

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

Table of Contents

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING, THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 2017.....4

A STANDING RULE CHANGES.....4

 A.1 Short Title: No Candidate Regions.....4

 A.2 Short Title: No Vanishing Business.....5

 A.3 Short Title: Debate Time Streamlining.....5

B RESOLUTIONS.....6

 B.1 Short title: *your name*. Eligibility.....6

C. BUSINESS PASSED ON.....6

 C.1 Short Title: Best Series.....6

 C.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough.....7

 C.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough.....8

 C.4 Short Title: Three Stage Voting (“3SV”) or “The Only Winning Move Is Not to Play”8

 C.5 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo (Out of the Many, a Hugo).....11

 C.6 Short Title: EPH+.....13

 C.7 Defining North America.....13

 C.8 Retrospective Improvement Part 1.....14

 C.9 Retrospective Improvement Part 2.....14

 C.10 Universal Suffrage.....15

 C.11 Young Adult Award.....15

 C.12 Short Title: 5 and 6.....16

D. NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.....16

 D.1 Short Title: Best Series.....17

 D.2 Short Title: The Reasonable Amendment.....18

E.	COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS.....	18
E.1	Standing Committees of WSFS.....	18
E.1.1	MPC Election Results.....	18
E.2.	Standing Committees of the Business Meeting.....	18
E.2.1	Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee.....	18
E.2.2	Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee.....	18
E.3	Special Committees.....	18
E.3.1	Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee.....	18
F.	FINANCIAL REPORTS.....	18
	APPENDICES.....	18

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

All meetings will be held in Room 205 of the Helsinki Exhibition & Convention Centre in Helsinki, Finland, with Kevin Standlee presiding over all sessions of the Business Meeting. The Officers are:

Presiding Officer:	Kevin Standlee
Deputy Presiding Officer	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Paul Dormer
Videographer:	Lisa Hayes
Sergeants-at-Arms	_____

The debates in these minutes will not be word for word accurate, but every attempt will be made to represent the sense of the arguments.

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

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

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

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS MEETING, THURSDAY, AUGUST 10, 2017

The business meeting staff consists of Kevin Standlee, Presiding Officer; Donald E. Eastlake III, Deputy Presiding Officer; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Paul Dormer, Timekeeper; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; _____, Sergeants-at-Arms.

The Business Meeting may be conducted in an order different from that shown in the agenda. Minutes will follow any new order, but contain the numbering in the agenda.

A STANDING RULE CHANGES

A.1 Short Title: No Candidate Regions

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

Rule 6.1: Nominations. Nominations for election to the Mark Protection Committee shall be allowed from the floor at each Preliminary Business Meeting. To be listed on the ballot, each nominee must submit to the Secretary of the Business Meeting the nominee's consent to nomination ~~and the nominee's current region of residence. A nominee shall be ineligible if the nominee could not be elected due to the regional residence restrictions.~~ The deadline for submitting such consent to nomination shall be set by the Secretary.

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

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

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

A.2 Short Title: No Vanishing Business

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

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

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

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

A.3 Short Title: Debate Time Streamlining

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

[Rules 3.1: Main Motions: The Presiding Officer shall designate the default debate time for main motions. If an objection is raised to this default time, the Business Meeting shall vote on it without debate. If that designated time is defeated, the Business Meeting may, by majority vote, set the initial debate time limit for any motion to any positive whole even number of minutes up to 30.](#)

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

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

B RESOLUTIONS

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

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

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

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

C. BUSINESS PASSED ON

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

C.1 Short Title: Best Series

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

1. Insert words in existing Section 3.2.4 as follows:

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

2. Modify existing Section 3.2.5 as follows:

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

3. Insert the following section after existing Section 3.3.4:

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

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

4. Insert the following before existing Section 3.8.3:

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

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

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

Proposed by: Series Hugo Committee

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

C.2 Short Title: December Is Good Enough

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

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a poll to select the finalists for the Award voting. Each member of the administering Worldcon, the

immediately preceding Worldcon, or the immediately following Worldcon as of ~~January 31~~ the end of the ~~current~~ previous calendar year shall be allowed to make up to five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

Proposed by: Colette Fozard, Warren Buff, Nicholas Whyte

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

C.3 Short Title: Two Years Are Enough

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

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

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

Proposed by: Warren Buff, Colin Harris

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

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

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

Section 3.7: Nominations.

3.7.1: The Worldcon Committee shall conduct a two-stage poll to select the finalists for the Award voting. ~~Each~~ In the Nominating stage, each member of the administering Worldcon, the immediately preceding Worldcon, or the immediately following Worldcon as of January 31 of the

current calendar year shall be allowed to make up to five (5) equally weighted nominations in every category.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3.8: Tallying of Nominations.

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

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

Section 3.A: Finalist Selection Process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance.

3.9.1 Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the finalists, or in the case of deceased or incapacitated persons, their heirs, assigns, or legal guardians, in each category prior to the release of such information. Each person notified shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the person notified declines the nomination, that finalist(s) shall not appear on the final ballot. The procedure for replacement of such finalist(s) is described in subsection 3.A.4.

Section 3.11: Tallying of Votes.

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

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

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

C.6 Short Title: EPH+

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

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

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

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

C.7 Defining North America

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

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

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

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

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

C.8 Retrospective Improvement Part 1

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

Section 3.13: Retrospective Hugos

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

C.9 Retrospective Improvement Part 2

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

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

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

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

C.10 Universal Suffrage

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

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

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

Proposed by: Ron Oakes, Linda Deneroff and Tara Oakes

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

C.11 Young Adult Award

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Proposed by: Members of the YA Award Committee

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

C.12 Short Title: 5 and 6

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

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

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

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

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

D. NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

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

Preliminary Business Meeting may amend items under this heading, set debate time limits, refer them to committee, and take other action as permitted under the Standing Rules.

D.1 Short Title: Best Series

Moved: to amend the Best Series proposal as follows:

In section 3.3.X:

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

In Section 3.3.Y:

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

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

3.3.X Best Series. A *multi-installment* science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, setting, and presentation, appearing in at least *three (3) installments* consisting in total of at least 240,000 words by the close of the previous calendar year, at least *one (1) installment* of which was published in the previous calendar year, and which has not previously won under 3.3.X.

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

Proposed by: Kate Secor and Seanan McGuire

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

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

In this proposal, “volume” is taken to mean any story published separately from the others in a series. Hence, a trilogy of novels, an extremely long novel and

two shorter pieces, a pair of long novels and a novella, or a larger number of shorter pieces might make up the requisite three volumes (and total word count) – or even a set of stories greatly exceeding the length and number requirements (a condition which we can foresee as being quite frequent in the earlier years of such an award).

D.2 Short Title: The Reasonable Amendment

Moved: to amend 3.8.X (Nominee Diversity) of the WSFS Constitution by striking “best” and inserting “reasonable” in its place.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

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

E. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

E.1 Standing Committees of WSFS

E.1.1 MPC Election Results

E.2. Standing Committees of the Business Meeting

E.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

E.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

E.3 Special Committees

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

F. FINANCIAL REPORTS

APPENDICES