

2022 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
CHICON 8, THE 80TH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
SEPTEMBER 1-5, 2022

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
INTRODUCTION	1
A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS.....	2
A.1 Standing Committee of WSFS	2
A.1.1 Mark Protection Committee Report and Nominations	2
A.2. Standing Committees of the Business Meeting.....	3
A.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee	3
A.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee	5
A.3 Special Committees	6
A.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries Committee	6
A.3.2 Hugo Awards Study Committee	6
A.3.3 Site Selection Study Committee	9
B. FINANCIAL REPORTS.....	10
B.1 LoneStarCon 3 (San Antonio).....	10
B.2 Sasquan (Spokane)	11
B.3 MidAmeriCon II (Kansas City).....	13
B.4 Worldcon 75 (Helsinki, Finland).....	14
B.5 Worldcon 76 (San Jose).....	15
B.6 Dublin 2019: An Irish Worldcon (Dublin, Ireland)	17
B.7 CoNZealand (Wellington, New Zealand)	20
B.8 DisCon III (Washington, DC)	22
B.9 Chicon 8 (Chicago, Illinois)	24
B.10 Chengdu Worldcon (Chengdu, China).....	29
C. STANDING RULE CHANGES	31
C.1 Short Title: Making Business Meeting Feedback Possible	31
C.2 Short Title: If You Don't Have To Print, Neither Do We.....	33

D.	RESOLUTIONS.....	36
D.1	Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>After Yang</i>	36
D.2	Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>Strawberry Mansion</i>	36
D.3	Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>Neptune Frost</i>	37
D.4	Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>Mad God</i>	37
D.5	Short Title: Solidarity with Ukraine	37
D.6	Short Title: Sergey Lukianenko.....	39
E.	BUSINESS PASSED ON	43
E.1	Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo	43
E.2	Short Title: 30 Days Hath New Business	47
E.3	Short Title: The Statue of Liberty Play	50
E.4	Short Title: A Matter of Days.....	50
E.5	Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights	51
F.	NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS	55
F.1	Short Title: The Zero Per Cent Solution	55
F.2	Short Title: To Defuse the Turnout Bomb, Cut the Red Wire	57
F.3	Short Title: If a Tree Falls in The Woods and Nobody Is Around	58
F.4	Short Title: Best Game or Interactive Work	60
F.5	Short Title: Fan vs. Pro.....	63
F.6	Short Title: Clearing Up the Artist Categories Forever (No, Really, We Swear It This Time!)	66
F.7	Short Title: One Rocket Per Customer, Please!	71
F.8	Short Title: A Work, By Any Other Name	77
G.	ELECTION RESULTS	80
G.1	Worldcon 2024	80
G.2	NASFiC 2023	81
H.	REPORTS FROM WORLDCONS AND BIDS	83
H.1	Seated Worldcon: Chengdu (2023)	83
I.	ANNOUNCEMENTS	85
	APPENDICES	86
	Appendix A – Report of the Mark Protection Committee	86
	Appendix B – Results of the Mark Protection Committee Election	95
	Appendix C – Report of the Hugo Award Study Committee	96

Appendix D – Best Game or Interactive Work Report..... 117
Appendix E – Report of the E.2 Committee 120
Appendix F – Minutes of the Committee of the Whole for
 F.1 The Zero Per Cent Solution and
 F.2 To Defuse the Turnout Bomb, Cut the Red Wire 122
Appendix G – Minutes of the Committee of the Whole for F.5 Fan vs. Pro 124

2022 WSFS BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
CHICON 8, THE 80TH WORLD SCIENCE FICTION CONVENTION
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
SEPTEMBER 1-5, 2022

INTRODUCTION

The Business Meeting was held in the Crystal B Ballroom at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Chicago, Illinois. The Officers were:

Presiding Officer:	Jared Dashoff
Deputy Presiding Officer:	Jesi Lipp
Parliamentarian	Donald E. Eastlake III
Secretary:	Linda Deneroff
Timekeeper:	Todd Dashoff
Floor Manager	Martin Pyne
Videographer:	Lisa Hayes
Assistant Videographer	Kevin Standlee

The debates in the minutes are not to be considered word-for-word accurate, but every attempt has been made to represent the sense of the arguments. These minutes are complete and accurate to the best of the Secretary's knowledge, based on contemporaneous notes, verified against the video, and reviewed by the Presiding Officer.

**WORLD SCIENCE FICTION SOCIETY
BUSINESS MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 1-5, 2022**

The 2022 business meeting staff consisted of Jared Dashoff, Presiding Officer; Jesi Lipp, Deputy Presiding Officer; Linda Deneroff, Secretary; Todd Dashoff, Timekeeper; Martin Pyne, Floor Manager; Lisa Hayes, Videographer; and Kevin Standlee, Assistant Videographer.

The proceedings of these meetings were recorded per Standing Rule 1.6. The preliminary meeting was called to order on Friday at 10:03 a.m. and adjourned at 12:18 p.m.; the main meeting on Saturday convened at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 12:54 p.m., reconvened on Sunday at 10:03 a.m. and adjourned at 12:53 p.m., and lastly reconvened at 10:00 a.m. on Monday and adjourned *sine die* in memory of Roger Sims and Erle Korshak at 12:05 p.m.

CART services were sponsored by Google.

The Sunday and Monday sessions opened with the following acknowledgement:

The City of Chicago is located on land that is and has long been a center for Native peoples. The area is the traditional homelands of the Anishinaabe, or the Council of the Three Fires: the Ojibwe, Odawa, and Potawatomi Nations. Many other Nations consider this area their traditional homeland, including the Myaamia, Ho-Chunk, Menominee, Sac and Fox, Peoria, Kaskaskia, Wea, Kickapoo, and Mascouten. The City specifically acknowledges the contributions of Kitiyawa of the Potawatomi in fostering the community that has become Chicago. We acknowledge all Native peoples who came before us and who continue to contribute to our City. We are committed to promoting Native cultural heritage.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

A.1 Standing Committee of WSFS

A.1.1 Mark Protection Committee Report and Nominations

The members of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) for 2021-2022 were Judy Bemis (elected until 2023), Joni Dashoff (elected until 2023), Linda Deneroff (Secretary, elected until 2024), Cliff Dunn (appointed by DisCon III until 2023), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2024), Dave McCarty (elected until 2024), Ron Oakes (appointed by NASFiC 2020 until 2022), Chris Rose (appointed by Chicon 8 until 2024), Chen Shi (appointed by Chengdu 2023 until 2025), Daniel Spector (appointed by CoNZeland until 2022), Kevin Standlee (Vice Chair, elected until 2022), Jo Van Ekeren (Chair, elected

until 2022), Mike Willmoth (elected until 2023), and Ben Yalow (elected until 2022). Bruce Farr is a non-voting member appointed to the board of Worldcon Intellectual Property to meet a corporate requirement, and he is also the Treasurer. For the full MPC written report, please see [Appendix A](#), attached to these minutes.

Discussion: Friday: Kevin Standlee (he/him), vice chair of the MPC, gave the report. The MPC is the only permanent standing entity of WSFS. The MPC is also the board of directors of Worldcon Intellectual Property (“WIP”), the legal entity that owns WSFS service marks outside the U.S. The MPC, acting as an unincorporated association, owns the marks within the United States. There were no questions.

There wasn’t a lot new this year. The MPC has been doing its job and kept working on these things. There were no significant threats to our marks. The committee is starting to work on the prospects for registering Lodestar as a registered mark now that it has become a permanent award. He said if anyone had questions they should come to the next MPC meeting at 1 p.m. on Monday in the DuSable Room.

The next item was to open nominations for the MPC since the terms for Jo Van Ekerin, Kevin Standlee, and Ben Yalow had expired. Nicholas Whyte, Ron Oakes, Jo Van Ekerin, Kevin Standlee, and Ben Yalow were then nominated for three-year terms membership on the MPC. Jo Van Ekerin declined the nomination.

Saturday: The results of the election were announced by Andrew Adams as follows: Kevin Standlee, Ben Yalow and Nicholas Whyte were elected to the Mark Protection Committee. A motion was made without objection for the tellers to destroy the ballots, and they were instructed to do so. The full results are noted in [Appendix B](#).

A.2. Standing Committees of the Business Meeting

A.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The members of the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee (“NP&FSC”) for 2021-2022 were Don Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Lipp, Kevin Standlee, and Jo Van Ekerin. The authority of this committee stems from:

Standing Rule 7.7: Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee

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

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

The committee report to this Business Meeting was submitted late this year due to the fault of the committee Chair.

Actions: The committee did a review of the Constitution and Standing Rules and found a number of potential problems and possible improvements but decided to postpone proposing changes related to these until next year due to the press of business this year.

The possible ratification of the constitutional amendment adding the new section 5.1.6 (Deadline for Submission of New Business) has effects on the Standing Rules. This constitutional amendment moves the deadline from the Standing Rules to the Constitution. If this amendment is ratified, then, under Standing Rule 4.3, the Business Meeting Secretary should adjust cross references as shown below for Standing Rules 4.5 and 5.4; Standing Rules 2.1 and 4.4 should also be deleted if the amendment is ratified.

~~**Rule 2.1: Deadline for Submission of New Business.** The deadline for submission of non-privileged new business to the Business Meeting shall be thirty (30) days before the first Preliminary Meeting. Proposed agenda items may be withdrawn by the consent of all proposing members at any time up to two weeks before the published deadline for submitting new business. A list of such withdrawn business must be made available to the membership. 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.~~

~~**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 the deadline established for new business set in Rule 2.1.~~

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 deadline established in ~~Rule 2.1~~ [Section 5.1.6. \(Deadline for Submission of New Business\) of the WSFS Constitution](#) shall be made generally available to WSFS members (e.g. via publication on the host Worldcon's web site) by no later than seven (7) days after the deadline for new business set in ~~Rule 2.1~~ [Section 5.1.6. \(Deadline for Submission of New Business\) of the WSFS Constitution](#).

Rule 5.4: Amend; Ratification Amendments. Motions to amend a constitutional amendment awaiting ratification must be submitted in advance by the deadline in ~~Rule 2.1~~ [Section 5.1.6. \(Deadline for Submission of New Business\) of the WSFS Constitution](#). This rule can be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote.

Discussion: Friday: Donald E. Eastlake (he/him), the chair of the NP&FSC reported that while the committee did a review of the Constitution and the Standing Rules and came up with some ideas for potential improvements, they felt this year's agenda was already crowded and therefore deferred them for now. However, the committee noted that if certain amendments to the Constitution passed this year, then the Secretary would be required to update the Standing Rules and the Constitution. The committee therefore

documented that should Item E.2 (30 Days Hath New Business) be ratified, the deadlines for new business and things like would go from being that from a Standing Rule to a part of the Constitution, and that the Business Meeting Secretary could update both.

By executive privilege, the members of this committee were reappointed by the chair. Anyone wishing to join should contact Donald Eastlake.

A.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee ("WCRG") members for 2021-2022 were Mike Willmoth <mwillmoth@gmail.com> (Chair), Linda Deneroff <lindad@isomedia.com>; Cheryl Morgan <cheryl@cheryl-morgan.com>; and Kevin Standlee <kastandlee@gmail.com>. The WCRG Committee has been working on updating the individual files that make up the guide. As new versions (PDFs) are created they are sent to Kevin Standlee for archiving and to Cheryl Morgan for placement on wsfs.org. New topics will be added occasionally, such as Timeline, contributed by Bobbi Armbruster last year. The WCRG appears at <http://www.wsfs.org/committees/worldcon-runners-guide/>. The committee will accept suggested updates from fans around the world via email using guide@wsfs.org. It maintains .docx files as backups and for future updates.

Special thanks go to Linda Deneroff who continues to add content and to clean up the files before posting online. Thanks also go to Kevin Standlee for being willing to archive the guide and to Cheryl Morgan for maintaining the guide online.

The authority of this committee stems from:

Standing Rule 7.8: Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

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

The direct website is <http://www.wsfs.org/committees/worldcon-runners-guide/>.

Discussion: Friday: Mike Willmoth (no pronoun preference), the chair of the WCRG, said that the committee had again made incremental progress this year. He thanked Linda Deneroff for updating the content and fixing formatting issues. He also thanked Kevin Standlee for being the archive backup for the Word documents that are the source of the PDFs online, and Cheryl Morgan for maintaining the website where the guide is located. This weekend Mike also made some progress for a new page regarding the differences between North American and non-North American Worldcons and asked some past Worldcon chairs to submit content for the new page, which they've agreed to do.

By executive privilege, the members of this committee were reappointed by the presiding officer. Anyone wishing to join should contact Mike Willmoth.

A.3 Special Committees

A.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries Committee

Long List Committee report for 2021
December 2021 – August 2022

The Formalization of the Long List Committee (“FOLLE”) has continued to curate the Long List of Worldcons. The current membership of the Long List Committee is Mark Olson (chairman), Joe Siclari, Kent Bloom, Colin Harris, Kevin Standlee, Tim Illingworth and Ben Yalow.

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

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

Discussion: Friday: Kent Bloom, a member of the FOLLE committee said it continues to nitpick its way through minor issues, such as names of guests of honor, chairpersons and locations, and has added inconsequential footnotes. That list is published in, among other places, this year’s Souvenir Book. The FOLLE committee has added footnotes, especially regarding the things that have happened in the last two years that have confused a number of people about who was where, and when.

Mr. Bloom said the committee wishes to continue to do that and therefore asked that the business meeting recognize the continuing existence of the FOLLE committee. Without objection, the committee was continued as currently constituted.

A.3.2 Hugo Awards Study Committee

The Hugo Awards Study Committee (“HASC”) for 2019-2020 consisted of Cliff Dunn (Chair); Kate Secor (Co-Chair); Ira Alexandre, Alison Scott and Dave Hook (Subcommittee Chairs); Nana Amuah, Terri Ash, Michelle Cobb, John Coxon, Todd Dashoff, Lindadee, Vincent Docherty, Martin Easterbrook, Farah, Erica Frank, Kat Jones, Joshua Kronengold, Terry Neil, Lisa Padol, Martin Pyne, riverpa, Claire Rousseau, Alison Scott, Sparkle, Kári Tulinius, Jo Van, Nicholas Whyte, and Ben Yalow.

Their report is appended to this agenda as [Appendix C](#).

Discussion: Friday: Cliff Dunn (he/him) thanked everyone who worked on the committee this year. However, he noted that Item C.1 on the agenda was not within the remit of the committee, but it was individuals from the committee proposed it. They had

to bring some items forward that are not quite finished because they needed the business meeting feedback, and bringing motions forward at the motion is the only way to do that. Unfortunately, due to poor communications, it became a much bigger issue than expected.

Mr. Dunn added that the Discord has now been set up to send email digests to those persons who are not on Discord and who request it, and the committee is moving toward a clearer definition of its subcommittees and giving them more autonomy. The committee is also working on being more inclusive and more transparent. Ideally, anyone with an internet connection will be able to participate.

He noted that the committee was creating a clearer process issuing reports in the run up to Worldcon rather than releasing everything at the end. There would also be clearer definitions of subcommittee structure, with more autonomy. Those who are interested in a given item can work on that. In the process, they don't get overwhelmed with a sudden influx of outside interest in their item.

Mr. Dunn felt the committee had a clear purpose as noted by the number of items he expected the meeting to refer back to committee over the course of the business meeting. He used the proposal for a best audio book award that was suggested last year and possibly turning it into a best audio presentation award as an example of a proposal brought to the committee in good faith, still not being “ready for prime time,” working on it, and ultimately bringing something before the business meeting.

He noted that the business meeting is a less than ideal way to handle a number of things since only the people who attend can participate. However, the HASC is open to everyone with has an Internet connection can participate, either by email or by Discord. Mr. Dunn then asked the presiding officer to continue the committee for another year.

