audiovisual productions from eligibility in the “Best Fanzine” Hugo Award category.

Simply excluding audiovisual productions from the fanzine category is a punitive act that revokes nominators’ and voters’ existing rights. The pool of active nominators have shown an interest in fan podcasts, having nominated Starship Sofa twice for best fanzine.

Creating a new award category for audiovisual periodicals preserves nominators’ and voters’ existing rights to recognize these works.

Audiovisual production and distribution technology changes swiftly, though, and “podcasts” may be irrelevant in the near future, superseded by new methods. Naming this new category “Best Fancast” emphasizes the fannish nature of the works being considered while acknowledging that “podcasting” isn’t the only applicable distribution and playback method relevant to fandom.

Ensuring the category is open to existing and new audiovisual production and distribution models preserves nominators’ and voters’ existing rights to recognize these works.

There is some concern that extending this category to dramatic presentations could cannibalize the “Best Dramatic Presentation” Hugo Award categories. Therefore, this motion excludes audiovisual productions that are eligible in either “Best Dramatic Presentation” Hugo Award category.

It does not exclude audiovisual series with only some dramatic content; the existence of some dramatic content in a series does not necessarily make it eligible for a “Best Dramatic Presentation” category Hugo Award.

It does not automatically exclude all audiovisual dramatic series. A fan-produced anthology dramatic series by a consistent production team could be considered, as a whole, eligible for “Best Fancast” because only individual episodes would be eligible in a “Best Dramatic Presentation” category.

This is consistent with existing rules for fanzines and semiprozines. Fiction-centered fanzines are not excluded from consideration, and the semiprozine nominees have included fiction-centered semiprozines every year since the category’s inception.

Finally, there is the question of interest.

One needs only look at the iTunes Store and search the podcast category to find many fannish podcasts. Fans are producing them, they're out there, and people are listening to them.

If we look at the 2010 Hugo Award statistics <<http://www.aussiecon4.org/hugoawards/files/2010HugoVotingReport.pdf>>, we see that the podcast Starship Sofa won handily with 170 #1 ballots and 221 ballots in the final redistribution. That's not an insignificant number of ballots.

In 2011, we have podcasts nominated both in Best Fanzine and Best Related Work. Again in Best Fanzine we find Starship Sofa. In Best Related Work, we have the professionally-oriented writer's podcast Writing Excuses. We'll have to wait for the published statistics to see if other podcasts were nominated but didn't make the final ballot, but those will be available for review before ratification at the 2012 Business Meeting.

There is definitely interest in podcasts, both generally and among Hugo nominators and voters.

If this interest is not borne out in actual nomination and voting, or if the field is too broad and shallow to support nominees that meet the 5% criteria for nominations, there is a re-ratification clause that will allow WSFS to easily sunset the category after 3 years.

This is an opportunity to fix one of the identified issues with the "Best Fanzine" category and at the same time recognize a growing avenue of fanac that, as fanzines have from the very beginning, fosters the fannish community and encourages fannish communication.

Moved by: Andrew Trembley (#233); Catherine Crockett; Christopher J Garcia; Colin Hinz; Robert B. Hole Jr. (#2597); Howard "howierd" Stateman (#1178); and Peter Sullivan (#994)

4.3.3 Short Title: Hugo for Children's Books

3.3.___: Best Children's/Young Adult's Book.

(a) A book-length young adult or children's science fiction or fantasy book published in the previous calendar year.

(b) An author (or authors) whose book is nominated in this category and the Best Novel category may *not* be nominated in both categories simultaneously.

(c) Two years after being implemented, this Constitutional Amendment may be repealed by a simple majority vote at either of the two subsequent Main Business Meetings.

Proposed by: Chris Barkley (#3386) and Juli Marr Hanslip (#3387)

Seconded by: Elizabeth Wollheim (#2832), Johnny Carruthers (#584) and David Brin (#573)

An objection to consideration being made and seconded, by a serpentine vote of 15 to 36, more than two-thirds in the negative, the motion will not be considered.

4.3.4 Short Title: Hugo Exclusions Constitutional Amendment Proposal

Moved, To amend the WSFS Constitution to expand “Section 3.12: Exclusions” to items 3.12.1 and 3.12.2.

Keep the following text as 3.12.1: “No member of the current Worldcon Committee or any publications closely connected with a member of the Committee shall be eligible for an Award. However, should the Committee delegate all authority under this Article to a Subcommittee whose decisions are irrevocable by the Worldcon Committee, then this exclusion shall apply to members of the Subcommittee only.”

Add the following text as 3.12.2: “No member of the current Mark Protection Committee or any Mark Protection Committee subcommittees shall be eligible for an Award.”

Commentary:

1) The Mark Protection Committee and Mark Protection Committee subcommittees are floating committees that operate outside of Worldcon and are not covered by exclusion 3.12 (to be changed to 3.12.1).

2) The Mark Protection Committee and Mark Protection Committee subcommittees often represent the Hugo Awards, act as its public face, and help shape policy regarding Hugo Award licensing, marketing, and administration. Therefore, it would be a conflict of interest for a member to speak on behalf of, influence policy decisions of, or perform tasks in an official capacity for the Mark Protection Committee or Mark Protection Committee subcommittees while simultaneously being recognized as a potential nominee, appearing on the ballot, or actively campaigning for their own eligibility or nomination status.

3) The Mark Protection Committee and Mark Protection Committee subcommittees presently have a self-policing rule whereby members agree to recuse themselves and

decline a Hugo nomination. Incorporating this rule into the constitution would make this policy permanent without the possibility of repeal by the Mark Protection Committee and Mark Protection Committee subcommittees and ensure that potential members are aware of this policy so they do not face a difficult choice at a later date.

Proposed by: Rene Walling

Seconded by: Kate Kligman

Supported by: Chris Hansen, Diane Lacey, Ruth Lichtwardt, Jeff Orth, Jannie Shea, James Shields and Geri Sullivan

An objection to consideration was raised, and by a vote more than two-thirds in the negative, the motion will not be considered.

Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 1 p.m. until 10a.m. on Friday, August 19.

Business Meeting, Friday, August 19, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 10:10 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Donald E. Eastlake III, Presiding Officer Pro Tem, presiding; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Warren Buff, Timekeeper.

1. COMMITTEE REPORTS

All committee reports were received at the preliminary business meeting and were dealt with at that meeting.

1.1 Mark Protection Committee Election

Nominations for election to the WSFS Mark Protection Committee were made at the Preliminary Business Meeting, at which time nominees accepted nomination and indicated their current residence zone.

The members whose terms of office expire at this Worldcon are: Stephen Boucher (RoTW), Mark Olson (East), and Linda Deneroff (West). Ruth Sachter resigned as stated below. Due to zone residency restrictions, we can therefore elect at most two persons from the Western zone, one from the Central zone, one person from the Eastern zone, or four people from the Rest of the World – but not more than four people overall. The person replacing Ruth will serve for a one-year term; the other three will serve for three years. Write-in votes are allowed, but write-in candidates must submit their consent to election by the close of balloting.

Nominees for the MPC were Stephen Boucher; Kate Kligman; Mark Olson; Dave McCarty; David Gallaher; Warren Buff; Adina Adler; and Linda Deneroff.

Kevin Standlee spoke in favor of several candidates. Ben Yalow asked the Business Meeting how much power they want to give the MPC. He prefers that the MPC do what it is directed to do and not what it thinks it ought to do.

Without objection, the Chair appointed Leslie J. Turek, Sharon Sbarsky, and Jill Eastlake as tellers for the MPC election. Ballots prepared by the Secretary were distributed to those present and collected by the tellers. The tellers then retired to count the ballots.

2. WORLDCON REPORTS

All Worldcon reports were received at the preliminary business meeting and were dealt with at that meeting.

3. BUSINESS PASSED ON FROM AUSSIECON 4

The following Constitutional Amendments were approved at Aussiecon 4 and passed on to Renovation for ratification. If ratified, they will become part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Renovation.

3.1 Short Title: Change the Membership Rate Limitations

Moved, to modify Section 1.5.5 of the WSFS Constitution to replace “two (2) times the site-selection fee” with “four (4) times the site-selection fee”.

Section 1.5.5: Voters have the right to convert to attending membership in the selected Worldcon within ninety (90) days of its selection, for an additional fee set by its committee. This fee must not exceed ~~two (2)~~ four (4) times the site-selection fee and must not exceed the difference between the site-selection fee and the fee for new attending members.

Commentary. *The current rules limit the rates that voters can be charged to convert their supporting memberships to attending memberships. This means that the voting fees, and therefore the supporting memberships, are forced higher to keep the initial voter attending rate from being too low. Also the maximum initial voter attending membership rate may be sufficiently below the required average membership rate that it forces conventions to have higher attending rates for members who join later, which discourages people, particularly people who are becoming interested in Worldcons, and who might want to join. Committees want the flexibility to tailor membership rates to accomplish those goals without being constrained by the low initial voter attending membership limitations.*

Time set is 5 minutes.

Discussion: There was no discussion and this Constitutional amendment was ratified without objection.