Nicholas Whyte (he/him) objected to continuing the committee as constituted, He felt a new approach was needed. He said that in its five-year existence, only two words had been changed, which added “or comic” to the Best Graphic Story category. He noted that Mr. Dunn had been very frank about the imperfections of the process. He also believed the committee needed to consult more widely with public stakeholders; they had the opportunity to do so and did not. Mr. Whyte also noted that one of the amendments was submitted to the business meeting without the consent of the committee members. He agreed with the majority of the committee members who voted against the committee continuing with the current leadership. Mr. Whyte said this was not an attack, just noting that a more inclusive approach was needed. In fact, he wasn't sure the committee needed to be continued at all. In past years, the business meeting would create specialized subcommittees to address particular and specific constitutional amendments and report back the following year, but now such a committee needs to be structured proactive and inclusively, involving stakeholders not in the room. He suggested building new structures and leaving the old ones behind.

The presiding officer noted that it is within the power of a committee to appoint its chair; it is also in order for the business meeting to direct a committee to change its chair by amending the resolution to reform the committee.

Andrew Adams moved to enter into a Committee of the Whole to further discuss this issue, and was seconded, but by a show of hands, the motion failed.

Perianne Lurie moved to reform the Hugo Awards Study Committee with the first order of business to be to elect a new chair, and was seconded. This would require a majority vote. Before discussion could commence, Kate Secor (she/her) made a motion to turn off the video recording to discuss the merits of the committee without it being captured for perpetuity on video. This would permit freer discussion and prevent embarrassment for people whose names might come up during that discussion.

Allen Tipper (they/them) disagreed. He felt that in the spirit of debate, the camera should remain on. In future people would be able to look over it and understand why the business meeting made the decisions that it did, and it may well be useful for future Worldcons.

Elsbeth Kovir (she/her) felt people's names should not be on line forever since we do not want to damage people's reputations if we can help it.

Olav Rockne (he/him) said he had done a lot of research on Section 3.12.2 of the WSFS Constitution for the committee this year, and he didn't want the cameras turned off because every bit of historical record we have for these decisions can be valuable in future debates. "We are already missing too many records," he noted; "most of the 1970s are a blank slate. I had to go back to those who actually remember it and try to ask them what do you remember from the business meeting in '75." He did not want to leave people with no record of why the decision to be made here was made and strongly opposed turning off the cameras.

The presiding officer also noted that the secretary would continue to take notes.

Terry Ash (she/her), another member on the HASC, said that the discussions at the end of its tenure turned nasty, and she did not want the current discussion to live on YouTube till the end of time. However, Ms. Lurie said there were a lot of virtual members accessing the business meeting who are not permitted to vote. Turning off the cameras would disenfranchise them even more.¹

A motion to turn cameras on or off required a majority vote, and by a show of hands, the motion was defeated.

Martin Pyne (he/him) opposed the amendment in its current form because it gave no direction to the committee as to what it should do. He felt it was the responsibility of the

¹ This meeting was not live-streamed.

business meeting to name a chairperson, which would give direction to committee leadership. Joshua Kronengold (he/him) asked who would be the interim chairperson of the committee if the motion passed, to which the presiding officer responded that he would choose the chairperson of the committee.

By a show of hands, the motion, to give specific instruction to elect a new chairperson of the committee as it is reformed or amended, failed.

By another show of hands, the motion to reform the committee failed, and the HASC was discharged. The business meeting thanked all the members of the Hugo Award Study Committee who have participated over the past five years.

A.3.3 Site Selection Study Committee

The chairperson of the Site Selection Study Committee was Jared Dashoff, who announced that there was no report and the committee was discharged.

B. FINANCIAL REPORTS

B.1 LoneStarCon 3 (San Antonio)

Remaining Funds
November 15, 2021 – July 31, 2022



Date	Description	Amount	Total
11/15/2021	2021 Balance		\$43,039.20
12/02/2021	DisCon III Grant - Capitalize! Fund (\$1,000), General Fund (\$2,000)	\$3,000.00	\$40,039.20
04/11/2022	SF3 - Wiscon Guests Grant	\$2,000.00	\$38,039.20
11/15/2021	Outstanding balance		\$38,039.20

Prepared by: Bill Parker

Convention: LoneStarCon 3

Parent Organization: Alamo Literary Art Maintenance Organization

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

Address: P.O. Box 27277, Austin, TX 78755-2277

Contact Email: president@alamo-sf.org

Website: <http://alamo-sf.org>

Officers:

President: Scott Zrubek: president@alamo-sf.org

Vice President: Randall Shepherd: vicepresident@alamo-sf.org

Secretary: Jonathan Guthrie: org_secretary@alamo-sf.org

Treasurer: Bill Parker: treasurer2016@alamo-sf.org

Communications: Kurt Baty: communications@alamo-sf.org

IT: Steve Staton: it@alamo-sf.org

Webmaster: Bill Parker & Clif Davis: webmaster@alamo-sf.org

B.2 Sasquan (Spokane)



Sasquan Financial Report as of August 1, 2022

Date	Description	Amount	Total
6/24/2020	2020 Balance		\$29,585.96
11/14/2021	Remaining Balance		\$29,585.96

Sasquan wound down as an organization and disbursed its remaining funds to the parent organization, SWOC (a 501(c)(3) organization incorporated in the State of Washington), where these funds are being kept separate from SWOC's operating budget.

In September 2017, the SWOC board voted to create the Bobbie DuFault Memorial Scholarship Fund, which will be financed using these remaining surplus funds. This fund will be used to grant scholarships to fans who want to attend SMOFcon and other con-running conventions.

The criteria for requesting a scholarship to a specific convention are: (1) never having attended that specific convention before; (2) having served on a convention in a staff position; (3) not being able to attend without the granting of a scholarship; and (4) sending a letter requesting a scholarship to the SWOC Board of Directors. These scholarships will be given out only one time to each person.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent cancellation of the 2022 ConComCon, no scholarships were awarded this past period. We are hoping to award scholarships to qualified candidates as COVID-19 restrictions lessen in 2022.

Prepared by: Richard O'Shea, aricosh@earthlink.net
New Inquiries should go to the new SWOC Treasurer, Richard O'Shea.

Convention: Sasquan
Parent Organization: Seattle Westercon Organizing Committee ("SWOC")
Current Tax Status: a 501(c)(3) Organization
Address: SWOC; P.O. Box 88154; Seattle, WA 98138
Website: <http://www.swoc.org>

Officers:
President: Jerry Geiseke
Vice President: Angela Jones
Treasurer: Richard O'Shea
Marah Searle-Kovacevic, Pat Porter, Sally Woehrle, James Stringer – Members-at-large

Discussion: Saturday: Linda Deneroff (she/her) made a motion to censure Sasquan for failing to fulfill its duties to fandom over the past four years. She noted their financial reports been identical since 2019, if not 2018, and they've made no significant financial contributions to fandom. Sasquan says will give \$500 scholarships to SMOFCon or ConComCon² to those who apply. However, they have never listed any requirements or explanation of how to even apply for a scholarship, nor do they publicize the scholarship. Therefore she believed Sasquan should be censured for failing to contribute to greater fandom. The motion was seconded.

Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Mike Willmoth (no preference), one of the three vice chairs of Sasquan, noted that immediately after that convention, Sasquan made large donations to various groups, such as Westercon 70 in Phoenix, the International Costumers Guild and ASFA, but he had no knowledge of recent expenditures. He said that to censure Sasquan when they had made all these donations was a shot in the foot. He added that he would follow up with the chair of Sasquan regarding future donations.

Kent Bloom (he/him) noted that the Worldcon Heritage Organization, which he represents, received a large donation after Sasquan. He felt that ennui had taken over and that Sasquan needed a kick in the “you-know-what”, not a censure.

Ben Yalow (he/him) felt it was an extreme measure to censure Sasquan. He felt they had complied with the Constitution.

By a show of hands, the motion to censure Sasquan failed.

² ConComCom, usually also referred to as C-Cubed, is a local smofcon-like convention in the Northwest.

B.3 MidAmeriCon II (Kansas City)



MidAmeriCon II Financial Statement July 15, 2021-July 15, 2022

This report was submitted after the business meeting concluded.

Balance forward 7/15/2021			\$36,477.78
INCOME	AMOUNT	TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL
Total Income			\$00.00
EXPENDITURES	AMOUNT	TOTAL	GRAND TOTAL
Internal Hosting		(\$190.97)	
<i>Pair Networks</i>	(\$71.44)		
<i>Hosway</i>	(119.53)		
Storage Locket Fees		(\$2,136.00)	
<i>Reimbursement for 2 years</i>	(\$2,136.00)		
Total Expenses			(\$2,326.97)
Remaining Balance			\$34,150.81

Prepared by: Ruth Lichtwardt, Convention Chair & MASFFC Treasurer

Convention: MidAmeriCon II

Parent Organization: MidAmerican Science Fiction and Fantasy Conventions, Inc. (MASFFC)

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

Contact Email: rlichtwardt@icloud.com

Address: PO Box 414175, Kansas City, MO, 64141

Convention Website: <https://www.midamericon2.org>

Officers and Members:

President & Chairman of the Board: Margene S. Bahm – arya.stark4@gmail.com

Vice President: James J. Murray – james.murray013@gmail.com

Treasurer: Ruth Lichtwardt – rlichtwardt@icloud.com

Secretary: Carol Doms – carol.doms@gmail.com

Board Members:

Paula Helm Murray – kaylisdragon2@gmail.com

Jeff Orth – jeff.orth@gmail.com

John J. Platt IV – jplattiv@gmail.com

Earline Beebe – earlinemabeebe@sbcglobal.net

B.4 Worldcon 75 (Helsinki, Finland)




WORLDCON 75

Financial Statement as of August 1, 2022

ITEM	AMOUNT	TOTAL
Balance on June 30, 2020		11,764.62 €
INCOME		0.00 €
EXPENSES		
Bookkeeping System	59.52 €	
Web Hosting	300.87 €	
<i>Bank Fees</i>	353.06 €	
<i>Storage</i>	129.96 €	
<i>Support for Finncon 2022</i>	5,000.00 €	
<i>Carry-over to Archipelacon 2</i>	5,921.21 €	
Total Expenses		11,764.62 €
Final Balance		0.00 €

This is the final report transferring all the remaining funds and financial responsibilities (at this point web and bank fees) to Maa ja Il mary. The remaining funds will be used for Archipelacon 2.

B.5 Worldcon 76 (San Jose)



**Financial Report
Worldcon 76
for the period of August 20, 2016 to June 30, 2022
(Life of the Convention)**

INCOME	US Dollars
Attending Memberships	\$ 958,071.92
Supporting memberships	127,100.00
Dealers	95,480.00
Creator's Alley	2,057.35
Art Show Net Sales	22,456.72
Hotel Rebates	82,110.00
Mobies	10,897.50
Garage Sale	1,325.47
Sales to Members	5,197.08
Advertising	21,684.92
Donations	18,852.72
TAFF/DUFF donations	1,901.50
Alzheimer's Association	13,232.97
Sponsorships	48,150.00
PAF	74,906.20
MexicanX Donations	22,204.19
LGBTQ Donations	6,563.00
Tours	6,165.50
Credit Card rewards to cash	1,550.00
Extra Hugo Trophies Purchased	1,575.00
Interest	<u>1,160.01</u>
GROSS PROFIT	\$1,522,642.05

EXPENSE	
Tech	\$ 195,538.83
Exhibits	24,180.72
Member Services	97,392.98
Events	9,601.80
Chair's Office	209,302.71
Promotions & Publicity	28,835.58
Facilities	572,971.97
Operations	15,446.81
WSFS	24,412.55

EXPENSE	
Hospitality	44,337.80
Programming	14,663.96
Publications	69,018.52
Finance	164,504.78
CONVENTION EXPENSES	\$1,470,209.01
NET INCOME	\$ 52,433.04
ASSETS	
Current Assets	
Checking/Savings	82,827.67
Total Current Assets	82,827.67
Other Assets	2,004.69
TOTAL ASSETS	\$ 84,832.36
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Liabilities	\$ 67,329.25
Equity	17,503.11
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	\$ 84,832.36

Membership Count:

All Attending 6,091
Supporting 1,810
Total Memberships 7,901

Prepared by: Cindy Scott cindyscott@worldcon76.org

Convention: Worldcon 76

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

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

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

Contact Email: <info@worldcon76.org>

Convention Website: www.worldcon76.org

Officers and Members:

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

Notes: Chair's Office expenses increased due to legal fees.
Member Services expense increased for storage costs.
WSFS expense decreased as 2 Hugo Rockets were used from surplus.
Publications expense increased as we incurred more domain hosting fees.
Finance expenses increased as we made a donation to Chicon 8.

B.6 Dublin 2019: An Irish Worldcon (Dublin, Ireland)



Financial Statement as of June 30, 2022

Chair's Introduction

Dublin 2019, in its privileged position, has worked hard to support fans, fan development, organizations and events as the impact of COVID-19 has continued, unpredictable but tangibly affecting fan activities.

It has been a grave year when two countries have gone to war in Europe. Unconscionable that in 2019 Russian and Ukrainian fans laughed and smiled at Dublin 2019 in concert and now their countries are at war. Ukraine has been invaded, with destruction unimaginable, but fighting. Our friends in one country are in fear of missiles, our friends in the other are looking over their shoulder in fear of their dictator leader. Dublin 2019 reached out.

We note the success, temerity and positiveness of fans overcoming all the challenges, congratulate them and are grateful to help where we can. We know our energy and funds have been welcomed but it's about supporting the community.

While the Dublin 2019 team have continued to work to finish off our own matters, we still have some bills to reconcile, tax affairs to resolve and are chasing still unresolved matters (that can go on my gravestone, I expect). The pandemic has impacted everything a bit.

We were very pleased to be able to get our Hugo Videos online!

A massive amount of work and effort went into that and I'm grateful to the tech team for their time. There were technical costs to that, which we were happy with. The current climate, as you'll appreciate, delayed it more than any of us would like, but we are all so pleased we got that task completed. (Thanks Tech Team!)

We continue to support activities where needed. Two events approached us in crisis mode, and we immediately helped, to ensure their success and occurrence. There are dastardly unexpected and unfair outcomes from the pandemic that even tight fiscal responsibility cannot evade. We listened, we engaged, we helped.

Dublin 2019 needs to responsibly support fannish activities where it can, during this time, and we have repeatedly reached out to do so. We have been in a unique time and

unexpected position where we can dynamically help fan organisations facing unexpected challenges.

We have passed along funds to Chicon 8, working in a clever way to maximise that.

We have supported Octocon, the National Irish SF Convention as it prepares to go to its new venue in Dublin Croke Park.

We have also supported Capricon, Enniskillen Comic Festival, Dublin Comic Arts Festival and Irish Artists, SF Outreach, Corflu Craic, The Alamo Fan Fund, a legacy writing project in Glasgow, Ukrainian Fans. Our plans continue immediately toward the next financial period, supporting an African Writer travel project and the Irish Gaming Association in July of this year.

We successfully offered direct development opportunities through fan scholarships to support attendance at a rare European Smofcon which saw over 100 fans participate and 18 fans receive support. This helped change the demographic of Smofcon and saw a vibrant, youthful and exciting event take place. (With no Covid cases). We have supported fans getting to Chicon 8 who will be developing themselves for future roles.

During this time on a number of occasions we have also offered financial support where it might have been required but was turned down. One such example, we offered support to Conversation, the 2023 Eastercon which, while welcomed, wasn't required. We also checked on the 2023 Eastercon losing bid where, likewise, assistance was not required.

We are also co-operating with both Eastercon 2023 Conversation and Eastercon 2024 Levitation if funds are required and have provided funds to assist with accessibility costs to Levitation.

We have provided funding for African writers to attend international SFF conventions so that they can participate in the programme more fully. Virtual solutions do not always work well in African countries.

The ongoing work has been noted and we have been entrusted with surplus funds from another convention to distribute, which we will do.

We continue to minimise non-committed spending for eventualities while reducing our funds and meeting commitments and supporting fans who need fellow fan support.

James Bacon

Chair Dublin 2019 An Irish Worldcon

Income	EUR
Income to 30 June 2021	€ 1,183,172.83
Income from 1 July 2021 to 30 June 2022	0
TOTAL INCOME	€ 1,183,172.83

Expenditure	
Expenditure to 30 June 2021	€ 1,123,290.59)

Expenditure	
Finance	710.21
Logistics & Tech	2,564.56
Promotions	6,593.59
2022 grants and community development	13,408.86
Passalong - Chicon 8 (11,300 USD)	11,060.67
Scholarships to SMOFcon Europe (2021)	5,000.00
Expenditure to 30 June 2022	1,163,884.48
2022 Net (Income - Expenditure)	19,288.35

Notes

All figures are in EUR

EUR is Dublin 2019 Base currency

VAT must be charged on memberships at 23%

Membership Count (as of 19 August 2019):

Attending Members	6,525
Total Members	8,430

Prepared by: John JC Clarke

Convention: Dublin 2019, An Irish Worldcon

Parent Organization: DUBLIN WORLDCON CONVENTION ORGANISING COMPANY
(Trading as "Dublin 2019")

Current Tax Status: Standard tax liability (There is no applicable non profit status in Ireland)

Address: Whitethorn, Leopardstown Road, Sandyford, Dublin 18 D18 W2W2, Ireland

Contact Email: info@dublin2019.com

Convention Website: <https://dublin2019.com/>

Officers and Members: James Bacon (Director), Brian Nisbet (Director & Secretary) & John Clarke (Director)

B.7 CoNZealand (Wellington, New Zealand)



Financial Statement as of June 30, 2022

Prior Period Status		NZ\$
Income		\$1,100,253.67
Expenses		\$524,254.37
Prior Net Balance		\$575,999.30

Current Period		
Executive Division	Donations	\$787.10
Publications Division,	Advertising Income, Souvenir Book	\$814.26
Finance Division	Foreign Exchange Differences	\$2,850.96
Total Income		\$4,452.32

Expenditures		
Executive Division,	2021 WorldCon Thank You Party, Misc	\$3,300.00
Executive Division,	Donation: Capricon	\$22,786.69
Executive Division	Passalong to Chicon 8	\$74,000.00
Executive Division	Donation: Chicon 8	\$35,179.72
Executive Division	Staff Travel	\$24,940.93
Executive Division	Donation: SFFANZ	\$4,000.00
Finance Division	Depreciation, Office Equipment	\$84.96
Finance Division	Office Expenses/PO Box rental/Postage	\$94.65
Finance Division	Other Bank fees	\$87.40
IT Division,	Software Subscription	\$372.00
IT Division	Domain Names/Web Hosting	\$1,281.24
Publications Division	Souvenir Book – Mailing	\$2,476.47
WSFS Division	Dues & Fees, Mark Protection	\$2,930.83
Total Expenditure		\$171,534.89

Current Period Summary		
Income		\$4,452.32
Expenses		\$171,534.89
Current Period Balance		-\$167,082.57


Full Summary		
Income		\$1,104,705.99
Expenses		\$695,789.26
Current Net Balance		\$408,916.73

Notes

All values in NZ\$.

Prepared by: Andrew A. Adams (CoNZealand Financial DH)
Convention: CoNZealand
Parent Organization: Science Fiction & Fantasy Conventions of New Zealand Incorporated
aka SFFCoNZ
Current Tax Status: New Zealand Charity, No. CC56587
Address: 26 Halifax Street
Kingston
Wellington 6021
New Zealand
SFFCoNZ Email: lynelle.howell@gmail.com
Officers: Daniel Spector President
Harry Hamilton Musgrave Treasurer
Lynelle Howell Secretary
Andrew Alexander Adams Director
Raewyn Olena Niven Director
Anton Reinauer Director

B.8 DisCon III (Washington, DC)



Financial Statement as of 14 November 2021

Income	
Memberships	\$779,605.27
Escrow from bid	\$25,440.00
Worldcon 76 Pass along Funds	\$10,000.00
Dublin 2019 Pass along Funds	\$10,000.00
CoNZealand Pass along Funds	\$60,000.00
Donations	\$74,806.04
Art Show and Dealer Fees	36,300.00
Art Show Sales	\$33,046.92
Advertisements	\$7,690.00
Merchandise Sales	\$12,108.30
Reimbursable Expenses	\$20,636.54
Site Selection Payments	\$187,800.00
Total	\$1,257,433.07

Expenses	
Chair's Division	\$155,345.23
Pass Along	\$40,000.00
Art Sales Reimbursements	\$30,773.34
Site Selection Transaction Fees	\$7,546.50
Publications	\$68,617.01
Facilities	\$82,275.91
Tech	\$192,479.47
Events	\$47,574.57
Exhibits	\$5,107.63
Member Services	\$125,398.75
Outreach	\$30,735.53
Programming	\$3,468.93

Expenses	
Operations	\$29,196.34
WSFS	\$26,461.75
Total	\$844,980.96

Current balance	\$412,452.11
Site Selection Fees Held in Escrow	\$180,303.50
Net Balance	\$232,148.61

Prepared by: Samuel M. Scheiner (DisCon III CFO; sscheiner@discon3.org)
Approved by: Mary Robinette Kowal, Chair
Convention: DisCon III
Contact Email: chairs@discon3.org
Convention Website: www.discon3.org

Parent Organization: Baltimore-Washington Area Worldcon Association
Current Tax Status: 501(c)(3) organization; incorporated in Maryland, USA
Address: P.O. Box 314, Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Officers: **President:** Michael Nelson
Executive Vice President: Judith Kindell
Vice President: John Sapienza
Treasurer: Robert MacIntosh
Corresponding Secretary: Ann Marie Rudolph
Recording Secretary: Jean Marie Ward

Discussion: Saturday: Martin Pyne (he/him) raised a question whether the transfer of pass-along funds from DisCon III to Chengdu had been completed. John Pomeranz (he/him), the legal advisor to DisCon III said that they are holding onto the funds for Chengdu because it is difficult to transfer funds between the U.S. and China. DisCon III is holding onto the funds in trust for Chengdu, and expects to transfer the funds to an appropriate entity very soon.

Ben Yalow(he/him), the co-chair of Chengdu, thanked DisCon’s parent corporation and noted that because of the complexities of transferring funds to China, Chengdu is currently establishing a new U.S. 501(c)(3) corporation that will eventually collect the money from DisCon III as well as other funds. Mr. Yalow also announced that they had just received the new Articles of Incorporation, and the corporation will be located in Wyoming.

Mr. Pomeranz added that the paper documentation following the site selection vote had been transferred to Chengdu shortly after the completion of the election at DisCon III.

Cliff Dunn (he/him) asked when memberships will open for people who did participate in the site selection vote. Mr. Yalow responded that until the credit card paperwork is completed, Chengdu cannot take new memberships.

B.9 Chicon 8 (Chicago, Illinois)



Financial Report Worldcon 80 – Chicago July 29, 2020–July 31, 2022

INCOME	U.S. Dollars
4000.00 Membership Revenue	
4001.00 Pre-Vote Memberships	
4001.01 Chicago in 2022 before 2020	15,345.00
4001.02 Chicago in 2022 - 2020 income	6,119.16
4001.03 Voting Fees (from CoNZealand)	31,750.00
Total 4001.00 Pre-Vote Memberships	53,214.16
4010.00 Basic Memberships	
4010.01 Supporting	72,583.00
4010.02 Adult Attending	392,839.38
4010.03 YA (18-24)	7,405.00
4010.04 Teen (14-17)	2,690.00
4010.05 Child (10-13)	1,450.00
4010.10 First Worldcon	109,099.53
4010.11 Virtual	15,670.00
Total 4010.00 Basic Memberships	601,256.91
Total 4000.00 Membership Revenue	654,471.07
4050.00 Member Services Revenue	
4052.00 Sales to Members	
4052.01 In-Person Sales	1,010.00
Total 4052.00 Sales to Members	1,010.00
Total 4050.00 Member Services Revenue	1,010.00
4200.00 Exhibits Revenue	
4201.00 Dealers Room Revenue	
4201.01 Dealers Deposit	1,000.00
4201.02 Dealers Room - Tables	16,784.56
4201.03 Dealers Room - Booths	4,186.92
4201.04 Dealers Room - Power	1,742.14
Total 4201.00 Dealers Room Revenue	23,713.62
4202.00 Art Show Revenue	
4202.01 Art Show - Panel & Table	4,807.06
4202.02 Art Show - Print Shop	273.83
4202.03 Art Show - Mail In Fees	407.10

INCOME	U.S. Dollars
Total 4202.00 Art Show Revenue	5,487.99
Total 4200.00 Exhibits Revenue	29,201.61
4350.00 Publications Revenue	
4351.00 Souvenir Book	
4351.01 Souvenir Book Pro Ads	5,000.00
4351.02 Souvenir Book Semi-Pro Ads	1,800.00
4351.03 Souvenir Book Fan Ads	3,350.31
Total 4351.00 Souvenir Book	10,150.31
Total 4350.00 Publications Revenue	10,150.31
4800.00 Chair & Finance Revenue	
4801.00 Interest Income	
4801.01 Savings Interest	41.28
Total 4801.00 Interest Income	41.28
4802.00 Pass-Alongs	
4802.01 Pass-Along 2019 (Dublin)	11,300.00
4802.02 Pass-Along 2020 (CoNZealand)	76,000.00
4802.03 Pass-Along 2021 (DisCon III)	20,000.00
4802.04 Pass-Along 2023 Chengdu Waiver	10,000.00
4802.05 Pass-Along 2020 (DisCon III-CoNZealand)	15,000.00
Total 4802.00 Pass-Alongs	132,300.00
4804.00 Grants	
4804.01 Chicon 7	5,000.00
4804.02 Worldcon 76 San Jose	5,000.00
Total 4804.00 Grants	10,000.00
4805.00 Sponsorships	
4805.01 Google	50,000.00
Total 4805.00 Sponsorships	50,000.00
4806.00 Chicago Worldcon Community Fund	16,757.84
Total 4800.00 Chair & Finance Revenue	209,099.12
TOTAL INCOME	903,932.11

EXPENSES	
5100.00 Chair	
5102.00 Corporate Expenses	
5102.01 Incorporation & Fees	226.68
Total 5102.00 Corporate Expenses	226.68
5103.00 Chair's Fund	185.41
5105.00 Hugo Nominee Gifts (DisCon III)	969.91
5107.00 CWC Fund Payouts	4,996.00
Total 5100.00 Chair	6,378.00
5120.00 Artistic Direction	
5120.01 Signage	122.23
Total 5120.00 Artistic Direction	122.23
5150.00 Diversity & Inclusion	
5151.01 Diversity Training – DH	4,000.00
5151.02 Bystander Intervention Training – All Staff	4,245.75
Total 5150.00 Diversity & Inclusion	8,245.75
5190.00 Finance	
5191.00 Comptroller/Budget	
5191.01 Financial Software – QuickBooks	305.20
Total 5191.00 Comptroller / Budget	305.20
5192.00 Licensing	
5192.01 ASCAP	838.00

EXPENSES	
5192.02 BMI	175.00
Total 5192.00 Licensing	1,013.00
5193.00 Insurance	
5193.01 Liability - D&O	1,396.00
Total 5193.00 Insurance	1,396.00
5194.00 Treasury Expenses	
5194.01 Stripe Transaction Fees	20,244.55
5194.02 Conversion to USD	1,452.73
5194.03 PayPal Fees for Reimbursements	511.71
5194.04 SQUARE Transaction Fees	15.90
5194.09 Bank Fees	-18.80
5194.10 Bank Check Printing	39.00
Total 5194.00 Treasury Expenses	22,245.09
5195.00 At Con Treasury Expenses	
5195.01 Registers	52.92
Total 5195.00 At Con Treasury Expenses	52.92
Total 5190.00 Finance	
5200.00 Facilities	
5400.00 Virtual Program Tech	
5401.00 Airmeet Software	6,000.00
Total 5400.00 Virtual Program Tech	6,000.00
5600.00 Facilities All Other	
5603.00 Exhibit Hall Expenses	
5603.01 Exhibit Hall Rentals	20,000.00
Total 5603.00 Exhibit Hall Expenses	20,000.00
Total 5600.00 Facilities All Other	20,000.00
Total 5200.00 Facilities	26,000.00
6000.00 Staff Services	
6002.00 Meeting Planning	11,569.98
6006.00 Con Office	
6006.01 Supplies	61.65
Total 6006.00 Con Office	61.65
6007.00 Logistics (includes MIMO)	
6007.02 Storage Rental	229.09
Total 6007.00 Logistics (includes MIMO)	229.09
6008.00 Postage	506.34
6009.00 PO Box	700.00
6100.00 IT Support Expenses	
6101.00 Website	601.76
6103.00 IT Infrastructure Expenses	
6103.02 Amazon Web Services	2,264.46
Total 6103.00 IT Infrastructure Expenses	2,264.46
6104.00 Precon Software	
6104.02 Zoom	330.30
6104.03 Email Management	1,203.19
6104.04 Wellington Reg System	25.95
6104.05 Planorama Program System	240.00
Total 6104.00 Precon Software	1,799.44
6110.00 IT Purchase and Lease	
6111.00 Laptops & Tablets	349.00
Total 6110.00 IT Purchase and Lease	349.00
Total 6100.00 IT Support Expenses	5,014.66
Total 6000.00 Staff Services	18,081.72

EXPENSES		
6200.00 Member Services		
6201.00 Registration		
6201.01 Sticky Labels/Tape		919.10
6201.06 Registration Tablets		461.68
Total 6201.00 Registration		1,380.78
6205.00 Child Play Areas		168.84
6211.00 Sales to Members		7,344.63
Total 6200.00 Member Services		8,894.25
6300.00 Promotions/Marketing		
6302.00 Advertising (outbound)		1,152.10
6304.00 Convention & Open Events		1,857.08
6307.00 Promo Materials and Mailing		89.51
6308.00 Flyers		306.75
Total 6300.00 Promotions/Marketing		
6500.00 WSFS		
6501.00 Hugo Awards		
6501.01 Rocket		5,479.68
6501.03 Base		5,000.00
Total 6501.00 Hugo Awards		10,479.68
6502.00 Other Awards		
6502.03 Lodestar Award		134.30
Total 6502.00 Other Awards		134.30
6504.00 Site Selection		
6504.03 Electronic Site Selection		897.00
Total 6504.00 Site Selection		897.00
Total 6500.00 WSFS		11,510.98
6600.00 Exhibits		
6607.00 Fanzine Lounge		126.06
Total 6600.00 Exhibits		126.06
6700.00 Program		
6702.00 Planorama		271.86
Total 6700.00 Program		271.86
6900.00 Hospitality		
6906.00 Hugo Losers Party DisCon III		4,185.94
Total 6900.00 Hospitality		4,185.94
TOTAL EXPENSES		112,234.44
NET INCOME		791,697.67

Bank Balances as of July 31, 2022

PNC Bank Main Fund	\$252,715.31
PNC Bank Money Market	\$522,861.28
PNC Bank CW Fund	\$8,815.84
Petty Cash	\$414.79
Undeposited Credit Transactions	\$6,890.45
Total Assets	\$791,697.67

Membership Count as of July 31, 2022

Membership	Count
Adult Attending	2,251

First Worldcon Attending	875
Young Adult (18-24) Attending	81
Teen (14-17) Attending	41
Child (10-13) Attending	30
Kid-in-Tow Attending	30
Total Attending	3,308
Virtual	245
Supporting	1,491
Grand Total	5,044

Prepared by: Alexia Hebel, Finance Division Head

Approved by: Dave McCarty, President

Convention: Chicon 8

Business Entity: Chicago in 2022 Worldcon

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

Address: 2020 N. California, Suite 299, Chicago, IL 60647, USA

Contact email: Treasurer@chicon.org

Convention Website: www.chicon.org

Officers and Members:

President: Dave McCarty

Secretary: Sandra Levy

Treasurer: Shirley McKinzey

Members:

Helen Montgomery

Leane Verhulst

Jason Spitzer

Gary Agin

Siobhan Murphy

B.10 Chengdu Worldcon (Chengdu, China)



Financial Report
Chengdu Worldcon 2023
20 Mar 2022 - 2 Aug 2022

Income	Category	Item	Amount (CNY)
	Pre-Memberships Sales	In-Person Admission-Students	131600
		In-Person Admission-First Worldcon	206080
		In-Person Admission-Non-First Worldcon	1290
		Total Income	338970

Expenses	Corporate Expenses	E-mail System	500
	Promotion in Chicon	Giveaways	59150
		Total Expenses	59650
		Net Income	279320

Membership Count

Type	Count
In-Person Admission-Students	658
In-Person Admission-First Worldcon	644
In-Person Admission-Non-First Worldcon	3
Advance Supporting Membership in DisCon	TBC
Grand Total	1305

NOTES:

1. Chengdu Worldcon 2023 is in the process of setting up a U.S. non-profit corporation to receive funds from non-Chinese sources, and we expect this to take place shortly. These include the voting fees from DisCon III, and pass-along funds from DisCon III and CoNZealand, which are still being held for us by their originating corporations.
2. Until the voting fees are transferred, we are not showing those memberships in the totals. However, everyone who purchased an advance supporting membership in Chengdu (voting token at DisCon III), or who voted at DisCon III, is already a full attending member, with all WSFS rights of Chengdu Worldcon 2023.
3. For the domestic membership counts, we have pre-sold in China but will not collect the money until our website is officially launched and the purchase channel gets ready to receive the money.
4. Chengdu Worldcon 2023 has also directed that both DisCon III and CoNZealand have waived 75% of their pass-along funds destined for Chengdu and sent them instead to Chicon 8. The remainder will be transferred to the U.S. non-profit once it is set up.