3.2 Short Title: Electronic Voting

Moved, to amend Article 6 of the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of clarifying the status of electronic voting on the Hugo Awards and Site Selection, by adding a new section after existing Section 6.2 as follows:

6.3: Electronic Voting. Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted to prohibit conducting Hugo Awards nominating and voting and Site Selection voting by electronic means, except that conducting Site Selection by electronic means shall require the unanimous agreement of the current Worldcon committee and all bidding

committees who have filed before the ballot deadline. Valid paper ballots delivered by any means shall always be acceptable. This section shall not be interpreted to require that such elections be conducted electronically, nor shall it be interpreted to allow remote participation or proxy voting at the Business Meeting.

Commentary. The phrase “Voting shall be by written ballot cast either by mail or at the current Worldcon” in section 4.1.2 has been held to prohibit conducting any portion of Worldcon site selection electronically, such as through a web site in the same manner as most recent Hugo Award elections. The word “mail” and “written ballot” has been interpreted to only allow paper ballots delivered by postal mail, private delivery, fax machine, or personal delivery by the voter or an authorized representative. This proposal would broaden the existing interpretation to require that “mail” be interpreted to include “e-mail and other electronic means” such as voting through a web site. It does not specify a specific technology for e-voting. It says that the constitution should be interpreted to allow electronic voting for both the Hugo Awards and Site Selection, but it does not require that such elections be held electronically, and it specifically requires that such elections must always have a paper-ballot/by-mail (or other delivery method) option.

Worldcons could unilaterally decide whether to conduct Hugo Award nomination and voting through electronic means. The decision to use e-voting for Site Selection would initially be in the hands of the individual Worldcon committee conducting the particular site selection, but a final decision to actually do so would require the agreement of all bidding committees who filed in time to appear on the Site Selection ballot.

In addition, this proposal explicitly excludes electronic voting, proxy voting, or other forms of remote participation at the Business Meeting. Voting at the Business Meeting shall continue to be in person only, including any votes held there such as constitutional amendments and elections to the WSFS Mark Protection Committee.

Time set is 4 minutes.

Discussion: Ben made a motion (that was seconded) to amend the above motion by striking electronic balloting for site selection. If this motion passed, the first sentence of the amendment would read: “Nothing in this Constitution shall be interpreted to prohibit conducting Hugo Awards nominating and voting by electronic means. . .”. He reasoned that we use two models for how we conduct voting. For Hugo voting there is an absolutely impartial Hugo Administrator, and Hugo elections are conducted in complete secrecy. Site selection uses a different model and is always conducted visibly, and it can be audited and challenged, if necessary. But if site selection is conducted electronically, everything becomes invisible, and in Ben’s opinion we

should not change to a model that requires us to trust site selection administrators. Jo Rhett spoke against the amendment, saying it is easy to require computers to log the all actions related to voting. He argued that it is much easier to steal an election conducted on paper than on computer. Done badly, anything can be abused. We are not talking about new technology. Perianne Lurie pointed out it requires agreement from the bids to conduct site selection voting electronically, so if you don't trust the site selection administrator, you can say "no.". Gary Blog spoke against the amendment; it gives a bid the right to electronically ballot; it doesn't require it. If we can trust the Hugo Administrator, there's no reason not to trust the site selection administrator. A motion to extend debate by two minutes passed. Dave McCarty spoke in favor of the amendment: auditing computers is still placing faith in some other body. "As the chief of the tightest race in history, the only thing that let me sleep at night was the fact that every paper ballot was checked by me and my team, and if I had had to place faith in any other entity in a race that close, [it] would just be untrustable." Alex von Thorn has thought about how such voting would be conducted. It would be anonymous but verifiable because of tokens. Priscilla Olson said privacy is paramount, and there are ways of hacking computers. There is no reason to change a system that works well. Saul Jaffe said there are organizations outside WSFS that have used electronic balloting successfully. Ballots are encrypted so that ballots are anonymous. The original amendment does not require electronic balloting; it only allows it. If all the bids in a site selection agree to use electronic balloting, they should be allowed to do so. A motion to further extend debate was defeated. Before the vote took place, Winton Matthews asked if this was a larger amendment, and the chair said that it was not.

The vote on the amendment to remove site selection from this constitutional amendment was defeated by a show of hands. The vote to ratify the original motion was passed by a show of hands.

3.3 Allow Electronic Distribution of Rules

Moved, to amend Section 2.4 and Article 1 of the WSFS Constitution by striking out and adding words as shown, with the intention of requiring Worldcon committees to publish copies of the WSFS rules without requiring that such publication be in the form of printed documents, except for distribution "at con."

2.4: Distribution of Rules. The current Worldcon Committee shall ~~print copies of~~ publish the WSFS Constitution and Standing Rules, together with an explanation of proposed changes approved but not yet ratified, ~~and copies of the Standing Rules~~. The Committee shall distribute these documents to all WSFS members at a point between nine and three months prior to the Worldcon, and shall also distribute

them on paper to all WSFS members in attendance at the Worldcon upon registration.

Amend Article 1 by adding a new section after existing Section 1.5.2 as follows:

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

Commentary on the changes in Section 2.4: *This revision permits Worldcons to distribute copies of the documents on paper or electronically. “Distribute” does not mean merely placing copies of the documents on the convention web site, the convention must notify its members of the availability of these documents.*

Commentary on the change to Article 1: *This makes it clear that Worldcons may distribute publications electronically, provided that members receive them on paper unless they choose otherwise.*

Commentary on both changes: *These changes allow for the Constitution and Standing Rules to be distributed electronically ahead of time, and requires them to be distributed on paper at the convention. This does not affect the inclusion of Article 3 and extensions as provided in Section 3.7.2.*

Time set is 4 minutes.

Discussion: There was no discussion and this Constitutional amendment was ratified without objection.

3.4 Expand Hugo Nominations Eligibility

Moved, to amend Section 3.7.1 of the WSFS Constitution as follows:

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the nominees for the final Award voting. Each member of ~~either~~ 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 five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

Commentary. *Increasing the potential pool of people eligible to make Hugo Award nominations would be a good thing. When Hugo Award nomination forms are distributed at the start of a calendar year, there is actually another standing Worldcon in existence – the following Worldcon.*

Time set is 4 minutes.

Discussion: After a short clarification that if a member joins in mid-January and the convention has not completed processing, that person would not be eligible, there was no discussion and this Constitutional amendment was ratified without objection.

3.5 Run-Off References

Moved, to amend portions of the WSFS Constitution by inserting text to clarify the relationship of “No Award” and “None of the Above” to the “Run-Off Candidate” rule, as follows:

(a) Amend Section 3.11.3 as follows

3.11.3: “No Award” shall be the run-off candidate for the purposes of Section 6.4.

(b) Amend Section 4.5.3 as follows:

4.5.3: “None of the Above” shall be treated as a bid for tallying, and shall be the run-off candidate for the purposes of Section 6.4.

Commentary. *The 2010 Hugo Award Administrator, Vincent Docherty, approached the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee questioning the way in which Section 3.11 is worded. The committee determined that previous constitutional revisions may have made it less than obvious that the wording at Sections 3.11.3 and 4.5.3 refers to the “Run-Off Candidate” rule at Section 6.4. This includes an explicit cross-reference in both cases to make it more obvious that these sections are related to each other.*

Time set is 2 minutes.

Discussion: There was no discussion and this Constitutional amendment was ratified without objection.

3.6 Mark Notice Revision

Moved, to amend the standard service mark notice in Section 2.2 of the WSFS Constitution by ~~striking out~~ and inserting words as shown:

Section 2.2: Marks. Every Worldcon and NASFIC Committee shall include the following notice in each of its publications:

“World Science Fiction Society,” “WSFS,” “World Science Fiction Convention,” “Worldcon,” “NASFIC,” ~~and~~ “Hugo Award,” the Hugo Award Logo, and the distinctive design of the Hugo Award Trophy

Rocket are service marks of the World Science Fiction Society, an unincorporated literary society.

Commentary. *Two new service marks have been created for the World Science Fiction Society. This adds those marks to the required notice that every Worldcon is to include with its publications.*

Time set is 2 minutes.

Discussion: There was no discussion and this Constitutional amendment was ratified without objection.

4. NEW BUSINESS

The makers of Items 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 had been directed by the Business Meeting to return with a joint proposal. They returned with the revised Item 4.3.1 below.

4.3.1(revised) Short Title: Best Fancast

Moved, To amend the WSFS Constitution to revise the Hugo Award category for Best Fanzine and create a new Hugo Award category for non-professional audio or video periodical works, including podcasts, by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

1. Amend existing Section 3.1.13 to remove non-print (where “print” includes paper and digital print publications) works from the Best Fanzine category’s scope:

3.3.13: Best Fanzine. Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (~~or the equivalent in other media~~), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine or fancast.

2. Insert a new section after existing Section 3.1.13 to create a new category:

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

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2016 Business Meeting, Section 3.3.X shall be repealed, and

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

Proposed by: Andrew Trembley #233, Catherine Crockett, Christopher J Garcia, Colin Hinz, Robert B. Hole Jr. #2597, Deb Geisler #43, Rich Lynch #61, Howard “howierd” Stateman #1178, Steven H Silver #819, Peter Sullivan #994

Time set is 20 minutes.

Commentary:

It has been argued that the skills required to write, produce and present an audio or video fan periodical is substantially different than the skills required to write, edit and publish a print (paper or digital) fanzine.

It has also been argued that the experience of listening to a podcast (or watching a vidcast) is substantially different than the experience of reading a fanzine.

Finally, it has been pointed out that, among award-granting bodies (including WSFS, where fiction categories are segregated between printed fiction and dramatic presentation), it is extremely rare to consider both print/text publications and audio or video productions for the same award.

For these reasons, we propose removing audio and video productions from eligibility in the “Best Fanzine” Hugo Award category.

Simply excluding audio and video productions from the fanzine category is a punitive act that revokes nominators’ and voters’ existing rights. The pool of active nominators have shown an interest in fan podcasts, having nominated *StarShipSofa* twice for best fanzine.

Creating a new award category for audio or video periodicals preserves nominators’ and voters’ existing rights to recognize these works.

Audio and video production and distribution technology changes swiftly, though, and “podcasts” may be irrelevant in the near future, superseded by new methods. Naming this new category “Best Fancast” emphasizes the fannish nature of the works being considered while acknowledging that “podcasting” isn’t the only applicable distribution and playback method relevant to fandom.

Ensuring the category is open to existing and new audio or video production and distribution models preserves nominators’ and voters’ existing rights to recognize these works.

There is some concern that extending this category to dramatic presentations could cannibalize the “Best Dramatic Presentation” Hugo Award categories. Therefore, this motion excludes audio and video productions that are eligible in either “Best Dramatic Presentation” Hugo Award category.

It does not exclude audio or video series with only some dramatic content; the existence of some dramatic content in a series does not necessarily make it eligible for a “Best Dramatic Presentation” category Hugo Award.

It does not automatically exclude all audio or video dramatic series. A fan-produced anthology dramatic series by a consistent production team could be considered, as a whole, eligible for “Best Fancast” because only individual episodes would be eligible in a “Best Dramatic Presentation” category.

This is consistent with existing rules for fanzines and semiprozines. Fiction-centered fanzines are not excluded from consideration, and the semiprozine nominees have included fiction-centered semiprozines every year since the category’s inception.

Finally, there is the question of interest.

One needs only look at the iTunes Store and search the podcast category to find many fannish podcasts. Fans are producing them, they’re out there, and people are listening to them.

If we look at [the 2010 Hugo Award statistics](#), we see that the podcast StarShipSofa won handily with 170 #1 ballots and 221 ballots in the final redistribution. That’s not an insignificant number of ballots.

In 2011, we have podcasts nominated both in Best Fanzine and Best Related Work. Again in Best Fanzine we find StarShipSofa. In Best Related Work, we have the professionally-oriented writer’s podcast *Writing Excuses*. We’ll have to wait for the published statistics to see if other podcasts were nominated but didn’t make the final ballot, but those will be available for review before ratification at the 2012 Business Meeting.

There is definitely interest in podcasts, both generally and among Hugo nominators and voters.

If this interest is not borne out in actual nomination and voting, or if the field is too broad and shallow to support nominees that meet the 5% criteria for nominations, there is a re-ratification clause that will allow WSFS to easily sunset the category after 3 years.

We recognize that if the Fancast category is not re-ratified the business meeting will have to address this question again and make additional adjustments to the fanzine category definition.

This is an opportunity to fix one of the identified issues with the “Best Fanzine” category and at the same time recognize a growing avenue of fanac that, as fanzines have from the very beginning, fosters the fannish community and encourages fannish communication.

Discussion: Mark Olson made a motion to divide the question into two parts, fancast and fanzine. By a show of hands, the motion was split in two [4.3.1(a) and 4.3.1(b)] and the fancast portion discussed first.

4.3.1(b) Short Title: Best Fancast

3. Insert a new section after existing Section 3.1.13 to create a new category:

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

Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2016 Business Meeting, Section 3.3.X shall be repealed, and

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

Discussion: Kevin Standlee asked that the chair rule that the portion of the amendment involving the sunset clause be binding on the 2016 Business meeting, and the chair did so. Paula Lieberman, speaking against, asked where the line is drawn to distinguish between broadcast and podcast, as when long-time radio broadcasts are also streamed. Chris Garcia, speaking in favor, said the fanzine categories have not evolved. Content is content, but form is definition. Best Fancast covers many things and will continue to evolve. More importantly, there is a vast amount of material to be nominated in a fancast category. There are very few things that separate print from broadcast. Bill Trojan opposed any category that is not the written word. If a podcast wants to be eligible for fanzine, he said, all they have to do is produce a transcript. Alex von Thorn, speaking in favor of the motion, raised a concern that podcasts will crowd out fanzines if we do not split them. Petrea Mitchell, also in favor of the motion, argued that fancasts are done by individuals. They have the same considerations, such as contributors, deadlines, and the only difference is software. Ebooks are beginning to contain audio, video and text in the same work. Joel Zakem does not want another Hugo category but believes this one is necessary. He felt that this year's Hugo Administrators put material in categories where it didn't belong, and this amendment would solve that problem. Colin Harris, speaking against, reiterated Mark Olson's theorem: will there be a substantial number of works capable of being nominated? He suggested a one-year test to see if there will be a volume of nominations to sustain the category. Kevin Standlee was somewhat swayed by Mr. Harris's argument, but also acknowledged that we are generally wary of Hugo

tests. Hugo Administrators have the authority to drop a category if there is a marked lack of interest in it. Mark Olson said he is sympathetic to the amendment but suggested we try it out for a year before writing it into the constitution. The biggest problem is there is no way to tell when Best Dramatic Presentation ends and Best Fancast begins.

Mike Scott made an amendment to change 2016 to 2014, allowing for one and half years of good data to see if the Hugo is working. Kevin Standlee made a parliamentary inquiry, asking if we could insert a blank for the year. The Chair agreed this was a good idea and, without objection, “2016” was replaced by a blank with the initially suggested values of 2014 and 2016. Additional suggestions were 2015 and 2017. The Chair stated that the procedure would be to vote on each alternative, starting with 2017, the most remote date, and working toward closer dates, with the first year to reach a majority filling the blank.

Filling the blank with 2017 failed by a show of hands.

Filling the blank with 2016 passed by a show of hands.

Debate on the original Fancast motion resumed. Norman Cook proposed rewriting the first sentence, but was ruled out of order. Ben Yalow, persuaded by Colin Harris’s argument moved to amend the motion from a constitutional amendment to a resolution that there be a trial Fancast Hugo category at the Chicago worldcon. This amendment was seconded, and debate on it began.

Chris Hensley spoke against this new motion. He preferred it be written into the constitution with the sunset clause since one year would not get out all the kinks and pointed to the Graphic Novel Hugo as an example. John Lorentz said there was already a provision in the constitution for a one-shot Hugo that gives us the ability to test a Hugo category without any rigmarole. Perianne Lurie said that, since the fancast category overlaps the fanzine category, there was no way to just run it as a test. Paula Lieberman asked, since *The Capture* won a Hugo as Best Dramatic Presentation, why cannot fancasts be included in that category. Gary Blog wished to ask Dave McCarty how he felt about the issue as chair of Chicon 7. Dave McCarty replied that he was not sure what Chicon 7 would do if the category were just a test. John Pomeranz said he believed it was appropriate to debate the viability of the original motion and not create a resolution. Colin Harris said 2016 is a long time for a test. He was in favor of a sunset clause in principal, but he would rather wait a year or two to get the right Hugo categories.

The vote on the motion to change the Constitutional amendment into a resolution failed by a show of hands. Mark Olson asked whether the term “periodical” as defined

for a fanzine would apply for fancasts. Steven Silver explained that the intent of periodical for fancasts means discrete individual issues.

A motion to extend debate failed, and the original motion to create a Best Fancast Hugo passed by a vote of 75 to 11. It will be passed on to Chicon 7 for ratification.

Without objection, the meeting was recessed for 10 minutes.

The Chair called the meeting back to order.

Without objection, the meeting proceeded with the consideration of the motion in the report from the Semi Prozine Committee (4.3.5), with the motion in the minority report by Ben Yalow to the Semi-prozine Committee report (4.3.6) and then the part of the revised item 4.3.1 split off as 4.3.1(a), with those two amendments considered sequentially.

4.3.6 Short Title: Paying Money for Content

Moved: To amend Sec 3.Y.Z by adding:

“(3) paid professional rates for a significant amount of its content.”

As maker of the motion, Ben Yalow stated that the purpose of his motion was to create a balance whereby works that are able to improve themselves by applying extra money to improve their product aren't compared against works with less money and that works with comparable money resources are in competition with each other. This amendment would add paying real money for content (sufficient to be considered professional rates) as something that makes the work professional.

Time set for debate is 20 minutes.