Prepared by: Joe Yao, Treasurer of Chengdu Worldcon

Approved by: Ben Yalow, Co-Chair of Chengdu Worldcon

Convention: Chengdu Worldcon 2023

Business Entity: Chengdu Science Fiction Society

Address: Room 1402, #159 Second Hongxing Road, Jinjiang District, Chengdu, PRC

Email: chengduworldcon2023@gmail.com

Website: www.chengduworldcon.com

Officers and Members:

Honorary Chair: Cixin Liu

Chair: Haijun Yao

Vice-Chair: Xiaolan Liang, Feng Yang, Zhenyu Jiang, Hongwei He

General Secretary: Shi Chen

Vice-General Secretary: Tina Wang, Yuxi Tan, Xue Yao, Yue Sun, Yao Chen, Yunning Xie, Wei Li

C. STANDING RULE CHANGES

C.1 Short Title: Making Business Meeting Feedback Possible

Moved, to amend the Standing Rules by [adding](#) text as follows:

Rule 2.5: Business Not for Final Passage. A Committee established by the Business Meeting may present business items for debate but with the express intent that the results of that debate shall be referred back to them. These shall be listed under New Business and treated as other main motions, but the result of the debate may be Referred to Committee.

Proposed by: Cliff Dunn, David Hook and Joshua Kronengold

Commentary: Roberts Rules generally presumes that a business item (other than a report) will be put to a vote for adoption at the meeting at which it is debated. Processes that would not result in this are often disbarred (i.e., technically a straw poll must take place under a suspension of the rules).

While this is often a safe presumption, it fails to consider a potentially iterative process where either (1) a request for further formal input, akin to a "Green Paper" in British terms, should be moved and debated but might not be quite in final form, or (2) a committee feels it necessary to solicit specific input to a proposal from the Business Meeting but is not prepared to recommend final adoption.

This amendment to the Standing Rules will expressly provide a formal process through which committees may present business for review without the intent of immediate adoption. It removes the need for using kludges, such as introducing business items with the expectation that they will be referred back to committee (and then hoping that they are not "accidentally" adopted) or attempting to execute a Committee of the Whole for a discussion without an underlying business item. The amendment envisions that only WSFS-authorized committees will use this process, so as to prevent potentially dilatory abuse, and someone seeking to "kick an idea around" on their own would still require a suspension of the rules).

In the event that the reporting committee is not continued, this would implicitly require the creation of a new committee. This is a feature, not a bug; it would prevent progress on such an item from being accidentally "lost" due to an administrative or procedural "slip" by the Business Meeting. However, the Business Meeting could still opt to simply "discard" the report (something which would be an affirmative action rather than something arising from a lack of action.)

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at time of 10 minutes.

Saturday: Cliff Dunn (he/him) noted that sometimes a committee needs feedback from the business meeting to determine where to go. Currently the only way to get such feedback is to bring a motion to the floor for a vote, even if the motion isn't ready for prime time. This motion would permit committees – just committees, not random members hoping to get feedback – to go to business meeting and ask for feedback. He felt the fundamental function is important to the process of amending the Constitution and asked the body to adopt the motion. The business meeting has taken to referring almost all constitutional amendments, at least regarding the Hugo categories to Hugo Award Study Committee, not to mention the Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee where items were bounced back to them twice due to issues the business meeting thought needed clarity.

Carl Fink (he/him) suggested that the word “only” be added between “debate may” and “be referred to committee” since, as originally written the standing rule would allow the business meeting to pass or reject the matter raised for debate, which Mr. Dunn said was not the intent.

Mr. Dunn accepted the revision, and if passed, the resolution would then read:

Rule 2.5: Business Not for Final Passage. A Committee established by the Business Meeting may present business items for debate but with the express intent that the results of that debate shall be referred back to them. These shall be listed under New Business and treated as other main motions, but the result of the debate may only be Referred to Committee.

Ben Yalow (he/him) spoke against the resolution by noting that if there were no committee, such a motion would go into “never-never land.”

Kate Secor (she/her) noted that an item need not be referred back to its original committee, and she felt it was important to bring things up sometimes without having to vote on them or make changes.

Jon Lennox (he/him) said the revised resolution would preclude saying “go away entirely,” which he felt should be an option.

By serpentine vote, the motion to amend the standing rule as noted above was 38 in favor and 52 opposed, and the amendment to the proposed standing rule was not adopted.

The question was called on the original amendment, which failed by a show of hands and debate then continued.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) felt it was important to bring things to the floor to have substantial debate on them without voting on something that might have substantial errors and need more work. He said the business meeting needs a way to discuss things without having to call for a vote.

Don Eastlake (he/him) spoke against the standing rule proposal because a committee can already bring a motion to the floor to discuss an issue, and he thought perhaps the makers of the standing rule were unaware of that. He believed the right thing to do would be for this rule to be reformulated to tell committees they can do this. Therefore he moved to refer this motion to the NP&FSC, which was seconded.

No one wished to speak on this new motion, and by a show of hands, the standing rule proposal was referred to the NP&FSC.

C.2 Short Title: If You Don't Have To Print, Neither Do We

Moved, to amend the Standing Rules by [adding](#) text as follows:

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

[In the event that the Worldcon Committee ~~shall~~ does not provide printed copies of business to attendees of the Business Meeting, the requirement in this rule shall be waived and the Worldcon Committee shall be required to promptly provide an electronic copy of any such submitted business to attendees ~~promptly upon its provision to the Worldcon Committee~~. In such an event, the Worldcon Committee shall also be responsible for providing ready access to the agenda to members attending the Business Meeting while at the meeting without an additional cost being imposed upon the attendees.](#)

Proposed by: Cliff Dunn and Kate Secor

Commentary: It is foreseeable in the not-too-distant future that a Worldcon Business Meeting might opt to not print hard copies of motions to be presented. In such a case, requiring the submitters of a “late” motion to print hard copies of their motion presents a disconnect with the format that the convention has chosen to use.

There are mechanisms by which an electronically-submitted motion may be distributed (e.g., an email listserv for the Business Meeting, a dedicated chat channel, or giving a staff member attached to the Business Meeting the ability to upload new files to the convention's website), and we do not intend to legislate which such method(s) should be used in the course of a meeting. However, if a convention is going to pursue an all-electronic format for handling business, then this requirement needs to be accommodated accordingly.

Additionally, if the Worldcon decides not to provide hard copies of even the basic agenda, it is unfair to potentially impose a requirement to, for example, purchase hotel/conference center wireless access. (Some areas of a hotel or convention center may either lack cellular access, or international users may find such access to be extremely expensive).

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 10 minutes.

Saturday: Cliff Dunn (he/him) noted that there was a period in August when it looked as though the business meeting was not going to have hard-copy agendas. This raised the prospect there might be a disconnect between late-submitted business having to be printed while nothing else was printed, and the committee not opting to include the late business if agreed to on the agenda. He believed that if a convention committee is going to decide not to print the business meeting agenda, then it is only fair to tell convention committees to make provision to update the agenda for such items and not have individuals run off hundreds of copies.

Elsbeth Kovar (she/her) proposed an amendment to the standing rule as follows (new text bolded):

In the event that the Worldcon Committee ~~shall~~ does not provide printed copies of business to attendees of the Business Meeting, the requirement in this rule shall be waived and the Worldcon Committee shall be required to promptly provide an electronic copy **and physical copy, if possible**, of any such submitted business to attendees ~~promptly upon its provision to the Worldcon Committee~~. In such an event, the Worldcon Committee shall also be responsible for providing ready access to the agenda to members attending the Business Meeting while at the meeting without an additional cost being imposed upon the attendees.

Lisa Hertel (she/her) spoke in favor of the amendment. She considered this an access issue since not everyone has access to electronic devices. She noted that not everyone can afford a tablet with a data plan; not everyone can read electronic text easily.

Kent Bloom (he/him) moved that this standing rule be referred back to a committee consider paper copies of the agenda provided to the business meeting and whether that should be a requirement of Worldcon committees. How should it be done and how should electronic copies be provided. His motion was seconded.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) noted that a written agenda is not a requirement for the business meeting; it's a requirement to anyone submitting business, and she didn't think it needed to be referred to a committee.

Ben Yalow (he/him) felt that since there were different opinions about what this motion was requiring, he believed it should be referred back to committee.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) believed the problem is the requirements on the members of the committee are not aligned with the requirements on the Worldcon. Therefore, a committee can align the two require that both are either required to provide paper or something else.

With no one else wishing to speak on the motion to refer to committee, the question was called on referring this proposed standing rule to a committee of the presiding officer's choosing to include discussion of the necessity of paper copies and the provision thereof on agendas. By a show of hands, the resolution was passed on to a committee that will be chaired by Jesi Lipp (they/them). Those wishing to be on the committee should contact them, and the committee will report back next year at Chengdu.

D. RESOLUTIONS

From the **WSFS Constitution Section 3.4.3**: 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 two-thirds (2/3) vote of the intervening Business Meeting of WSFS.

D.1 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for *After Yang*

Moved, to extend for one year the eligibility of the movie *After Yang*, based on limited availability, as authorized by Section 3.4.3 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by: Nana Amuah, Olav Rokne, and Cora Buhlert

Commentary: *After Yang* is a 2021 science fiction film that screened at Cannes in France on July 8 of that year, before premiering in the United States on January 21, 2022 at the Sundance Film Festival and a wider release in theaters and Showtime on March 4.

Due to this limited release schedule, very few members of Chicon 8 had the opportunity to view the film before the deadline for nominating the 2022 Hugo Awards.

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes. Without discussion, the extension was granted unanimously.³

D.2 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for *Strawberry Mansion*

Moved, to extend for one year the eligibility of *Strawberry Mansion*, based on limited availability, as authorized by Section 3.4.3 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by: Nana Amuah, Olav Rokne, and Cora Buhlert

Commentary: *Strawberry Mansion* is a 2021 science fiction film that screened at Sundance on January 29 of that year, then screened at various film festivals throughout the country before a limited release in the United States on February 18, 2022. It was released on home video on June 21, 2022.

Due to this limited festival release schedule, very few members of Chicon 8 had the opportunity to view the film before the deadline for nominating the 2022 Hugo Awards.

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes. Without discussion, the extension was granted unanimously.

³ The presiding officer asked for unanimous consent to consider items D.1 D.4 as a block for extending Hugo eligibility, and there was no objection. The presiding officer then asked for unanimous consent to grant extended eligibility for D.1-D.4 as a block, and again there was no objection. Eligibility was thus extended for those items.

D.3 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for *Neptune Frost*

Moved, to extend for one year the eligibility of *Neptune Frost*, based on limited availability, as authorized by Section 3.4.3 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by: Nana Amuah, Olav Rokne, and Cora Buhlert

Commentary: *Neptune Frost* is a 2021 science fiction film that screened at Cannes on July 8 of that year, then screened at various film festivals throughout 2021 and 2022 (including the New York Film Festival and Sundance) before a limited release in the United States on June 3, 2022. It was released on home video on August 9, 2022.

Due to this limited festival release schedule, very few members of Chicon 8 had the opportunity to view the film before the deadline for nominating the 2022 Hugo Awards.

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes. Without discussion, the extension was granted unanimously.

D.4 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for *Mad God*

Moved, to extend for one year the eligibility of *Mad God*, based on limited availability, as authorized by Section 3.4.3 of the WSFS Constitution.

Proposed by: Nana Amuah, Olav Rokne, and Cora Buhlert

Commentary: *Mad God* is a 2021 science fiction film that premiered in Switzerland at the Locarno Film Festival on August 5, 2021. Throughout the rest of the year, the film screened solely at film festivals across the world. In 2022, the film received a limited screening in theaters and a wider release on the streaming service Shudder on June 16, 2022.

Due to its initial limited festival release schedule in 2021, very few members of Chicon 8 had the opportunity to view the film before the deadline for nominating the 2022 Hugo Awards.

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes. Without discussion, the extension was granted unanimously.

D.5 Short Title: Solidarity with Ukraine

Resolved, that it is the spirit of the Business Meeting to offer solidarity with Ukrainian Fans, recognizing that Ukraine has been invaded by fascists. We encourage all to boycott those who would platform or champion the illegal

invasion. The Business Meeting looks forward to a return of freedom and fandom to Ukraine.

Proposed by: Borys Sydiuk, James Bacon, Erin Underwood, Chris Garcia, Kelly Buehler, Frank Kalisz, Mike Glycer, Ian Stockdale, Dave Farmer, and Chuck Serface

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes.⁴

Saturday: Chuck Serface (he/him) said that he had served in Ukraine as a teacher between 2008 and 2010, where he taught English as a foreign language. His student told him how important science fiction is in their life, and he read the following statement:

Ukraine is an ancient and wonderful land. Ukrainians are kind and welcoming people. Ukraine is a young country. Our fandom is growing, our love of literature, science fiction and space flight strong, our conventions pleasant. We ask for solidarity.

Fans who allow the platform or champion an illegal invasion should know that this is not right. Fandom is about friendship. Not a space for fascists to gloat or goad. We have asked for a clear message, it supports a civilized and democratic approach to this matter.

Mr. Serface asked the business meeting to support Ukraine as it supports the civilized and democratic approach to the matter as we all should.

Ben Yalow (he/him) believed that the Worldcon business meeting and WSFS is not and should not be involved in real-world political considerations. Article 1 of the Constitution talks about science fiction, which unites all of us. Mr. Yalow was not challenging the merits of the current situation, only that this was not the business of WSFS.

Olav Rokne (he/him) disagreed and said there was no such thing as neutrality when it comes to atrocities. Silence always stands with the status quo and empowers the violent.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) offered an amendment to strike the words “by fascists,” which was seconded. A motion was made to extend time for debate by 2 minutes, to which there was no objection.

Vivian Abraham (any pronouns) noted that this motion is not referring to a specific group of fascists. Fascism exists, and it is strong in every country right now, around the world, including ours. We need to call it out when we see it.

⁴ Because time limits could not be set until the main meeting on Friday, the presiding officer ruled that Objections to Consideration and Postpone Indefinitely would still be in order for D.5 and D.6 only.

Nicolai Plum (he/him) supported the amendment and said that removing the word “fascism” made the motion clearer while condemning the violence without getting into “he said/she said” terminology that could undermine the fundamental point of the motion.

Ira Alexandre (they/them) is of Russian Ukrainian descent. They said the less that we name what is happening, the more power it will have over us.

By a show of hands, the vote to remove “by fascists” was defeated.

Debate then continued on the underlying resolution. Jason Spitzer (he/him) said if we find a situation so repugnant, we ought to call it out.

Kate Secor (she/her) noted that no one at the meeting was in favor of fascism, but as written, the resolution has nothing to do with anything that is in the purview of the WSFS business meeting. We should not be voting on this resolution because it is not in our purview. There are other, more substantive ways to show our support of Ukraine.

Alex Acks (they/them) spoke in favor of the motion. She argued that science fiction, like all art, is political, and pretending we are on neutral ground is not a well-founded point. It is our purview because we are human beings.

Elspeth Kovar (she/her) reiterated that the business meeting does not have the right to do this. She supports Ukraine, but if we approve this resolution, where does it end.

Cliff Dunn raised a point of order that this motion was *ultra vires* (outside of the body) and that we did not have the power to debate it.

The presiding officer noted that there is precedent in the business meeting for *ultra vires* items being voted on; *e.g.*, Pluto not being a planet anymore; he ruled this resolution to be within the purview of the business meeting.

Mr. Dunn then moved to appeal the decision of the presiding officer, and it was seconded. The presiding officer defended his ruling: the word “fans” is in the resolution. A prior business meeting approved a resolution decrying that Pluto is no longer a planet, and this motion is no farther away from WSFS business than that was. Therefore he felt this motion was within the purview of the body.

With no time remaining, by a show of hands the ruling of the presiding officer was sustained.

Then, by another show of hands, the resolution without amendment passed.

D.6 Short Title: Sergey Lukianenko

Resolved, that it is the spirit of the Business Meeting to show solidarity with Ukrainian fans and to condemn Worldcon 2023’s Guest of Honour, Sergey Lukianenko’s appalling utterances, calling Ukrainians Nazis and encouraging an

illegal invasion of Ukraine. This is utterly unacceptable. Lukianenko should neither be platformed nor celebrated, and we ask the Chengdu 2023 committee, fans and members to refuse Sergei Lukianenko as your guest. It is shameful that he is honored by Worldcon.

Proposed by: Borys Sydiuk, James Bacon, Erin Underwood, Chris Garcia, Kelly Buehler, Frank Kalisz, Mike Glycer, Ian Stockdale, Dave Farmer, and Chuck Serface

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Saturday: Alexis Layton (he/him) objected to consideration, which required a three-fourths (¾) vote in favor. However, by a show of hands, the objection to consideration failed.

Ben Yalow (he/him) then raised a point of order. He noted that Section 1.6 of the Constitution clearly delineates the duties between WSFS (which is us) and the convention committee. Explicitly, it says, “everything else is solely the responsibility of the convention committee” and not in the purview of WSFS. Therefore, he felt, this motion was not within WSFS’s purview to attempt to influence the convention committee.

The presiding officer ruled that Mr. Yalow’s point was not well taken and quoted the section of the Constitution⁵, and added that the resolution does not specifically direct the convention to do something.

Mr. Yalow then appealed the ruling of the presiding officer.

Defending his ruling, the presiding officer noted that the word “ask” does not take responsibility. If the resolution were to remove the person as the Guest of Honor (“GOH”), he would rule the resolution out of order because the business meeting cannot remove a GOH. However, asking the committee to remove a GOH is not out of order.

Mr. Yalow agreed that trying to make the motion mandatory would clearly cross the line. However, he believed that the line is drawn not at the requirement to do something totally unconstitutional, but in attempting to persuade the business meeting to do something that is totally unconstitutional. He felt the line was at attempting to influence, rather than attempting to mandate – especially when the latter is specifically prohibited by our rules.

Terry Neill (she/her) responded that if the business meeting cannot request that a committee can or cannot do something it feels strong about, what are we here for? We can ask a committee to take our opinion into consideration.

Elsbeth Kovar (she/her) said that by asking we are trying to influence the Worldcon committee. She felt that “influence” herein was very close to the same meaning as “ask”.

⁵ “Authority and responsibility for all matters concerning the Worldcon, except those reserved herein to WSFS, shall rest with the Worldcon Committee, which shall act in its own name and not in that of WSFS.”

Cliff Dunn (he/him), speaking favor of the presiding officer's ruling, said he was concerned that asking for removal of a GOH was unconstitutional. Was it unconstitutional when DisCon III removed a GOH? If the business meeting were asking the convention to violate its 501(c)(3) status, which is required, that would be one thing, but the business meeting is asking them to do something that is explicitly within their remit. Mr. Dunn did not believe that that was improper.

By a show of hands, the presiding officer's ruling was sustained; the resolution was not out of order.

The presiding officer believed that debate time was expired, but Mr. Pyne pointed out that if debate time has expired before either or both sides of the question had an opportunity for substantive debate, each side that had not had an opportunity would have two minutes to debate. He felt that none of the discussion regarding Mr. Yalow's appeal of the presiding officer's ruling constituted substantive debate and there again appealed the ruling of the presiding officer.

The presiding officer agreed and restored two minutes of debate time on each side.

James Bacon (he/them) said he hoped that Chengdu was going to be a wonderful convention. However, he was saddened that the business meeting was forced to use the democratic process, which is available to us, to seek support against those who would politicize Worldcon. Ukrainians, he said, didn't politicize Worldcon. When a Worldcon GOH says terrible, absolutely reprehensible things about a whole nation, they have politicalized the Worldcon. That isn't right. What we can do is say that something should be done about the GOH. We politely ask. We don't tell. It is about saying this is wrong. There has never been a Worldcon GOH who has gotten it as wrong as this GOH. To encourage and want a country invaded. To want people liquidated. To call them Nazis – this is unbelievable stuff. All we say here is this is wrong. Please refuse this person. It shouldn't be part of our community and he definitely shouldn't be a Worldcon GOH. It brings shame to us all.

Rafe Richards (he/him) was not defending the Chengdu GOH, but since that the presiding officer ruled the business meeting has the right to do it, he foresaw a future business meeting criticizing future GOHs, and gave some possible examples, including, perhaps, a future GOH who once voted Republican. Worldcon is a world convention, and will go to places under different types of governments. If we don't like that, we should not give them the conventions.

Chris Garcia (he/him) argued in favor of the resolution. Awards and honorships are about what we as a community value. We need to take a stand for where our beliefs lie, otherwise they are not important. Even if those beliefs may not be universal, this room, we have values and should express them.

Elsbeth Kovar (she/her) noted that we would be setting a precedent if this motion passed.

Lew Wolkoff (he/him) noted that we don't know who the honorees are before the site selection vote, so we cannot criticize a potential GOH.

Ben Yalow (he/him) believed that if this resolution passed it would open a can of worms would never be shut, and that would be very bad for our community.

With time expired, it was time to vote. By a show of hands, the resolution passed.

E. BUSINESS PASSED ON

The following item resulted in the addition of a new section now numbered 3.9, as well as changes to the sections now numbered 3.8.1, 3.10.1, and 3.12.4, as shown below. It received first passage at Sasquan and was ratified at MidAmeriCon II with a 2022 sunset clause. It must now be re-ratified in order to remain part of the WSFS Constitution.

E.1 Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo

This is the text amended by E Pluribus Hugo (“EPH”):

Section 3.8 Tallying of Nominations

3.8.1: Except as provided below, the final Award ballots shall list in each category the six eligible nominees receiving the most nominations. ~~If there is a tie including fifth place, all the tied eligible nominees shall be listed.~~ as determined by the process described in Section 3.9.

Section 3.10: Notification and Acceptance

3.10.1 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 ~~finalist~~person notified shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the ~~finalist~~person notified declines nomination, that finalist(s) shall not appear on the final ballot. The procedure for replacement of such finalist(s) is described in subsection 3.9.4.

Section 3.12: Tallying of Votes

3.12.4: 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 per cent (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.

This is the new section created by E Pluribus Hugo:

Section 3.9: Finalist Selection Process

3.9.1: 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 3.9.3 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 3.9.3 for ties.)

3.9.2: The phases described in 3.9.1 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.

3.9.3: 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.

3.9.4: After the initial Award ballot is generated, if any finalist(s) are removed for any reason, they will be replaced by other works in reverse order of elimination.

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 20 minutes.

Saturday: Dave Wallace (he/him), one of the original sponsors of EPH, referenced a recent discussion on *File 770* as well as a piece by Nicholas Whyte that surveyed some of EPH's effects and noted that it has served as a useful tiebreaker. The overall effect has been very beneficial over the past 5 years. There was a question as to whether it is a black box. Mr. Wallace wanted to show how the published reports permit spot-checking of the results against individual ballots when people have voted for something that was eliminated in one of the final rounds. That anyone can get a certain amount of information about how groups of nominations appeared without tracing them to individual ballots (unless a member chooses to share that information) is something that is useful. He shared a bit of his analysis, and the link is on *File 770*. He gave the following examples:

Superservice SF had 6 solo votes and 55 shared 2-way with *Rageaholic*.
Rageaholic had 21 solo, and the 55 shared 2-way votes with *Superservice SF*.
Neither shared votes with any other long-list nominee.

This was an example of the EPH doing what it was intended to do, reducing a mini-slate to a single entry on the final ballot.

Mr. Wallace also did a more detailed analysis of the elimination of *Storyological* within a few days of the publication tables.

Storyological at the time of its elimination had 14 solo votes, 1 3-way with *Fansplaining* and *Fangirl Happy Hour*, and 7 2-way votes: 1 with *Coode Street*, 1 with *Fangirl Happy Hour*, 1 with *Tea and Jeopardy*, 3 with *Skiffy and Fanty*, and 1 with *Down and Safe*.

This kind of analysis, he said, offers an opportunity for people to spot check the effects of EPH without necessarily having to run the whole thing. It offers more opportunity for the results to be at least spot-checked so that we know the algorithm is, in fact, functioning correctly.

David Kaplan (he/him) believed that EPH had an additional drawback in that it decreased the viability of borderline popular works that tend to appear on ballots alongside more broadly popular works. He argued that works by people in minority groups might be nominated by other members of those groups who will nominate them alongside mainstream works. While the voters themselves would not be disenfranchised, they would be enfranchised only to the extent that their tastes were homogenous with the dominant community. If the business meeting at any future point had an appetite to rewrite the Hugo nomination rules, he suggested reverting to approval voting for

nominations and letting no awards results in the elections point the way to identifying slates. If a category should return a no award result he felt the voting process for that category could simply be repeated using the existing ballots but disqualifying the finalist although this might result in the award being referred to the following year unless the original voting deadline were made earlier.

Rafe Richards (he/him) said that EPH was born out of crisis. He reminded everyone that No Award is not a desirable outcome. EPH, along with 5 and 6, fixed that crisis. If people think that without EPH those who triggered that crisis would not come back and take advantage of the weakness that they already know exists, they are far more optimistic about human nature than Mr. Richards. He stressed that EPH works. If it needs to be tweaked, tweak it, but otherwise we should ratify it.

Lisa Hayes (she/her) believed that EPH is a black box. There are only a few people who understand it, and fewer people who know how to implement the algorithm. We had Four and Six, which was watered down to Five and Six, which would have been an adequate block to the “Puppy” problem. She suggested moving to something everyone could understand and vet.

Kate Secor (she/her) said that EPH is not that complicated. She’s explained it to people, and it makes sense to them, including people for whom it is their first Worldcon. It may be a black box, but no one outside the business meeting cares. The people in the room are outliers on the matter. Nominations go in; finalists come out. They don't care, but we do. And what we decided, after many hours and hours of debate in this meeting and elsewhere and presumably into the future, was that this was the best way to do it. She asked why we couldn’t just leave well enough alone for once.

Dave McCarty (he/him) has been a frequent Hugo Administrator. He’s the person who that has put the most sets of data (nine) through EPH and done the categories by hand to understand them. He noted that EPH promised to do two specific things but hasn’t: It was promised that it would take a perverse minority of the voters, say 20%, and get their control of the ballot proportional to them. So, if 20% of the voters were in the slate, they controlled 20% of the ballot. EPH does not do that at all. He said EPH will affect one item in the category, sometimes maybe two, but it will not get 20% down to 20%. Secondly, he said EPH promised to not give outside preference to people who nominate only one thing in a category, i.e., bullet voting. But Mr. McCarty believed that it is now the easiest way to hack a vote. It works and it’s easy, you don’t need many people to do it, and it will get an item on the ballot. EPH is opaque: if you have someone messes with the data, he had no faith that he could spot it. The data cannot be validated, especially not in the short amount of time between when the software needs to run and when the Hugo Award team needs to start communicating to finalists. Most importantly, he said that EPH and Five and Six work against each other. EPH and Five and Six were created out of fear, but at least Five and Six is a demonstrable system. He reiterated: EPH is an opaque system that twiggles [sic] things in a way that can't be defended, explained, or audited by anybody on the planet.

Jo Van Ekeren (she/her) spoke in favor of re-ratification. She was deeply involved with all of the discussions in the months leading up to the passage of EPH. It was not passed out of fear and was well thought-through. What it promised was to be a disincentive for slates, and it works to discourage slates. It's agnostic. It has nothing to do with being liked by the right people. It doesn't matter whether you are leftist, rightist, a flautist: if you have a slate, it will deprioritize the slate, so the rest of us have a chance to get something we like on the ballot. There are people waiting in the wings to come back with slates. She noted that if you are able to read the EPH ratings, they provide more information than we've ever had about the nomination process. You can see if EPH is working. It's an effective way to discourage slating, and you can see it in the results. There are people waiting in the wings to come back as slates. We have to trust the Hugo Award administrators to do things properly.

The question was called, but there were objections, and people still wished to speak. With a two-thirds (2/3) vote needed to close debate, by a serpentine vote the motion to close debate passed with 59 in favor and 26 opposed.

By a show of hands, EPH was re-ratified and the sunset clause will be removed from the Constitution.

The following items received first passage at DisCon III and must be ratified at Chicon 8 in order to become part of the Constitution.

E.2 Short Title: 30 Days Hath New Business

5.1.6. Deadline for Submission of New Business. The deadline for submission of non-privileged new business and committee reports to the Business Meeting shall be thirty (30) days before the first Preliminary Meeting. Proposed agenda items may be withdrawn by the consent of all proposing members at any time up to fourteen (14) days before the published deadline for submitting new business. A list of such withdrawn business must be made available to the membership. The Presiding Officer may accept otherwise qualified motions and reports submitted after the deadline, but all such motions shall initially be placed at the end of the agenda.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 6 minutes.

Saturday: Donald Eastlake (he/him) wanted to propose an amendment to be placed at the end of the motion. However, before the amendment could be debated, Standing Rule 5.4 required a two-thirds (2/3) vote to suspend the rules because Mr. Eastlake had not submitted his amendment before the deadline. (It would take only a majority vote to ratify the constitutional amendment.)

Mr. Eastlake then proposed his amendment to make “This rule may be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote.” as the final sentence of the underlying motion. He explained that when the amendment came up last year, he was the presiding officer and ruled that the amendment was in the nature of the standing rule, and even if it were in the Constitution, it could be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote. There was some question about that, and now Mr. Eastlake wished to make it explicit.