Discussion: As maker of the motion, Ben Yalow reiterated that a percentage of money to determine the dividing line between prozine and professional was not the way to delineate the line. He cited as potential examples Paul Allen's magazine, paying much more money than Dave Hartwell's magazine, competing with each other for a Hugo in the same category. Paul Allen's sf magazine is paying \$5 per word; competitive with professional magazines. His magazine is not providing one-quarter of his income or that of his staff. Even Stan Schmidt doesn't pay that much, and if you're magazine is going to be paying more than Stan Schmidt, you're a professional magazine. Mark Olson spoke against this motion. The committee tried to come up with a series of dividing lines to separate fanzines, semiprozines and prozines – the zine continuum. The unresolved issue is where should the dividing line be. Approving Ben's amendment would not be a catastrophe; it's an adjustment., but the majority of the committee felt it moved too many things to prozine and depleted the semiprozine

category. He argued that while Ben’s proposal may be the way to go at some point in the future, people would use their judgment as to what constituted semi-professional. Ron Oakes enquired if there was a standard by which to gauge “a significant amount of its content.” Perianne Lurie agreed, that we don’t know what professional rates are or what constitutes a significant amount is and that professional rates differ for fiction and nonfiction, and may be interpreted in many different ways. Elspeth Kolvar said rather than making more changes, the business meeting should work with what was presented and discuss financial distinctions down the road. Deidre Saoirse Moen spoke in favor of the motion and said that pro rates are defined by SFWA and that in fiction markets alone there are about 70 qualifying markets for semiprozines. By a hand vote, this amendment failed.

Secretary’s Note: Discussion of Motion 4.3.5 was broken into two sections 3.3.12 and 3.3.13. Discussion of Section 3.3.13 is relevant for both Motions 4.3.1(a) and 4.3.5, with the final amended version as approved by the business meeting appearing under Section 4.3.5. After much discussion, later in the proceedings, Section 4.3.5, as amended, was recombined and voted on in toto.

4.3.1(a) Short Title: Best Fancast

Moved, To amend the WSFS Constitution to revise the Hugo Award category for Best Fanzine and create a new Hugo Award category for non-professional audio or video periodical works, including podcasts, by ~~striking out~~ and adding words as follows:

4. Amend existing Section 3.1.13 to remove non-print (where “print” includes paper and digital print publications) works from the Best Fanzine category’s scope:

3.3.13: Best Fanzine. Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues ~~(or the equivalent in other media)~~, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine or fancast.

John Pomeranz asked that Section 3.3.12 be amended at the same time as Section 3.3.13, to keep them in parallel; that is, to add the word “periodical” and strike “or the equivalent in other media,” as shown below. The rules would have to be suspended to allow Mr. Pomeranz to create this second order amendment, which requires a two-thirds vote. With a vote of 44 to 22, the rules were suspended. Mr. Pomeranz proposed that Section 3.3.12 be amended as shown below.

3.3.12: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues ~~(or the equivalent in other media)~~, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which in the previous calendar year met at least one (1) of the following criteria:
(1) paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,
(2) was generally available only for paid purchase.

Discussion: Perianne Lurie spoke against the second order amendment “If we think that fancasts are fan productions, then allowing these semiprofessional productions in the same category would stomp all over the fancasts.” She added that they should compete in the semiprofessional category where they are in a similar weight class as the semiprofessional printed media. Semiprofessional ’casts should not compete with fancasts. Colin Harris said we need to be clear, given that the spirit of the Hugos is to try to provide the maximum amount of relevant high quality work with eligibility in an appropriate category whilst recognizing that we’re not going to have a hundred categories. He asked whether it is better to have many multiple categories for print and other media, or three categories for print and one category for fancasts, and was in favor of the latter. On the basis of the fancast amendment was to have another media that covered all the fanzine and semiprozine space in “other media” Mr. Harris was in favor of the second order amendment. A motion to extend debate failed in a vote of hands. Then, with 37 in favor of the second order amendment and 20 opposed, the second order amendment passed. A sunset clause does not apply to this amendment. Another motion to extend debate by two minutes failed in a show of hands. It was pointed out that deleting the phrase “or the equivalent in other media,” removes the previous year’s changes, but the maker of the original amendment, Steven Silver, said that the phrase would not apply to PDF files. A further motion to extend debate for five minutes passed in a show of hands. Richard Lynch spoke in favor of the motion: “No disrespect to the semiprozine committee, but it was not well represented by the fanzine editors. And the proposal that’s being proposed to replace the version in the semiprozine report has been vetted by the fanzine community, and they are very much in favor of it.” Mark Olson spoke against, saying that it took something that applied appropriately to fanzines with plausible merit and misapplied it to the semiprozine category. The changes have the effect of removing anything that wasn’t “text on square pages, either electronic or paper, and presented in a timely release, a periodic release. It removes everything that is updated continuously for both fanzine and semiprozine.” He added that much of the future of fanzines is electronic and the fanzine community, by thinking that the 1950s is a good home to stay in, is making a mistake by requiring publication on a regular schedule, and he did not want this to be extended to semiprozines. Since the second order amendment to remove the

phrase “or the equivalent in other media” passed, he felt the semiprozine amendment as amended should be defeated.

Perianne Lurie made a motion to divide Section 3.3.12 and Section 3.3.13 and passed in a show of hands.

Colin Harris spoke in favor of splitting the amendment. He felt there were two separate discussions going on: one regarding the phrase “or the equivalent in other media”; ; the other about the fancast amendment as passed that adds the phrase “and which does not qualify as a semiprozine or fancast” at the end. He added that “the way to get out of this mess is if we add the words at the end, that you cannot be in semiprozine and fanzine if you’re eligible for fancast – that moves all the audio/video out completely – we can then decide to debate on merit whether or not the reinsertion of the word ‘periodical’ and striking the phrase ‘or the equivalent in other media’ – which is a direct reversion of the change from two or three years ago – that’s not about fancast; it’s about taking all the blogs out that we put in.”

Mark Olson made it clear that he did not think that the proposed change to Section 3.3.12 was not the intent of the semiprozine committee. He added that “we want to keep the semiprozine category as wide open as possible” and not exclude anything. Elspeth Kolvar preferred that we not make too many changes at once. Priscilla Olson said she thought it was great that John Pomeranz wanted to make everything parallel, but splitting up the semiprozine would just add more confusion.

Ron Oakes asked that the amendment as amended be read back. Kevin Standlee read it back as follows:

3.3.12: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (~~or the equivalent in other media~~), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, which does not qualify as a fancast, and which in the previous calendar year met at least one (1) of the following criteria:

- (1) paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,
- (2) was generally available only for paid purchase,

All proposed changes for Section 3.3.12 were defeated.

With no time remaining for debate, the chairman called for a vote on the semiprozine committee report with Section 3.3.13, as amended. It was then pointed out that Section 3.3.13 needed an additional clarification that “paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication” meant monetary remuneration. While the

maker of the amendment said “paid its contributors ~~and~~/or staff monetarily in other than copies . . .” the chairman read it back as “it inserts the word ‘monetary’ after the word ‘contributions’ in 3.3.13,” but that was a misstatement. With the additional modification, Section 3.3.13 passed by a show of hands.

As twice amended, the entire semiprozine amendment passed with a vote of 60 to 4.

For clarification, the entire Section 4.3.5, as amended, is printed below.

4.3.5 Short Title: Semiprozine

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution:

Add a new section: 3.Y.Z: A Professional Publication is one which meets at least one of the following two criteria:

- (1) it provided at least a quarter the income of any one person or,
- (2) was owned or published by any entity which provided at least a quarter the income of any of its staff and/or owner.

Amend the sections 3.3.12 and 3.3.13, by replacing them with:

3.3.12: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (or the equivalent in other media), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which in the previous calendar year met at least one (1) of the following criteria:

- (1) paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,
- (2) was generally available only for paid purchase,

3.3.13: Best Fanzine. Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues ~~(or the equivalent in other media)~~, at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which does not qualify as a semiprozine or a fancast and which in the previous calendar year met neither of the following criteria:

- (1) paid its contributors or staff monetarily in other than copies of the publication,
- (2) was generally available only for paid purchase.

Add to the end of Section 3.9 (Notification and Acceptance): “Additionally, each nominee in the categories of Best Fanzine and Best Semi-Prozine shall be required to confirm that they meet the qualifications of their category.”

Without objection, the Chair recessed the meeting for 5 minutes.

The Chair called the meeting back to order.

6. COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

6.1 Results of the Mark Protection Committee Election

The Mark Protection Committee election tellers announced the voting results. Newly elected members to the MPC are

1. Linda Deneroff (Western, through 2014)
2. Dave McCarty (Central, through 2014)
3. Warren Buff (Eastern through 2014)
4. Stephen Boucher (ROTW, through 2012)

6.2 Committee Appointments

All committees, unless otherwise stated, have the authority to augment and manage their membership at their own discretion.

6.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The chairman of the World Science Fiction Convention Business Meeting renewed the present membership of the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee, consisting of Don Eastlake, Tim Illingworth, and Kevin Standlee. The committee will decide among itself who will be their nominal leader.

6.2.2 Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee

The chairman of the World Science Fiction Convention Business Meeting renewed the present membership of the Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee, consisting of Mike Willmoth (Chair), Bill Taylor, John Hertz, Sharon Sbarsky and any others appointed by the Chair of that committee

6.2.3 Hugo Eligibility Rest of the World (HEROW) Committee

The chairman of the World Science Fiction Convention Business Meeting renewed the present membership of the HEROW Committee, consisting of Ben Yalow (Chair), Perrienne Lurie, Robert MacIntosh, Cheryl Morgan, Howard Rosenblatt and Kevin Standlee.

6.2.4 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee

The chairman of the World Science Fiction Convention Committee renewed the present membership of the Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee, consisting of Mark Olson (Chair), Kent Bloom, , Dave Grubbs, Colin Harris, Tim Illingworth, Richard Lynch, Craig Miller, Joe Siclari, Kevin Standlee, and Ben Yalow.

6.2.5 Mark Protection Committee

Although the elected members cannot appoint proxies or representatives, Worldcon and NASFiC appointees serve at the pleasure of their appointing committees. That means they can appoint anybody and change their appointees at any time.

The 2013 Worldcon will appoint its representative to the Mark Protection Committee at a later date.

6.3 Former Worldcon Chairs Photo Session (not before 11 a.m.)

The former Worldcon chairs photo session will take place at the conclusion of the Saturday business meeting, but not before 11 a.m.

6.4 Mark Protection Committee Meeting

When the photo shoot is over on Saturday, a meeting of the Mark Protection Committee will occur. If site selection runs late, the meeting will be held in its scheduled slot in the program.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12.35 p.m. to meet at 10 a.m. on Saturday 20 August.

Site Selection Business Meeting, Saturday, August 20, 2011

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m. The business meeting staff consisted of Kent Bloom, Deputy Chairman; Donald E. Eastlake III, Parliamentarian; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; and Warren Buff, Timekeeper.

Kent Bloom, who was unable to attend the first two days of the Business meeting, offered to let Donald continue to preside but Donald deferred to Kent.

5. Site Selection Business

5.1 Report of the 2013 Worldcon Site Selection & presentation by winners

Patrick Molloy, the site selection administrator, announced the results of the vote for the 2013 Worldcon and said the entire counting process took 50 minutes.

Mr. Molloy certified the winner of the 2013 Worldcon as Texas, with 694 votes out of a total of 760 valid ballots 14 invalid submissions. (See Appendix A for the breakdown of the vote.)

The chair commended the site selection administrator and the tellers for their due diligence and without objection instructed the site selection administrator to destroy all site selection ballots for the Worldcon.

5.2 Question Time for the Seated Worldcon

5.2.1 Worldcon in 2013

Bill Parker and Laura Domitz, the co-chairs, announced that the 2013 Worldcon will be called LoneStarCon 3, to be held August 29-September 2, 2013. The guests of honor will be James Dunn, Norman Spinrad, Darrell K. Sweet, Ellen Datlow, and Willie Siros, along with Toastmaster Paul Cornell. Special Guests will be Leslie Fish and Joe R. Lansdale. LoneStarCon 3 will be held at the Henry B. Gonzalez Convention Center. The hotels will be the Marriott Rivercenter and Marriott River Walk. Membership prices on the progress report will be good through January 1, 2012. Bill Parker thanked everyone who has helped the bid, Kent Bloom extended his congratulations and condolences, and then Bill and Laura answered questions.

Young adult memberships will include voting rights. A payment plan will be established, and people will be able to purchase memberships via PayPal. Ultimately members will be able to check their membership status on the website. Memberships

will be available for purchase in the dealers' room at Renovation later in the afternoon in the area where site selection was held. LoneStarCon 3 has not yet established whether they will have a "taster" membership. A corkage waiver is built into the hotel contract, and late night programming and parties will be in the Marriott River Center. The Hugos will be held in the largest auditorium in San Antonio.

5.2.2 Chicon 7 (2012)

David McCarty spoke on behalf of Chicon 7. The convention will all be in one hotel, with no need to go outdoors. There will be a 2,300 seat auditorium for the Hugo Awards, and they hope to stream it as well. It is not too soon to start volunteering for programming or sending in suggestions. Chicon 7 plans to be a 6,000 convention. Hotel reservations will start to be taken in January. The rate will be \$145 for single, double, triple, or quad. Suites start at \$160-170 and run to about \$700-800. Parking facilities specific to the hotel are not set in stone, but will be 50% of their listed rate. It will be easy to park in the outer regions of Chicago and then take public transit system, and information will be provided. Parking at the hotel has a mix of parking, but it's mostly valet. There are many direct flights from non-North American venues, and Chicago is a hub for United.

5.3 Presentations by future Worldcon bids

5.3.1. Presentation by bidders for 2014

London in 2014. Michael Scott answered questions. A fifth 4-star hotel is going to open in 2013. Construction has started on a cable car from the Excel to the East End, and the Docklands railway extension will have been completed by the time of the convention. A connection to the Underground will be close by. They are in negotiation regarding room rates, which include taxes and breakfast. The closest hotels to the convention centre will be attached or very close by. About a 100 yard walk.

NASFiC in 2014. Mike Wilmoth announced there may be a NASFiC bid from Phoenix and that it would probably precede the London worldcon. There are no plans to make it a Westercon as well. The site is capable of supporting 1,000 members, and the convention would probably run four days.

5.3.2. Presentation by bidders for years after 2014

Spokane in 2015. Alex von Thorn represented the bid. He said there is a large fan community in the Northwest, and the bid will have the use of a great facility. Parking will be \$5 per day, but parking at the convention center may be slightly more. The Doubletree is adjacent to the convention center and there are three more hotels

available within a minute or two walk. Spokane in 2015 will participate in pass along funds. The weather in Spokane is perfect from July through September, with average highs in the mid-to-low 80s. The bid committee has many members who have worked Worldcons at division head level or higher. There are direct flights from many cities, and hourly flights from Seattle.

Orlando in 2015. Adam Beaton represented the bid. The hotel will be the Coronado Springs in Disney World, but he emphasized that unless one is entering the theme parks, there is no entrance or resort fee. The hotel rate will be \$139 per night for up to four people. The convention facilities have 220,000 square feet of space. There are 71 nonstop domestic flights and 19 international cities that have direct flights there. Orlando is a destination city, and there are many, many restaurants. The bid is working on a discount rate for reduced rate admission to the theme parks. Mr. Beaton named several members of his bid committee who have vast Worldcon experience, even though Renovation is his first Worldcon. The Orlando bid's dates are Labor Day weekend, but Disney is very excited about the convention and will be able to offer incentives to help the convention compete against Dragon*Con.

Kansas City in 2016. Diane Lacey and Ruth Lichtwardt announced their bid for a downtown convention. Kansas City has undergone renovation in the last few years and has a pleasant night life. Room rates are historically low. Their website is www.KCin2016.org.

New Orleans in 2018. Raymond Boudreau announced a bid for New Orleans.

New Zealand in 2020. René Walling said New Zealand is quietly bidding.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned *sine die* at 10:55 a.m.

Linda Deneroff, Secretary
Kent Bloom, Deputy Chairman
2011 WSFS Business Meeting

**MINUTES OF THE 2011 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING
RENOVATION, THE 2011 WORLDCON
Thursday August 18, Friday August 19, and Saturday August 20, 2011**

**APPENDIX A
Site Selection Results for 2013 Worldcon**

FIRST BALLOT	Mail-In	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	TOTAL	
Texas	92	130	171	301	694	WINNER
None of the Above	0	3	3	8	14	
Xerpes	0	3	1	2	6	
Minneapolis in '73	1	0	2	2	5	
Denton, the Happiest Place on Earth	0	0	2	2	4	
Boston 2020 Christmas	0	0	0	3	3	
Antartica	0	0	1	0	1	
Babylon 5	0	0	0	1	1	
BSFS Club House	0	0	0	1	1	
Chicago	0	1	0	0	1	
Cincinnati	0	0	0	1	1	
Fred Duarte's House	0	0	1	0	1	
Peggy Rae's House	0	0	1	0	1	
Spuzzum	0	0	0	1	1	
Unalakleet, Alaska	1	0	0	0	1	
Total with Preference	94	137	182	322	735	
Needed to Win					368	
No Preference	6	3	7	9	25	
Total Valid Ballots	100	140	189	331	760	
Invalid Ballots	13	0	0	1	14	

Submitted by Patrick Molloy, Renovation Site Selection Administrator

**MINUTES OF THE 2011 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING
RENOVATION, THE 2011 WORLDCON
Thursday August 18, Friday August 19, and Saturday August 20, 2011**

**APPENDIX B
How to Join SMOFs Email List**

Though not discussed at the meeting, many fans participate in the SMOFs list to discuss items of interest to the business meeting. Sharon Sbarsky updated the information for how to join the list.

- Go to: <http://listsmgt.sflovers.org>
- Click on the link: SMOFs
- Fill out form to join the mailing list (your name and email address).

If you believe the list administrator will not know who you are, please email smofs-owners@lists.sflovers.org and to let them know you were a member of Renovation.

**MINUTES OF THE 2011 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING
RENOVATION, THE 2011 WORLDCON
Thursday August 18, Friday August 19, and Saturday August 20, 2011**

**APPENDIX C
Reports Submitted to the Business Meeting**

**SECTION 1.1
REPORT OF MARK PROTECTION COMMITTEE ACTIONS
September 2010 - August 2011**

Members of the Mark Protection Committee from September 2010 through August 2011 were as follows, with the expiration of membership listed in parentheses after their name: Stephen Boucher (elected for until 2011), Scott Dennis (elected until 2012), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2012), Tim Illingworth (elected until 2013), Dina Krause (appointed by ReConstruction until 2012), Ruth Sachter (elected until 2012), Adrienne Seel (appointed by Anticipation until 2011), Kevin Standlee (elected until 2013), Ben Yalow (elected until 2013), Mark Linneman (appointed by Aussiecon 4 until 2012), Mark Olson (elected until 2011), Linda Deneroff, (elected until 2011), Sandra Levy (appointed by Chicon 7 until 2014), Ian Stockdale (appointed by Renovation until 2013). Kent Bloom's term expired at the conclusion of the 2010 meeting, and we thank him for his services to this committee. Ben Yalow was appointed chairman; Linda Deneroff, secretary; and Scott Dennis, treasurer.