The motion to suspend the rules was seconded. By a show of hands, more than two-thirds agreed to take up the amendment.

Winton Mathews (he/him) then asked if this was a greater or lesser amendment. The presiding officer ruled that this was a lesser change and would not require re-ratification at Chengdu.

Kate Secor (she/her) raised a point of order and requested that the presiding officer rule on whether the amendment was out of order because something that occurs prior to the business meeting cannot be suspended at the meeting without creating a time loop. However, the presiding officer ruled that the amendment was in order because it allows the business meeting to suspend the rules to take up the new business that was submitted after the deadline. This text was there as part of the Standing Rules, and the intent of the original motion is to simply move it into the Constitution. The revised constitutional amendment would read:

5.1.6. Deadline for Submission of New Business. The deadline for submission of non-privileged new business and committee reports to the Business Meeting shall be thirty (30) days before the first Preliminary Meeting. Proposed agenda items may be withdrawn by the consent of all proposing members at any time up to fourteen (14) days before the published deadline for submitting new business. A list of such withdrawn business must be made available to the membership. The Presiding Officer may accept otherwise qualified motions and reports submitted after the deadline, but all such motions shall initially be placed at the end of the agenda. This rule may be suspended by a 2/3rd vote.

Joni Dashoff (she/her) noted that this was adding a modifier at the end of the entire paragraph, but she believed the sentence was trying to modify only the last sentence. Therefore she suggested breaking the paragraph in two, so the modifier was clearly only modifying the agenda order. Thus, it would read:

5.1.6. Deadline for Submission of New Business. The deadline for submission of non-privileged new business and committee reports to the Business Meeting shall be thirty (30) days before the first Preliminary Meeting. Proposed agenda items may be withdrawn by the consent of all proposing members at any time up to fourteen (14) days before the

published deadline for submitting new business. A list of such withdrawn business must be made available to the membership.

The Presiding Officer may accept otherwise qualified motions and reports submitted after the deadline, but all such motions shall initially be placed at the end of the agenda. This rule may be suspended by a 2/3rd vote.

Mr. Eastlake moved to form a committee to be headed by him to report back the next day (Sunday). The presiding officer noted that the committee report would be taken up after site selection results were announced and before debate was started on Item F.2. To Defuse the Turnout Bomb, Cut the Red Wire . . . (because it had already been decided to put F.2 before F.1 in the agenda).

Ms. Secor objected because the business meeting still has a lot of work ahead of it. However, Mr. Eastlake noted that wordsmithing takes time and if done under the pressure of the entire meeting would have errors. He was certain a committee could come back at the next session with wording that reflected the intent correctly.

By a show of hands, the amendment was referred to a committee to report back on the morrow and taken up before any new business.

Sunday: The Deputy Presiding Officer read the report of the committee, which recommended that the amendment retain its original form with the addition of the text “This Rule may be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote” at the end of the paragraph. See [Appendix E](#) for the full report.

Andrew Adams (he/him) asked whether this is a change at all since it derives from Roberts Rules of Order and is purely an explanatory change and does not need to be ratified next year. The presiding officer agreed that this was not a change, but explained that using the term “lesser change” makes it clearer as to why the motion would not need to be re-ratified next year.

The committee’s report was taken as a motion to amend E.2, which was actually seconded at the previous day’s meeting. There was no further discussion. Without objection and by a show of hands, the text of E.2 was ratified as amended below and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Chicon 8.

5.1.6. Deadline for Submission of New Business. The deadline for submission of non-privileged new business and committee reports to the Business Meeting shall be thirty (30) days before the first Preliminary Meeting. Proposed agenda items may be withdrawn by the consent of all proposing members at any time up to fourteen (14) days before the published deadline for submitting new business. A list of such withdrawn business must be made available to the membership. The Presiding Officer may accept otherwise qualified motions and reports submitted after the

deadline, but all such motions shall initially be placed at the end of the agenda. This rule may be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote.

At the conclusion of the discussion of E.2 on Sunday, Allen Tipper (they/them) made a motion to suspend the rules to consider, as the first item of business at the next day's meeting, a resolution that it was the sense of the business meeting that the 2023 Worldcon committee in Chengdu was not currently fulfilling its obligations as a Worldcon and formally censure it accordingly. This was seconded. A motion to suspend the rules, as had just been discussed above, required a two-thirds (2/3) vote to suspend the rules, and was neither debatable nor amendable. By a show of hands, the motion to suspend the rules failed.

E.3 Short Title: The Statue of Liberty Play

Section 2.7: Membership Pass-along. Within ninety (90) days after a Worldcon, the administering Committee shall, except where prohibited by applicable law, forward to the Committee of the next Worldcon its best information as to the names and contact information ~~of postal addresses of~~ all its Worldcon members who have given permission for that data transfer and only for the purposes for which permission to use that data was given. ~~to the Committee of the next Worldcon.~~

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 12 minutes.

Saturday: Joni Brill Dashoff (she/her) asked if Worldcon was still collecting postal information even if it no longer needs to be passed on, and the presiding officer noted that that was the case. She noted that email addresses can be created without being linked to a real person. Asking for a postal address confirms that a person exists in a real time and place.

The presiding officer noted that the text of the motion allows a Worldcon committee to either collect postal information or not, because they are not required to pass it on. Therefore they are not required to have it. That does not direct them to stop collecting it.

With no further debate, the vote was taken. By a show of hands, the amendment was ratified and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Chicon 8.

E.4 Short Title: A Matter of Days

Section 2.4: Distribution of Rules. The current Worldcon Committee shall publish the WSFS Constitution and Standing Rules, together with an

explanation of proposed changes approved but not yet ratified. The Committee shall distribute these documents to all WSFS members at a point between ~~nine and three months~~ two hundred seventy (270) and ninety (90) days prior to the Worldcon, and shall also distribute them on paper to all WSFS members in attendance at the Worldcon upon registration.

Section 5.3: Constitutional Pass-along. Within ~~two (2) months~~ sixty (60) days after the end of each Worldcon, the Business Meeting staff shall send a copy of all changes to the Constitution and Standing Rules, and all items awaiting ratification, to the next Worldcon Committee.

Proposed by: The Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Discussion: Friday: Debate time was set at 4 minutes.

Saturday: There was no discussion. By a show of hands, the amendment was ratified and became part of the Constitution at the conclusion of Chicon 8.

E.5 Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights

Moved, to amend Article 1 by ~~striking out~~ and inserting text as follows:

1.5.1: Each Worldcon shall offer ~~supporting~~ WSFS memberships and attending ~~memberships~~ supplements.

1.5.2: The rights of ~~supporting~~ WSFS members of a Worldcon include the right to receive all of its generally distributed publications. WSFS memberships held by natural persons may not be transferred, except that, in case of death of a natural person holding a WSFS membership, it may be transferred to the estate of the decedent.

1.5.3: The rights of ~~attending members~~ WSFS members who have an attending supplement of a Worldcon include the rights of ~~supporting~~ WSFS members plus the right of general attendance at said Worldcon and at the WSFS Business Meeting held thereat.

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

Proposed by: The Nontransferability Committee

Discussion: Friday; Debate time was set at 20 minutes.

Saturday: Ben Yalow (he/him), the maker of the motion, spoke in favor of ratifying the it. What this amendment does, he said, is split the right to attend the annual meeting (“Worldcon”) from membership in the World Science Fiction Society (“Society” or “WSFS”). If you believe in the Society’s activities, you join the Society; and joining the Society stays with you for the life of the convention.⁶ If you wish to attend the Worldcon, you then pay a supplemental fee. Worldcons have always had the right to do this, but this amendment would make it mandatory.

John Lorentz (he/him) spoke against the motion. This creates a division that does not currently exist. The members of WSFS are the members of the Worldcon. There is not a separate organization that you join and then pay more to attend the convention. You join the convention, and that puts you into WSFS for that year. There is a long tradition of members being able to sell their memberships if they cannot attend. This takes away that tradition. What this amendment does is maximize the income for the convention that year; it does not help individuals whatsoever.

Andrew Adams (he/him) said that in 2020, CoNZeland had to change from an in-person convention to a virtual one and was faced with a horrible set of decisions, partly to do with membership statuses. While Mr. Adams personally felt neutral about which way the business meeting clarified this issue, he said this is another hard decision, but we have to have clarity. If the business meeting doesn’t like this amendment, give the Worldcon some other form of clarity regarding memberships.

Mark Roth (no pronoun preference) said that he purchased someone else’s membership and that perhaps today’s business meeting attendees don’t recall sleeping 8 or 10 people to a room because that was all they could afford. There are still people who barely scrape by to attend Worldcon. He considered this amendment a personal attack on people with low incomes or fixed incomes. If there were an opposite of the Big Heart Award, this amendment would win hands down. You pay; you’re a member. That’s all it should be.

Kate Secor (she/her) explicated that you join the Society. Your membership in the Society gives you the right to vote site selection, nominate for the Hugo Awards, etc. Then you pay for the attending supplement to attend the annual convention. If you are a member of IEEE, you get to be a member, whether you go to their annual meeting or not. Transferring rights is a nightmare. If someone transfers a membership after using some of the rights, how does the purchaser know what rights they are getting? They don’t. How does the convention track which rights the newly transferred membership still has? We keep saying we are a club, that are fandom, yet we have no commitment to the notion that we are a Society that has values and rights that come with it. This motion just codifies that we are a club.

⁶ There are some minor tweaks to deal with death.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) disagreed and said that what this motion does is make memberships that we have bought less valuable because we cannot transfer the parts of it that people might want to buy. They will have to pay more, and they will pay the seller less, when someone decides to sell a membership. However difficult it may be for the people administering it, they can do it, and she believed we should keep doing it the way we've been doing it.

Mr. Roth then asked whether this motion would require the business meeting to be hybrid or virtual, but the presiding officer ruled the question not germane to the discussion.

As both a member of the committee that proposed this amendment and as a former Hugo Award database administrator, Ron Oakes (he/him) fully supported ratification of the amendment. He said this does very little to sell or transfer an attending membership, now called an attending supplement, to the convention. You can still sell it. The only requirement is to make sure the purchaser has a WSFS membership (formerly a supporting membership). He added that the attempt to lower the cost of the site selection fee (supporting membership or WSFS membership – all of which are essentially the same thing) is a separate issue. This amendment solely clarifies what to be a WSFS member or supporting member means and to make it easier for those who administer the data related to the Hugo Awards and site selection. It is difficult to untangle what rights belong to the prior member and what rights belong to the new member.

The question was called, but failed in a show of hands.

Lisa Padol (she/her) spoke against ratification. She said this would be difficult to explain to a new potential attendees: no, they cannot just purchase my attending membership; they must also purchase a WSFS membership.

Dave Howell (he/him) felt this split was easy to explain. If someone purchased an expansion game set, they would quickly understand that they still needed the full game in order to make use of the expansion set. He believed that someone would be really confused if they bought a membership and was told it came with all the rights, but discovered some of them were not available because they had been used. He felt that would be upsetting to a purchaser.

Corina Stark (she/her) felt this amendment did not make it clear that an attending supplement could be sold only to someone who had already purchased a WSFS membership. That may result in people attending the conference who do not have the right to attend the business meeting or vote in site selection. This would create two classes, a have and a have-not. She preferred to see an amendment to include that someone could only transfer an attending supplement to a WSFS member. This would still put a burden on the purchaser to also obtain that WSFS membership, but it would be clearer and still allow a transfer of the attending supplement.

Terry Neill (she/her), a former registration, site selection and Hugo Award staff volunteer, felt that implementing this structure so that one could not transfer an attending

supplement without the purchaser already having a WSFS membership would not be difficult, and Glasgow was prepared to do so if this amendment were ratified.

Joni Brill Dashoff (she/her) a former Worldcon treasurer and site selection administrator, noted that this amendment does not specify what rights are contracted for as a WSFS member. She thought that this amendment was transferring everything except voting rights to the purchaser, and therefore didn't think this amendment clarified the situation.

Kevin Standlee (he/him) said that his late father-in-law had been a veterinarian and was a member of a veterinary organization. If he had also purchased a ticket to his organization's meeting, he could transfer that ticket to anyone, but the purchaser could not attend the convention unless they were a member of the organization.

Gene Olmstead (he/him) wanted to know how many people we were really talking about. If there were only ten, it could be easily dealt with. You build it into your system.

Ms. Neill responded that she could not give specific number, but it was sufficient enough to be a pain in the ass.

Cliff Dunn (he/him) said a lot of people buy the underlying membership not to exercise any of the voting rights, but to attend the convention. But if there is a change to a virtual convention or there's a policy change, the underlying reason for the purchase might evaporate. Were this to restrict the transfer of memberships where rights had been partially exhausted, Mr. Dunn might have been in favor of it because it's the partially exhausted rights that cause the problem. However, where none of the rights have been exhausted, there is no problem in transferring both the WSFS rights and the attending supplement and should be permitted.

Ms. Lurie noted that she too is a member of multiple professional organizations. A nonmember could attend their conferences without being a member by paying a little extra since, usually, there is a small discount for members of the organization. She noted that there were people at Chicon 8 who were not members because they had one-day memberships or were a child. They did not have any WSFS rights, but they were at the convention.

Lisa Hertel (she/they) said she was very confused by the last paragraph of the amendment. She believed the amendment benefitted the SMOFs, not the regular attendees.

With time exhausted and no one else wishing to speak, it was time to vote. By division, the amendment was ratified, with 46 in favor and 40 opposed. It became part of the Constitution at the end of Chicon 8.

F. NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Items under this heading have not yet received first passage and will become part of the Constitution only if passed at Chicon 8 and ratified in 2023.

Kate Secor asked that the business meeting form into a committee of the whole to discuss reconciling F.1 and F.2, which are mutually exclusive. Without objection, the committee of the whole was permitted to be recorded. See [Appendix F](#) for the minutes of that meeting.

F.1 Short Title: The Zero Per Cent Solution

Moved, to strike the following from the WSFS Constitution

~~3.12.2: “No Award” shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category (excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place) is less than twenty five per cent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received.~~

Proposed by: Olav Rokne, Amanda Wakaruk, Paul Weimer, Jason Sanford, Cora Buhkert, Camestros Felapton, Christopher J. Garcia, Marshall Ryan Maresca, Joe Sherry, Adri Joy, Gideon Marcus, Lori Anderson, Kevin Anderson, Oghenechovwe Donald Ekpeki, Haley Zapal, Amy Salley, Chris M. Barkley, Mike Glycer, Alasdair Stuart and Patrick Nielsen Hayden


Commentary: Over the past several years, several Hugo Award categories have come close to not being awarded due the current wording, but not the original intent, Section 3.12.2 of the Constitution.

While this clause was designed to guard against categories in which there was a lack of interest, there has not been a significant decline in the categories most at risk of being affected by 3.12.2. Rather there has been a significant uptick in interest in other categories.

Since 2,362 final Award ballots were cast in 2021, if any category received fewer than 591 votes in the final count, then a result of “No Award” would have been declared. Fancast received 632 votes, barely scraping past that 25 per cent threshold. Fanzine (643 votes), Editor – Long Form (667 votes), and Fan Writer (680 votes) were all poised near the abyss.

For context, consider that [591 is more votes than any category received in 1963 when 3.12.2 was first proposed.](#)

At Denvention 3 in 2008, only 302 people voted in the Fanzine category. By absolute terms, this was less than half the number that voted for Fanzine at DisCon III in 2021, but because only 762 people voted in the Hugo Awards overall, the category had a participation rate of 39.6 per cent and was in no risk of falling prey to the criteria set forth in 3.12.2. Conversely, despite there being 643 votes cast in Fanzine last year, this only amounted to 27.2 per cent participation.



Worldcon has grown since the 1960s to the point at which this threshold is no longer relevant and could even be harmful.

The fact that this threshold is based on the overall number of ballots cast in more high-profile categories (like Best Novel or Best Dramatic Presentation), it risks punishing these important and community-oriented categories (like Fancast and Fanzine) – despite the existence of substantial and sustained interest in these categories.

In an era of superhero franchises and a true renaissance of SF/F television worldwide, it is unwieldy to expect community-oriented categories to pull the same interest as multi-million dollar franchises. We do a disservice to the diversity of our community when we establish the latter as the threshold of popularity for the former.

To address this unanticipated problem, we propose decoupling the viability threshold from the total number of final award ballots.

Several other options for reform of this section have been discussed, such as changing the percentage, moving the threshold to an absolute value, or creating other metrics. However, eliminating this viability test altogether is the simplest action that would solve the immediate problems faced in an era of disproportionate increases of interest in some Hugo categories.

Discussion: Friday: Debate was set at 20 minutes. **Note:** a motion was made and seconded to discuss F.2 (“To Defuse the Turnout Bomb . . .”) prior to discussing this amendment, which was seconded and passed by a show of hands.

Sunday: Corina Stark (she/her) spoke in favor of the motion. Unexpected things, like a pandemic or financial crisis, can prevent people from nominating and voting for the Hugo Awards. That does not make the art any less significant, and it makes no difference how many votes are received.

Kent Bloom (he/him) said the current clause in the Constitution was a useful feature though, as far as he could tell, it had never actually been used. He felt it was a good motivator to convince people to vote in the esoteric areas in which they have an interest. If no one votes, why should we give a Hugo Award? If there is no statistical difference between the first and eighth places, which is what happens when you get only 10 or 15 votes in favor, then we should not be giving a Hugo in that instance.

The secretary noted that the intent of this motion is to strike the entirety of Section 3.12.2 in the Constitution, and that the printed long form of the agenda was misprinted.

A motion was made to call the question; it was seconded and there was no objection. By a serpentine vote of 72 in favor and 19 against, the amendment passed and will be passed on to Chengdu for ratification. (If it is ratified there, this section of the Constitution will be removed and following sections will be renumbered.)

Note: The deputy presiding officer noted that Roberts Rules of Order paragraph 29 says, “When it is clear that there has been a full vote and there can be no reasonable doubt as to which side is in the majority, a call for *Division* is dilatory, and the chair should not allow the individual member’s right of demanding a *Division* to be abused to the annoyance of the assembly.”

F.2 Short Title: To Defuse the Turnout Bomb, Cut the Red Wire . . .

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by [adding](#) text as follows:

3.12.2: “No Award” shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category (excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place) is less than twenty-five per cent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received [and the total number of valid ballots cast for that category, excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place, is fewer than 200.](#)

Proposed by: The Hugo Awards Study Committee

Commentary: The meat of this discussion can be found in the report of the Hugo Award Study Committee. In sum, the 25% threshold for categories being “forced” to No Award represented a fairly low number of ballots cast at the time it was initially inserted into the Constitution (in the late 1970s). While overall turnout has increased in recent years, in several categories turnout has remained static by comparison, and as a result rising overall turnout has come to threaten several categories with an automatic “No Award” due to a decreasing share of overall turnout in those categories.

The Committee has sought an alteration involving the most minimal change to the Constitution by adding in a “ceiling” at 200 votes for triggering this section, something which would “defuse” this concern for the foreseeable future. We acknowledge that 200 votes is an arbitrary number (though so, too, was/is 25%). At the same time that number seems to be high enough that so that the category is not being voted on only by a “handful of voters” and still retains the rule in the event of either a decline in turnout (turnout below 1000 voters is not an utterly distant memory) or utterly dismal turnout in a given category.

Discussion: Friday: Debate was set at 20 minutes.

Sunday: Since a motion was made and seconded at the preliminary business meeting to discuss this item prior to F.1 (“The Zero Percent Solution”), this amendment was taken up first. Speaking first, Kate Secor made a motion to suspend the rules and move to a Committee of the Whole for 15 minutes to discuss F.2 and F.1 and come back with a single motion since she believed F.2 and F.1 were mutually exclusive, and she found that confusing. By unanimous consent the rules were suspended, and the business meeting became a Committee of the Whole (“COTW”).

See [Appendix F](#) for the minutes of the COTW, which was chaired by the deputy presiding officer. At the conclusion of the COTW, the deputy presiding officer reported that it was the recommendation of the COTW that the rules be suspended, that F.2 be removed from the agenda, and that the committee take up F.1 immediately. The deputy presiding officer then made a motion on behalf of the COTW to do so. It was seconded and passed by a vote in two-thirds in favor.⁷

F.3 Short Title: If a Tree Falls in The Woods and Nobody Is Around . . .

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by [adding](#) text as follows:

[**3.12.3: In the event that the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category \(excluding those cast for No Award in First Place\) is fewer than**](#)

⁷ While a member seconded this motion, by rule motions made by committees of more than one person do not need to be seconded.

ten per cent (10%) of the total number of final Award ballots received in a non-Retro Hugo vote in two years out of three successive years, an amendment effecting the removal of that category from the list of enumerated Hugo Award categories shall be automatically placed on the agenda for the next Worldcon's Business Meeting.

Proposed by: The Hugo Awards Study Committee

Commentary: Again, the meat of the discussion can be found in the report of the Hugo Award Study Committee. Given the proposed restriction (in the view of the Committee) or elimination (in the view of the minority report) of any requirement for turnout for an award to be given, the Committee felt that it was preferable to retain some sort of mechanism to initiate a debate on the future of a category with consistently dismal interest. Relying on individual members to do so is problematic, as discussions regarding the elimination of any single category invariably bring with them strong emotions on those eligible for the award in question, so an “automatic” mechanism to start such a discussion is desirable. This stands out even more given the addition of multiple categories since the turn of the century.

The Committee notes that the proposed 10% threshold has not yet been met in any year by any category. The Committee also notes that such turnout would be utterly dismal by any standard at present, and that there are non-trivial costs (both in terms of finances and in terms of other resources) which come with each category that is awarded, be it for the conventions making the award(s) or the nominators and voters. These issues arose with the shift to six finalists in each category and with the addition of Best Series, and they will invariably continue to mount with the net addition of further categories.

The Committee finally notes that it is not using any “special” process to expedite a category’s removal– the amendment will need to be presented as if it were any other amendment and have to go through the two-year ratification process after not less than two years of exceedingly low voter participation in order to be removed. This is a high bar to clear, and if a category clears the first part of it (being presented to the Business Meeting for consideration) due to “unusual circumstances” (such as a “troubled” set of finalists in one or two years), the Business Meeting will be free to dispose of it as if it were any other business item.

Discussion: Friday: Debate was set at 20 minutes.

Sunday: Cliff Dunn (he/him) said that we are “creeping up” to the point of having too many Hugo Awards. It costs money to create the awards and hold the ceremony, but the social cost of removing a Hugo Award is also very high. Therefore, this amendment proposed an intentionally hard-to-beat threshold of ten per cent (10%) of ballots cast in two out of three successive years to remove a Hugo Award, at which point it would come before the business meeting as an amendment to remove that category from the Constitution. He added that if we reached a point that participation in a given award was

that low, we need to have a discussion without someone putting their head on the chopping block in order to have that discussion.

Andrew Adams (he/him) made a motion to change what was currently a constitutional amendment to a standing rule, and it was seconded. The presiding officer explicated that if the amendment were change to a standing rule, (a) it would take effect at the end of Chicon 8, (b) as a standing rule, it could be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the business meeting, and (c) as a standing rule, it could be changed in the future by a one-year process.

Dave McCarty (he/him) felt it was better to have this amendment be a constitutional amendment, requiring a two-year process to amend rather than be at the whim of a business meeting.

Ben Yalow (he/him) noted that this would still be a two-year process to kill a category because all this motion does is it puts an item on to the agenda. While Mr. Yalow thought this was a criterion that was too hard to actually happen, at least it would be on to the agenda, and if the business meeting wanted to make the constitutional change, it would have to vote it on twice.

Kevin Standlee (he/him) felt the advantage of this change is that it would instruct the business meeting what to do, rather than the convention, so procedurally it would be better as a standing rule since such rules are instructions directly to the business meeting.

A motion was made to call all the questions. That meant that first there would be a vote on the amendment to the motion to change it to a standing rule, followed immediately by a vote on the underlying motion without debate. This was seconded, and the questions were called without objection. By a show of hands, motion F.3 was changed to a standing rule.

Then, by a second show of hands, the text of this motion passed, to take effect at the end of Chicon 8 and be inserted into the standing rules in a place to be determined by the secretary.

F.4 Short Title: Best Game or Interactive Work

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution for the purpose of creating a new Hugo Award category for Best Game or Interactive Work by [inserting](#) new subsections after existing Sections 3.2.4 and 3.3.9, and revising Sections 3.2.6, 3.3.7, 3.3.8, and 3.3.9 as follows:

[**3.2.X. An interactive work is \(1\) a game, or \(2\) a narrative or presentation in which active input or interactive play is an integral component of the work itself or where it impacts the outcome, narrative, or order of elements of the work itself in a non-trivial fashion, and \(3\) is not ephemeral, in the**](#)

sense that the interactive elements of the work are accessible to participants through published or shareable artifacts, and the work is not an event requiring the participation of specific named persons.

3.2.6: The categories of Best Novel, Novella, Novelette, and Short Story shall be open to [non-interactive](#) works in which the text is the primary form of communication, regardless of the publication medium, including but not limited to physical print, audiobook, and ebook.

3.3.7: Best Graphic Story. Any [non-interactive](#) science fiction or fantasy story told in graphic form appearing for the first time in the previous calendar year.

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

3.3.9: Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form. Any [non-interactive](#) television program or other production, with a complete running time of 90 minutes or less, in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year.

[3.3.Y: Best Game or Interactive Work.](#) Any [interactive work or interactive substantial modification of a work in the fields of science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects, released to the public in the previous year and available for public participation in the interactive elements of the work in that year.](#)

[Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2026 Business Meeting, this Section shall be repealed; and](#)

[Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2026 Business Meeting.](#)

Proposed by: Ira Alexandre, Dave Hook, Nana Amuah, Erica Frank, Joe Sherry, Adri Joy, Kit Stubbs, Caz Abbott, Aleta Pérez, Owen Blacker, Marguerite Kenner, Alasdair Stuart, Darusha Wehm, Phoebe Barton, Jaime O'Brien, Sarah Elkins, Matt Arnold, and enne queu

Commentary: The proposal for this category in the present formulation is proceeding at the recommendation of the Hugo Award Study Committee.

A Hugo Award specifically for games and interactive works is not only viable and recommended, but necessary for explicitly recognizing a vital and unique site of

speculative fiction storytelling. Many common questions and issues are addressed at gameshugo.com/faq, with further supporting evidence, documentation, sources, references, and discussion. A synopsis of major points is provided below:

- The viability of a Best Video Game category was demonstrated at DisCon III in 2021, with 40.5% of voters casting ballots for finalists. Participation in the nominations phase was comparable to Best Dramatic Presentation: Short Form and more robust than many established categories.
- This proposal is for a permanent, medium-neutral category: Best Game or Interactive Work. It is not limited to video games and provides the best chance for games and interactive works of all kinds to get recognition.
- Like Best Related Work, it includes both new works and substantial modifications to existing works.
- This category is accessible in terms of time, finances, and ability.

Expansions on the above points are provided in the Best Game or Interactive Work Report included in the online materials provided for the Business Meeting. Full details and discussion are available at gameshugo.com/faq.

Discussion: Friday: Debate was set at 30 minutes.

Sunday: A motion was made to take up F.4 before F.3, was seconded and passed by a show of hands.

Ira Alexandre (they/them), the maker of the motion spoke first. They noted an error in the motion and asked to amend the sunset clause from 2026 to 2028, as follows.

[Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2028 Business Meeting, this Section shall be repealed; and](#)

[Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2028 Business Meeting.](#)

It was seconded and, without debate, passed by a show of hands.

Mx. Alexandre then noted that the Hugo Awards need a Best Game category to recognize the incredible amount of spectacular and innovative storytelling being done in that medium. They noted that the viability for video games was amply demonstrated in 2021 with 40% participation in the final round. Nominations were comparable to Best Dramatic Presentation: Short Form category, while outperforming many established categories, such as Best Graphic Story and most of the artist, editor, and fan categories that our community acknowledges and values. The finalists included a range of titles, half of them independent. The voter packet was successful, and Hades, an independent,

affordable, cross-platform game, won the award. They noted that the line between digital and analog is increasingly blurry. A medium-neutral games and interactive works category would not only futureproof the category and ease the burden on Hugo administrators, but would also give a wider range of works a better chance at the recognition they deserve. With 4 years of research and feedback from the community, the Games Hugo campaign has repeatedly demonstrated its viability in terms of time, finances, ability, and accepted community practice, and this research, publicly available at gameshugo.com, addresses every question and concern from the community.

Rafe Richards (he/him) said we probably all agree that there are too many awards. The problem is that we can't agree on which ones should go, and unless one does he could not support a new award.

A motion was made and seconded to call the question and end debate. By a show of hands, debate was closed.

By a show of hands, the amendment passed, as amended, and will be passed on to Chengdu for ratification.

F.5 Short Title: Fan vs. Pro

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by **adding** and **removing** text as follows:

~~**3.2.11: 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.**~~ A professional publication is a publication produced by professional activity. Any category including language pertaining to non-professional or professional activity will be understood to use the definitions in 3.2.X and 3.2.Y.

3.2.X: Professional activity shall be that which was undertaken with the expectation of sale or other direct profit (by the creator or any co-creators), or which can only be accessed after a payment is made (other than incidental fees, e.g., convention membership fees).

3.2.Y: Non-professional activity shall be that which was not undertaken with the expectation of sale or other direct profit (by the creator or any co-creators), and which can be accessed in a full and final version without any payment.

3.2.Z: All activity shall be considered either Professional or Non-Professional. In cases where there is some doubt as to which category applies to a given work or activity, the will of the nominators should be

considered, as should the greater need to protect fan (non-professional) activity against professional activity than the reverse.

3.3.13: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available ~~non-professional~~ periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects ~~which~~ that does not provide, and is not owned by an entity that provides, at least a quarter of the income of at least one person, by the close of the previous calendar year and that 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,

Proposed by: The Hugo Awards Study Committee

Commentary: This matter is discussed at length in the report of the Hugo Award Study Committee, but the Committee in general felt that the lack of a clear (and consistent) definition of Fan vs Professional in the Constitution was problematic both for nominators and, potentially, for Hugo Administrators. This amendment seeks to establish a uniform set of boundaries between the two general categories of content, as well as to ensure that no “gap” emerges where something is considered Fan in one sense, Professional in another sense, and therefore not eligible in either category.

Discussion: Friday: Before the presiding officer could set a time limit, Terry Neill (she/her) moved to postpone this motion indefinitely. This generated an automatic debate time of 4 minutes and required a two-thirds (2/3) vote in favor of postponement in order to pass.

Terry commended the Hugo Award Study Committee (“HASC”) but felt this motion needed more work.

Cliff Dunn (he/him) objected to killing the motion. The HASC specifically wanted feedback from the business meeting before proceeding rather than continuing without feedback. That was the sole reason for bringing it up.

Dave McCarty (he/him) commended the committee for wanting feedback, but felt that trying to get a motion perfected inside of the business meeting was a losing proposition. He felt the motion should be postponed and worked outside the meeting.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) wrote the motion and said there were great difficulties resolving issues that might not align with WSFS as a whole. If it was not to be discussed at the business meeting, how could the HASC move forward and align other motions with WSFS interests.