The MPC Finance Report is appended at the end of this document.

After the past few years, this year had fewer issues. Major accomplishments of the Mark Protection Committee between September 2010 and August 2011 were:

1. We received an enquiry from Scott Dorsey regarding a full page ad for "Captain Celluloid's Movie And TV World Con" in *Classic Images* magazine (which included a look at their convention). We voted unanimously to send them a note asking them to use the generic "World Convention" rather than "World Con." There is no record that we ever received a response.
2. FaceBook listed a group described as "The Hugo video awards." A Google Translation of the group message in English read, "If this group reaches 38 people, I will be releasing videos of Hugo compromising. Warning this video may impair its integrity so I ask you to think twice before signing up. This group will be automatically deleted if Hugo or a benevolent philanthropist donates 20 euros to each member and at any time." The general consensus was that this was some sort of joke, and Mark Olson reminded the group that "we

don't own the name 'Hugo[, only the right to] prevent others from using the word 'Hugo' in the course of purveying goods and services related to the fairly limited part of commerce our registration covers in a way which would confuse those goods or services with ours." Kevin suggested that we simply note the site's existence and monitor it.

3. Tim reported that worldcon.**org** was not being properly maintained and pointed out that as of January 2011 wsfs.org still had the 2009 Constitution and Standing Rules posted. Ben was tasked with discussing the leadership and membership issues with the existing Worldcon Website Working Group members and reporting back to the MPC e-list with new appointments, and Sandra Levy agreed to help if needed.
4. Ben reported that control of worldcon.**com** was turned over to the MPC by Vincent Docherty, who had bought the name. Both he and Vince Docherty have the passwords to the website. Ben said the committee needed to decide who should have the passwords and who should be the admin, tech and registrant contacts. He suggested that the MPC chair be the admin, the HAMC chair be the tech, and the MPC secretary be the registrant.

Mark suggested that others should have the passwords as well, as long as they agree not to use it unless requested by an appropriate person. Sandra pointed out that the HAMC chair might not have the requisite skills and asked if it could be assigned to someone with whatever protections the group thinks is appropriate, or if the HAMC chair could appoint someone to work under his or her supervision. Kevin added that everything needs backups and multiple people with the passwords, so that every time we change officers/committee members we can change the data quickly. Ben added that if we ever decide on what to do about worldcon.com, we should migrate toward that scheme for all our other domains. There was a side discussion as to whether the password(s) should be written down, kept in a sealed envelope and/or be told to someone. Ben also clarified that currently worldcon.com is not in use and that "the only reason we have it (and any of the other unused domains that we keep) is to stop other people from using it, and causing confusion with our real worldcon.org site." A vote was taken on the original question to assign the MPC chairman to be the admin, the HAMC chair to be the tech, and the MPC secretary be the registrant of worldcon.org, and passed with eight votes.

5. René Walling asked Mark Olson to join the Hugo Award Marketing Committee. By a vote of 6 to 5, the membership was confirmed.
6. In March 2010, Kevin discovered a website, worldcon2011.org that hosts the XVIth World Congress of Cardiology, Echocardiography and Allied Imaging

Techniques. Mark pointed out that it “falls in the ‘not a conflicting usage’ category.” Ben agreed, but added that “it might be better for people looking for either of us if their name didn’t start with the string “Worldcon.” Don Eastlake took an opposite position, pointing out that “Causing confusion is pretty much the definition of trade mark infringement, and it is admitted that people would be confused by their URL.” It is worth repeating Don’s final paragraph as a general mission statement:

Worldcon is really our strongest and most important Mark, in my opinion. If you do nothing, it is quite possible that their use of worldcon will spread from the URL to other places in their collateral in future years. Will signs at this meeting say “Worldcon” in big letters? Possibly, if we do nothing. Even their current use erodes our mark to a limited extent. They would only incur costs if they changed their current usage and might put up a fight about that. So what you really need to do is put them on notice and obtain assures that they will not use “worldcon” in future years, which is what we did/got for that HVAC conference that started using "Worldcon" as a contraction for World Conference.

Upon further investigation, it appeared that the use of worldcon2011 was a one-off; a quick check showed that worldcon2009.org, worldcon2010.org, and worldcon2012.org were all unused. On that basis, no action was taken.

7. In May, we received a written note that a publisher other than the one that has asked us in the past was planning on producing a book of Hugo nominated works, and was planning on claiming that on the cover. Anyone may truthfully claim a “Hugo Award winner” or “Hugo Award nominee”, but the current President of SFWA was asked (by other parties) to comment. He wrote:

I would agree that you need to run this past a lawyer, soon. If these people note in the back copy (or the equivalent) that the stories are Hugo winners or nominees, that’s one thing. If the title, subtitle or any other aspect of the book represents or implies that the book is an authorized or licensed anthology, then you run a substantial risk of consumer confusion, which trade and service marks are meant to avoid.

It also seems like these folks may be attempting an end run around WSFS, and are trying to obtain the benefit of the Hugo mark without appropriate licensing, which aside from being vaguely sleazy puts any officially-licensed anthology at a perceptual and competitive disadvantage in the marketplace and will possibly make it more difficult for you to market and sell officially-licensed Hugo anthologies in the future.

Ben correctly pointed out that we have no restrictions on the mark for correct attribution, and no licensing is required. “However, when a respected industry professional who is fundamentally on our side makes such a suggestion, then I feel that I should forward it to the MPC for discussion, to see if we should discuss this with counsel (which would, presumably, cost us).”

Kevin noted that if that were the case

we’ve effectively lost control of our service mark for works of Hugo-nominated and Hugo-winning works and we should give back the \$100 license fee we already received for the previous anthology and apologize to the publisher, because we basically licensed something that we can’t control or license. . . . You can publish a work by an author who has won Hugos and describe it as by a “Hugo-award winning author.” You could even publish a collection of Hugo-nominated works. But putting “Hugo Award” in the *title* of such a collection seems like it should be a violation to me.

Mark asked if the terms of our agreement with the publisher who paid us a license fee was for exclusive use, and added that if it was termed “exclusive”, we sold “something we did not own.” He added, “Our goal should be to get the Hugo mark out as widely as possible.”

Don noted, however, that the question here is different. It is can we control someone's incorporation of our mark into the *name* of a work or series, a name which, itself, might at some point qualify for registration and agreed we should seek legal advice.

After protracted discussion, no action was taken.

8. Concurrent with item 7, we were asked if it would “be possible for the MPC to trademark the Hugo Awards as a series of science fiction books?” In reviewing the emails from this period, it looks like the two discussions may have been combined and/or confused. However, specific to this discussion, Ben noted that “The MPC would not undertake such a registration without explicit direction from the Business Meeting, since that is not a class we’ve been directed to register the mark in.”
9. May was a busy month. HAMC forwarded an email from the film production of *Neighbors*, requesting “permission to verbally refer to the Hugo Awards in one scene in the film.” They attached a copy of the script and gave the specific reference to the scene. Without much discussion, it was agreed that the film company did not need permission from us to use the term in the film, but since

the film company was still worried, we signed their release saying that we gave our permission, to the extent it was needed.

10. While coordinating the HAMC's CoverItLive coverage of the 2011 Hugo Awards Ceremony with the Renovation Events tech team, Kevin Standlee created (at their request) a generic Worldcon.events@gmail.com email account. He then used that account to create a UStream user named **Worldcon** with a profile name of "Events Worldcon" and a UStream channel named Worldcon (<http://www.ustream.tv/channel/worldcon1>). Kevin then shared the logon information with Renovation Events so that they can use it to live-stream events at Renovation. The plan is to hand this account over to Chicon 7 for their use in the same way. The account is not tied to any specific person's identity (except for backup password-recovery purposes) and will not be used as a personal email address.
11. At the beginning of August, Don Timm discovered a website called <http://worldcon.biz/index.html>. There has been no discussion of the issue at this time. But based on the precedent of ignoring Worldcon Construction in Southern California, until and unless they start trying to hold conventions we are not likely to act on this.
12. As a follow-up to item 3, Ben made the change to worldcon.com. He reported that we cannot redirect worldcon.com to worldcon.org until we get better control of worldcon.org's servers, so they know to respond to worldcon.com, as well and added that we could set up a tiny host for worldcon.com that simply does a redirect to worldcon.org. We have until October to renew the domain, but we may want to switch to a different registrar and then get one that allows a small dummy site to do the redirect. And since these people allow 4 names, not the usual three, on the account, Ben left Vincent's name on the account. We will follow up with this in subsequent weeks.

– Linda Deneroff –

Financial Report – Mark Protection Committee – World Science Fiction Society

1 August 2010 through 31 July 2011

	Amount	Balance
Cash on hand as of 1 August 2010		8061.09
Paid to Donald Eastlake for various marks (this amount was reported as owed last year)	(129.79)	7931.09
Paid to Deborah Geisler accumulated monthly expense	(165.00)	7766.09
Balance as of 31 July 2011		7766.09

All amounts are in U.S. dollars.

The Treasurer is not aware of any other pending debts, although I understand that Deborah Geisler and Mark Olson each continue to spend small amounts which will eventually require reimbursement.

We also may incur additional bills from our intellectual property attorney at any time.

The Marketing Committee has also been authorized to spend small amounts of money.

It is the practice of the Business Meeting and Mark Committee to encourage non-U.S. based Worldcons to use their suggested donation amounts to further the interests of the Society through protection of the Marks in their own countries. Consequently, I have not expected a donation from Anticipation or Aussiecon 4. It is the practice of the Treasurer to not request donations from U.S. Worldcons until after they have been held.

– Scott Dennis –

SECTION 1.2
REPORT OF NITPICKING AND FLYSPECKING COMMITTEE
September 2010 - August 2011

Authority

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.

Members

The members of the NPFSC are Don Eastlake, Tim Illingworth, and Kevin Standlee. The committee is willing to serve for another year.

Actions

In accordance with object (1), the committee continues to maintain the list of Rulings and Resolutions of Continuing effect through the WSFS web pages at <http://www.wsfs.org> and will continue to do so to the extent the committee is able to do so. (The 2010 Rulings and Resolutions are attached to this report.) Updating the WSFS web site continues to be challenging.

Pursuant to BM-2001-1 and subsequent related resolutions, the committee has, once every six months, reminded seated Worldcons of the requirement for legibility of badges, of the Business Meeting's request that Hugo Administrators publicize the list of works published by Best Editor nominees, and of the existence of standard lists of Worldcons and Hugo Awards.

Last year's WSFS Business Meeting instructed this committee "to review the governance and operation of all business meeting committees and include the results of this review in its next report." The Committee regrets to report that it has not completed this task.

Recommendations

The Committee has no recommended actions at this time.

World Science Fiction Society

Resolutions and Rulings of Continuing Effect

2010 Business Meeting, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Kent Bloom, Presiding Officer
Don A. Timm, Secretary
Robert MacIntosh, Timekeeper

Note: Items prefixed MPC are resolutions passed by the WSFS Mark Protection Committee.

CH-2010-01

[determined to be invalid as in conflict with Section 1.8.4 of the WSFS Constitution]

CH-2010-02

If a person is a member of multiple Worldcons whose members are simultaneously eligible to nominate for the current Hugo Awards, that person may cast only one set of nominations regardless of how many memberships that person holds.

MPC-2010-01

Members of the Mark Protection Committee and any of its subcommittees must agree to decline nomination for a Hugo Award presented in a year following a year in which that person served in whole or in part.

2010 MPC Meeting, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Ben Yalow, MPC Chair
Linda Deneroff, MPC Secretary

MPC-2010-01

Members of the Mark Protection Committee and any of its subcommittees must agree to decline nomination for a Hugo Award presented in a year following a year in which that person served in whole or in part. [Note: this was repealed by the MPC at its meeting after the WSFS Business Meeting at Renovation.]

MPC-2010-02

The Chairman of the Mark Protection Committee shall be ex officio a member of all subcommittees of the MPC.

MPC-2010-03

The WSFS Mark Protection Committee authorizes Victorian Science Fiction Conventions, Inc. to act as Agent for the MPC in Australia, to investigate options for protecting WSFS's service marks in Australia, and to report to the MPC e-list when practical to do so.

MPC-2010-04

The WSFS Mark Protection Committee authorizes CanSMOF Inc. to act as Agent for the MPC in Canada, to investigate options for protecting WSFS's service marks in Canada, and to report to the MPC e-list when practical to do so.

SECTION 1.5
FORMALIZATION OF LONG LIST ENTRIES (FOLLE) COMMITTEE

LONG LIST COMMITTEE REPORT FOR 2011
September 2010 - August 2011

The Long List Committee has continued to curate the Long List of Worldcons and Long List of Hugos. The only change of substance this year was a correction to the Chicon III attendance numbers which have been wrong since a program book typo in the mid-70s! We have added some attendance numbers and corrected some others based on improved information.

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

The current membership of the Long List Committee is:

- Mark Olson (chairman)
- Craig Miller
- David G. Grubbs
- Joe Siclari
- Kent Bloom
- Colin Harris
- Richard Lynch
- Kevin Standlee
- Tim Illingworth
- Ben Yalow

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

SECTION 1.6
REPORT OF THE SEMI-PROZINE COMMITTEE
September 2010 - August 2011

Committee Members: Chris Barkley, Seth Briedbart, Warren Buff, Neil Clarke, Gary Farber, David Hartwell, Saul Jaffe, Perianne Lurie, Kevin Maroney, Mark Olson, Stu Segal, Ben Yalow

This report consists of a report summarizing our discussions and reasoning and a motion made and seconded by the Committee. In addition, there are 3 minority reports, attached.

Discussion

A long time ago in a fandom now quite distant from us, the Hugos were born. At that time there was a vigorous fanzine culture of printed zines typed on stencils with print runs of a few hundred copies at most and available to anyone for “the usual” (a contribution of an article or a letter of comment or enough money to pay for printing and mailing the fanzine). For short fiction and most novels, the professional magazines were where the action was. The prozines were professionally printed and edited, the writers were (usually) paid, and the magazines with their glorious color covers were available only for cash. There were only a few things in between -- mostly amateurish wannabe fiction magazines -- but they were not thought to be good enough or numerous enough to be worth considering for a Hugo. So we had two categories, Best Fanzine and Best Professional Magazine, and no one needed to define either because everyone knew quite unambiguously what was what.

Fast forward a few years when *Locus* began as a classic fanzine. It was not noticeably different from other fanzines, at first, but *Locus* grew and eventually became something new: It still had traditional fannish newszine contents, but it was slick and professionally printed and people earned their living from it. And *Locus* and a few other giant, slick fanzines dominated the Best Fanzine category. WSFS ultimately created the Best Semi-Prozine category to provide a home for these giant fanzines so that the traditional amateur (and always underfunded) fanzines could still compete. Note that the differences between Best Fanzine and Best Semi-Prozine and prozine were defined entirely in terms of size and resources and not at all in terms of content, medium, or format.

Since then the field has grown more complicated still. Professional fiction magazines sometimes have landed in Best Semi-Prozine, and entirely new forms (blogs, websites, podcast, on-line fiction magazines, corporate websites, and others) have developed until we have a continuous band of eligible works running smoothly and without natural boundaries from a classic small-circulation print

fanzine up to the traditional prozines and beyond. For award purposes, this continuum – the zine continuum – continues to be divided into three categories: Fanzines and Semi-Prozines which are eligible for Hugos themselves, and professional magazines whose editors are eligible for a Best Editor Hugo. As always, content is no guide as to where to draw the lines.

The task before this committee was to devise a new set of dividing lines which still divided the zine continuum into three chunks but modified so that the competitors in each were of a comparable “weight class”, and to draw those lines so that Hugo voters and Hugo administrators could reasonably know which works were in which category. This concept of “weight class” is important since the only real reason to subdivide the continuous range of publications is so that size alone does not determine winners.

This turned out to be quite difficult.

The first thing we discovered was that there were *no* criteria which were available to the average voter which resulted in a well-balanced set of weight classes. All of the clear and easy choices turned out to be too simple and persistently assigned works to obviously wrong categories. (For example, one proposal made the criteria either a payment any size to contributors or non-general free availability. This put some professionally funded websites in Fanzine and obvious semiprozines into Professional and consequently was rejected.) For each of the options we considered, we examined how it would impact the existing fanzines, semi-prozines and prozines which contend for Hugos and insisted that our general sense of what ought to go where was largely met. The impact of these proposed changes are detailed in the Appendix. Note that the committee proposal basically moves several publications from the high end of Semiprozine into professional. (Note that Ben Yalow’s minority proposal effectively does away with the semiprozine category by moving all contenders into Pro.)

In the end, we decided to focus on the amount of money resources available to a publication to divide the zine continuum into three parts: Prozines, Semiprozines, and Fanzines. Basically,

- Prozines are owned or staffed by wage-paying entities. They’re basically commercial enterprises or run or funded by commercial enterprises.
- Semiprozines may pay for content or charge for copies, but they pay no one a living. There’s money involved, but not too much and the staff does not participate in it -- they’re basically labors of love on the part of their staff.
- Fanzines are available without paying cash, and pay no one for content. They are labors of love on *everyone*’s part.

The boundaries among these categories are not always easy to discern. (The same is true of the present category definitions, for the same reasons.) As such, we propose to ask the publications themselves (who would certainly know!) to declare their status as part of the nomination process.

We believe that this proposal is a good compromise between being simple for voters to understand and use, and actually putting publications into weight classes in which the competition is fair and balanced. (And we call as witness that this is a good compromise that no one is particularly happy with it!)

Consequently, the Committee recommends to the WSFS BM the adoption of the following motion:

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution:

Add a new section: 3.Y.Z: A Professional Publication is one which meets at least one of the following two criteria:

- (1) it provided at least a quarter the income of any one person or,
- (2) was owned or published by any entity which provided at least a quarter the income of any of its staff and/or owner.

Amend the sections 3.3.12 and 3.3.13, by replacing them with:

3.3.12: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available non-professional publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (or the equivalent in other media), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which in the previous calendar year met at least one (1) of the following criteria:

- (1) paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,
- (2) was generally available only for paid purchase,

3.3.13: Best Fanzine. Any generally available non-professional publication devoted to science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects which by the close of the previous calendar year has published four (4) or more issues (or the equivalent in other media), at least one (1) of which appeared in the previous calendar year, and which in the previous calendar year met neither of the following criteria:

- (1) paid its contributors and/or staff in other than copies of the publication,
- (2) was generally available only for paid purchase,

Add to the end of Section 3.9 (Notification and Acceptance):

“Additionally, each nominee in the categories of Best Fanzine and Best

Semi-Prozine shall be required to confirm that they meet the qualifications of their category.”

Appendix: The effect on this proposal and Ben Yalow's minority report on recent nominees. (get errors from Mark Olson)

	Nominees				Revised	
	2008	2009	2010	2011	Committee	Yalow
Interzone	Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Pro	Pro
Locus	Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Pro	Pro
NYRSF	Semipro	Semipro			Semipro	Pro
Clarkesworld		Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Pro
Weird Tales		Semipro	Semipro	Semipro	Pro	Pro
Helix	Semipro				Semipro	Pro
Lightspeed				Semipro	Pro	Pro
Ansible	Semipro		Semipro		Fanzine	Fanzine
Challenger	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine
The Drink Tank	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine
File 770	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine
Banana Wings		Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine
StarShipSofa			Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine
Argentus	Fanzine	Fanzine	Fanzine		Fanzine	Fanzine
Electric Velocepede		Fanzine			Semipro	Pro
PLOKTA	Fanzine				Fanzine	Fanzine

Minority Report from Stu Segal

I oppose the proposal adopted by the majority for the following reasons:

1. The current proposal, were it applied to this years' Semi-prozine nominees, would have the following effect:

- Clarkesworld - QUALIFIES as a Semi-prozine.
- Interzone - DOES NOT QUALIFY as a Semi-prozine.
- Lightspeed - DOES NOT QUALIFY as a Semi-prozine.
- Locus - DOES NOT QUALIFY as a Semi-prozine.
- Weird Tales - DOES NOT QUALIFY as a Semi-prozine.

These are the 2011 peoples' nominees for Semi-prozine; adopting a set of rules which eliminates 80% of the peoples' choices is completely inappropriate.

2. The committee was formed to create a proposal to “fix” the problem with what had become sarcastically called “The Locus Award”, as Locus had won the Semi-prozine Hugo in 17 of the prior 21 years. Interestingly, the proposal to eliminate the Semi-prozine Award, followed by the formation of the Committee, focused so much attention on the category that fresh new nominees appeared in the last three years; subsequently Locus has not won the Hugo in the Semi-Prozine category since the issue was brought to light 3 years ago. I submit for your consideration that the problem we were trying to correct has, in fact, been corrected as a result of the attention focused in the last 3 years; I conclude that no “fix” is currently needed.

Minority Report from Ben Yalow

I believe that the general idea that money is a good measure is worth supporting. However, I believe that money applies in an additional place. therefore, I propose the following amendment:

Title: Paying Money for Content

Moved: To amend Sec X.Y.Z by adding:

“(3) paid professional rates for a significant amount of its content.”

Discussion:

The purpose of the distinction between “professional” and “non-professional” is to ensure that works of equal degrees of professionalism are compared to each other, and works which are able to improve themselves by applying extra money to improve the work aren’t compared against works with less money. This ensures that works with comparable money resources are in competition with each other, leaving the skills of the creators to distinguish among works, which ensures that the skill is recognized.

Money can be used, at the decision of the creator of the magazine, to either be used to purchase better staff, or to pay more for content, which can be used to get better content to improve the work. In the current proposal, we use “paying staff” as a way to distinguish between non-professional (don’t pay staff) and professional (do pay staff). This amendment adds paying real money for content (sufficient to be considered professional rates) as something that makes the work professional. Without this, a work can be competing with a professional work like Analog for the content by paying professional rates, but still not be considered professional.

Minority Report from Saul Jaffe

While I believe that the committee has made a good attempt to find a solution to the perceived problems and to recommend a solution, I disagree with the proposal because the end result is too confusing and requires the average Hugo nominator to have specialized knowledge about the financial workings of the individual publications.

The criteria for Hugo Awards should be simple to understand. A person should be able to pick up a magazine, decide that it is worthy of the award, and by simply reading the criteria in the WSFS Constitution, be able to determine which category the magazine falls in: Professional, Semi-Professional, or Fanzine. By requiring other knowledge outside what's immediately known by looking at the magazine itself, the rules would require a person who is considering nominating that magazine to do some extensive research, or to nominate blindly and have his/her nominations potentially rejected by the Hugo Administrator. To me, this is unacceptable. I believe this has been an ongoing problem with the Semi-Prozine category and one of the things this committee was supposed to "fix". I'm not sure how many people nominated magazines in the Semi-Prozine category because they knew the magazine met the criteria as opposed to nominating it in that category because that's where it had been! nominated before by others. In other words, did people really check to see if the magazine met the criteria or did they just put it in that category out of habit or because others did?

The proposed addition to the end of Section 3.9 that requires nominees to certify that they meet the qualifications in the category is not enough to alleviate the problem. That certification happens AFTER the potential slate of nominees is determined. It does not help the person who is deciding what to put on his/her nomination form. In my opinion, this could lead to campaigning during the nomination period to get word out to potential nominators what category a particular magazine should be nominated in.

I also disagree with Mr. Segal's Minority Report which suggests that no fix is needed. I believe the Semi-Prozine category has been problematic for a number of years, and part of that problem is the complexity of the criteria and the specialized knowledge needed about the financial arrangements of individual publications. Therefore, I recommend that the proposed amendments put forth by the committee be REJECTED, and the committee reformed to reconsider the problem and to report back to the Business Meeting next year.

Renovation Business Meeting

Discussion and Ruling

Donald E. Eastlake, III
Presiding Officer Pro Tem

18 August 2011

This document consists of some discussion in the nature of the author's opinions of certain issues and an intended Ruling of the author in his capacity as Presiding Officer Pro Tem of the Renovation Business Meeting. It should be noted that binding rulings issue only in connection with actual business before the Business Meeting. While the author, at the time of drafting this document, intended to rule as stated below, he reserves the right to actually rule as he believes to be correct at the time of ruling from the Chair.

Discussion:

Communication between the WSFS Business Meeting (BM) and the WSFS Mark Protection Committee (MPC) is to be encouraged. In general these two bodies have existed in a relationship of cooperation and amity whose continuation is highly desirable. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the MPC is a committee of the World Science Fiction Society. The MPC is not a committee of the Business Meeting. While I believe that everyone has been acting in good faith, I also believe that errors have been made under what appear to me to be misapprehensions concerning the WSFS Constitution and the relationship between the BM and the MPC.

The MPC is entrusted with the "... protection of the marks used by or under the authority of WSFS". This protection is an activity of indefinite duration whose future prospects could be compromised by unwise short-term actions. This task has been entrusted by the Constitution to a body with elected members having three-year overlapping terms and appointed members with terms in office potentially even longer (for WorldCon representatives). It has not been entrusted to the will of any single WSFS Business.

Individual BMs have, in the past, issued instructions to the MPC and the MPC has generally accepted such instructions. This could be considered a tradition of WSFS. Nevertheless, the WSFS Constitution outranks such traditions.

The WSFS Constitution specifies the method by which persons become members of the MPC. The MPC is given complete authority by the Constitution to create and determine its officers and agents, which includes group entities, such as

subcommittees. Under this authority, the MPC can impose such requirements as it desires on such officers and agents. But the MPC has no authority to impose additional requirements for MPC membership. Thus, the requirement that MPC members decline Hugo nominations, adopted by the MPC, is beyond its authority, although it had the authority to adopt such a requirement for subcommittees or officers.

The legitimate place to initially challenge MPC rules is in the MPC. While an expression of opinion in the BM might influence the MPC, a single BM does not have the authority to countermand the MPC's complete authority under the WSFS Constitution to determine and select its officers and agents.

The BM and the con committees have many means of influencing or controlling the MPC. Two successive BMs can amend the WSFS constitution in any legal way to change, direct, eliminate, or otherwise control the MPC. A single BM can certainly indicate its opinions or desires concerning MPC actions or policies and one would hope that such indications would be influential. Con committees can appoint and replace their MPC member representative so as to assure that their opinions are supported by a voice and vote in the MPC and they can withhold funds. Without commenting on its advisability, Item 4.3.4 (Hugo Exclusions Constitutional Amendment) is an example of a procedurally proper method of the BM exercising its authority over the MPC through the process of amendment of the WSFS Constitution.

Ruling:

Item 4.1.2 (MPC Eligibility Rules) is not in order for the following reasons:

1. Provisions restricting the MPC's authority to determine the membership of subcommittees of the MPC violate the authority granted to the MPC by the WSFS Constitution.
2. Provisions purporting to actually invalidate actions by the MPC related to the MPC's internal processes are beyond the authority of a BM under the WSFS Constitution.

Note:

Should the ruling above be appealed and reversed, the author will, in the act of presiding, conform to the judgment of the assembly. Nevertheless, the author may continue to be of the opinion that the adoption of 4.1.2 has no binding effect on the MPC.