KJ/owlmoose (she/her) suggested the business meeting was not the appropriate venue for this discussion since it’s not very accessible to people. She felt there are many others who

would be affected by this motion and are not able to contribute to the discussion. She also believed there are better ways for the HASC to reach out to artists, semiprofessionals and others than at the business meeting.

Elsbeth Kovir (she/her) agreed that the business meeting wasn't the right venue to talk about this issue, but it was the only place to get a sense of what is going on. Though more people need to talk about it, this was the easiest way to discuss the issue.

Alex Acks (they/them) asked if it were possible to amend the motion to debate the issue without voting on it. The presiding officer ruled that that was currently out of order. Should the business meeting decide to not postpone this motion indefinitely, it could be debated with an option to not vote for the motion once it's been debated. Then the committee could come back next year with another motion.

Mr. Dunn asked if a motion to refer to committee was in order, but the Presiding Officer ruled it out of order because the current motion was to suspend indefinitely. It could be referred to a committee to report back at the main meeting after the motion to suspend was completed.

With no time remaining, the question of postponing the motion indefinitely was called, but failed to achieve a two-thirds (2/3) vote.

Debate was then set at 30 minutes.

Monday: On Monday, Cliff Dunn made a motion to refer this motion to a Committee of the Whole ("COTW") for no more than 15 minutes, to be chaired by the Deputy Presiding Officer, to provide content-based feedback on this motion, such that after the COTW rose and reported, the item could then be referred to a committee to report back at Chengdu with some direction as to how to approach the item. This was seconded and agreed to by a show of hands. See [Appendix G](#) for the minutes of that session.

Their report was to refer F.5 to same committee as F.6, with the following instructions: (a) to consider NOT defining fan vs. pro based on an expectation that an item would be for sale or not for sale, but perhaps based on first usage or presentation; (b) to consider whether a global definition of fan vs. pro is necessary or whether it is preferable to have a category-by-category definition; (c) to consider that things have multiple uses over its life, such as fan art or fan writing, and later sales do not disqualify them from being fannish; things can be both fan and pro; (d) to consider the distinction between collecting money for expenses related to the work vs. for the benefit of the creator, and (e) to ensure that all activity be defined either fan and/or pro (*i.e.*, all works be defined as fan, or pro, or both fan and pro, but that no work should be considered neither). Kent Bloom made a motion against referring F.5 to the F.6 committee. He said that many things had changed in the science fiction community since 1983, when we first started debating fan versus pro. Mr. Bloom felt that the internet has made the definition of fan vs. pro obsolete, and that things like Patreon had rendered it impossible to decide if someone was an amateur or

professional (in terms of monetary remuneration). He thought we should wait a few years and see what comes out of the new artwork definition.

Rafe Richards asked if there was anything in the proposed instructions to prevent the F.6 committee from coming back with Mr. Bloom's recommendations. The presiding officer believed that Mr. Bloom was asking for no further action on F.5, whether from a committee or otherwise, and that theoretically the committee could take F.5 and throw it in the trash can if they want to.

A motion was made to call the question, and it was seconded. There was no objection to calling the question.

By a show of hands, F.5 was then referred to the same committee as F.6 (chaired by Sara Felix, with Lisa Hertel as deputy chair), with the instructions as included in the report of the COTW.

F.6 Short Title: Clearing Up the Artist Categories Forever (No, Really, We Swear It This Time!)

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding and removing text as follows:

3.3.12: Best Professional Artist. ~~An illustrator whose work has appeared in a professional publication in the field of science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year.~~ One or more collaborators on a body of work first displayed during the previous calendar year and created as i) work for hire, ii) on paid commission, or iii) for sale (either directly or via a paywall-like structure).

3.3.17: Best Fan Artist. ~~An artist or cartoonist whose work has appeared through publication in semiprozines or fanzines or through other public, non-professional, display (including at a convention or conventions, posting on the internet, in online or print on-demand shops, or in another setting not requiring a fee to see the image in full resolution) during the previous calendar year.~~ One or more collaborators on a body of work first displayed during the previous calendar year in a fashion that did not qualify for Best Professional Artist, i.e., neither work for hire, nor commissioned for pay, nor for sale.

3.10.2: In the Best Professional Artist ~~category~~ and Best Fan Artist categories, the acceptance should include citations of at least three (3) works ~~first published~~ that were first displayed in the eligible year.

Proposed by: The Hugo Awards Study Committee

Commentary: It has been clear for some time that the current definitions of Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist in the WSFS Constitution (Sections 3.3.12 and

3.3.17) do not reflect the reality of how both professional and fannish art is produced and consumed today. Administrators have repeatedly been faced with dilemmas regarding artists who have been nominated by voters but turn out not to be eligible under the rather strict limitations prescribed by the rules.

Indeed, the Hugo Awards Study Committee was originally proposed in 2017 to address this single issue, with other areas added to its remit by amendment at that year's WSFS Business Meeting. A lengthy discussion at the 2018 Business Meeting referred the issue back to the Hugo Awards Study Committee, which has however made no further proposals until now. Separately, the Best Fan Artist definition was clarified and broadened by an amendment ratified in 2021, but the subcommittee felt that there was still room for improvement.

The subcommittee briefly considered, but rapidly rejected, the idea of merging the two categories into a single "Best Artist" award. There was consensus that recognition of fan activity, including art, is core to the Hugo Awards, and that professional art continues to be sufficiently important to the genre community to justify a separate award.

There was also a clear consensus that the pool of potential nominees in the Best Professional Artist category needs to be widened –the current definition effectively restricts eligibility to illustrators of magazines and book covers – but in a way that does not risk potential Best Fan Artist nominees discovering that they have been deemed to be professional by a quirk of the rules. Much fannish art is sold, after all.

The subcommittee discussed this dilemma at some length, and also touched on the inclusion of art other than images in Best Professional Artist, the requirement for artists to provide proof of eligibility to administrators (which under current rules applies to Best Professional Artist but not Best Fan Artist), and whether or not groups of artists should be eligible.

Ultimately the subcommittee decided that eligibility for both categories should be decided by the existence (or not) of a qualifying body of work by the creators in the previous year – i.e., someone who has produced sufficient professional art should be eligible in Best Professional Artist, and someone who has produced sufficient fannish art should be eligible in Best Fan Artist.

This leaves open the possibility that a nominee might qualify in both categories, but subcommittee members were prepared to live with that; after all, the very first winner of the Best Fan Artist award, Jack Gaughan, also won Best Professional Artist in the same year (1967).

Discussion: Friday: Before the Presiding Officer could set a time limit, Kate Secor (she/her) moved to postpone this motion definitely until after the site selection business is completed at the Sunday session of the meeting. Martin Pyne move to amend this so that this item of business would come after both the site selection and Item F.5 (should F.5

not be handled before Sunday) in order to simply things and to keep the agenda in order. This, too, was seconded. By a show of hands, the motion to amend passed.

Kate Secor then explained that the person who spearheaded this motion through the Hugo Award Study Committee is Jewish and would prefer not to have to do business on Saturday. No one spoke against the motion, and the vote was taken. By a show of hands the motion to postpone definitely as amended passed.

Debate time was set at 20 minutes.

Sunday: A motion was made and seconded to refer F.5 and F.6 to a Committee of the Whole (“COTW”) for a period of ten minutes to resolve a conflict between them.

Andrew Adams (he/him) felt that while the two motions were not as closely joined as F.1 and F.2, he felt there was sufficient overlap. Therefore it would be best to hash things out before proceeding further.

Martin Pyne (he/him) did not believe the two motions were tightly linked and that the business meeting could dispense with the art categories expeditiously (F.6) without bringing in F.5, which was more controversial and had widespread changes. He believed F.5 would have to be referred to a committee anyway.

Warren Buff felt the previous COTW was pretty efficient, and therefore these F.5 and F.6 should be referred to a second one.

Ira Alexandre (they/them) said that in the spirit that these two proposals were separately proposed, they believed that they should be discussed separately.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) was the drafter of F.5 and worked on F.6. He felt that while there were distinctions between the two motions, there were specific points central to the controversy between the two. Therefore he believed it was important to resolve those and determine the opinion of the business meeting regarding those issues in a way that would be common to both of them before dealing with either of the motions. Thus, he favored returning to a COTW to discuss those issues.

Terri Ash (she/her) said that as constructed, F.6 contained no overarching consequences for any other Hugo Award category. Therefore attempting to resolve both of them at once would not be expeditious and could wind up possibly not getting to any effective business at all.

The presiding officer then put the question of convening a COTW to the business meeting for a period of ten minutes, expandable by the COTW if they wished. By a show of hands, the motion failed.

Ms. Ash then spoke in favor of F.6 and said the artist categories have been so fundamentally devoted to publishing for so long that the community of those considered professional artists is very small and does not reflect the current state of science fiction

and fantasy art as it is currently exhibited, produced, and sold. She said “sold” was the operative word. Fan artists are not necessarily making fanzine covers or convention souvenir book covers. They are putting their work out in the world to sell it and make money. That means that they should be given the grace to have their art considered as professional, just like someone who has had the luck to get noticed by a publisher and have their work on a book cover or a magazine cover. DAW, for example, isn’t coming to the art show to find new people, and it is much harder to break into that market than it’s ever been.

Lisa Hertel (she/her) objected to the “for sale” portion of the motion. my objection is the for sale part of this. She supports herself as an artist, but even non-professional artists come to art shows and put their work up for sale. Their prices may not be very high; they certainly are not making a living by it. Even Ms. Hertel, a professional artist isn’t making a living by her art. She asked that the term “for sale” be stricken from the end of both sections, which was seconded. If passed, the amendment would now read:

3.3.12: Best Professional Artist. ~~An illustrator whose work has appeared in a professional publication in the field of science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year.~~ One or more collaborators on a body of work first displayed during the previous calendar year and created as i) work for hire or ii) on paid commission.

3.3.17: Best Fan Artist. ~~An artist or cartoonist whose work has appeared through publication in semiprozines or fanzines or through other public, non-professional, display (including at a convention or conventions, posting on the internet, in online or print-on-demand shops, or in another setting not requiring a fee to see the image in full-resolution) during the previous calendar year.~~ One or more collaborators on a body of work first displayed during the previous calendar year in a fashion that did not qualify for Best Professional Artist, i.e., neither work for hire, nor commissioned for pay.

Debate on the amended motion was set at 5 minutes. Ms. Ash’s speech above was considered the speed in favor.

Terry Karney (he/him) noted that if “for sale” were stricken from the amendment, it effectively keeps the status quo.

Dave McCarty also spoke against the amended motion. He said all work for sale is professional sale, whether it’s for \$1 or \$10, but fan art is free. People who think someone is a fan artist or a professional artist are misleading themselves. Fan art is an activity of making something for free. If it’s not for sale, it’s fan art. He felt that removing “for sale” was not well intentioned.

Diana Castillo (she/her) spoke in favor. She felt the previous speaker had an old understanding of what fan art is. Fan artists bring their own passion, but they have the reality of needing to pay their rent, food, supplies, etc. Eliminating the “for sale”

acknowledges these realities and brings this motion into reality and makes it so that someone who might be creating fan art of their favorite show can offer prints for sale and still be seen as a fan artist and not be lumped into the professional artist category. She urged passage of the amendment.

Seth Breidbart (he/him/himself/his/his) asked if Phil Folio's work is fan art; he makes his living from it, but it is not a work for hire or a paid commission.

Kate Secor (she/her) noted that this amendment is pushed by a misunderstanding and explained that one can be both a fan artist and a professional artist at the same time. We refer to fan artist and professional artist, but what is really meant is the body of work. These rules do not one's ability to be both. The intent is not to define a person; it's to define a body of work produced by one or more people.

Alex Acks (they/them) said this is a definition problem. Speaking as a millennial, they said their understanding of fan artist is "I make art of other people's intellectual property ('IP')." But if we are shifting more to that focus on the understanding that fan art is art that you are making of somebody else's IP, you are getting into a very sticky place because fan artists and fan writers of that definition live in a space where they are not supposed to be making money off it and can be sued or killed by the "Mouse assassins". She added that it is dangerous to focus on people making money off others' IP due to patent/trademark laws.

Ben Yalow (he/him) had the last word as time expired: "This amendment moves John Picacio completely out of professional artist . . ."

The motion to amend failed by a show of hands.

Returning to the original motion, Richard Fife (he/him) said this was a great definition between fan art and professional art, because a fan artist should not be making money off of their works.

KJ/owlmoose (she/her) said if striking the words "for sale" makes it such that artists who are so obviously professional artists, such as Phil Foglio and John Picacio, don't meet the definition of professional artist, then it is a bad definition. It's both too exclusive and too broad, and she made a motion to send the amendment back to a committee to report back next year.

The presiding officer restated the motion to refer to a committee with artists (presumably those who have already commented on this amendment); it was seconded.

Debate time was set at 5 minutes.

Andrew Adams (he/him) spoke in favor of referring to committee. This motion is not a final solution since there are different generations and different communities who have come into Worldcon with different perceptions of what the words pro and fan mean. This is not the final solution regardless of the name of the underlying motion. The current

proposal will meet one set of definitions of this; it will not meet another set of definitions. As a conrunner, he has had people who give their art to conventions for their use, freely, and then they put the original art in the art show, where it is sold. They are fan artists primarily covering the costs involved in making that art and donating it to fandom. Mr. Adams did not like the current definition necessarily, but he did not think this new one would solve it for all the different groups that we need to satisfy. While there might not be a perfect solution, he thought we still need further debate and consultation with a very wide range of fan and pro artists.

Kate Secor (she/her) believed there is fan art that is not using others' IP. You can have independent IP fan art. The point of fan art is you did it for free. It is not about what is in it; it is not about the content. The definitions of the Hugo Awards have all been very, very careful to stay away from content-based definitions. It can't get much simpler than: did you do it with the expectation you were going to be paid or with the expectation to tell people it was cool? There are an enormous amount of artists not in any category. Ms. Secor believed this current version solved problems that the business meeting had not even touched on. What do you do with people who aren't illustrators? She believed holding it up, because some people didn't believe in the existence of fan art for original IP was little silly.

Joni Brill Dashoff (she/her), vice president of the Association of Science Fiction and Fantasy Artists ("ASFA"), said that while this amendment separates art from being tied to an art show, it does not give a difference between Sara Felix, Lisa Hertel, and John Picacio, which is why she was in favor of sending the motion back to a committee.

Dave Wallace (he/him) asked if it were possible for the committee to report back in 2024 rather than 2023, but the presiding officer said that was not possible. It would have to be report back saying it didn't do anything, and then it would have to be reconstituted to report back in 2024.

Kevin Standlee moved to call the question, and was seconded. The motion to end debate was then adopted on a vote by show of hands. Then, by serpentine vote, with 49 in favor and 36 against, the amendment was referred to a committee to be chaired by Sara Felix and deputy chaired by Lisa Hertel (as appointed by the presiding officer) to report back at Chengdu.

F.7 Short Title: One Rocket Per Customer, Please!

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by [adding](#) and [removing](#) text as follows:

3.3.5: 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 3.3.5.~~ No series may be nominated that has previously won under Section 3.3.5 nor may any series containing an individual installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format. No series may appear on the ballot in the same year as any of its installments.

Proposed by: The Hugo Awards Study Committee

Commentary: This is the first of two not-mutually-exclusive amendments regarding Best Series that the Committee has put forward. The more sweeping of the two, this amendment would bar any series from winning the Hugo Award for Best Series if any installment had previously won another award.

The main argument for such a change is that the intent of the Best Series award should be to reward works that are primarily notable for their impact *as a series*. If a work in a series has already won a Hugo Award, then clearly that work has impact on its own. There are many fine series which could not, perhaps even should not, be nominated in their individual parts, but which are clearly Hugo-worthy as a whole. Not having this rule means that we have several series that have won multiple awards, while excellent series that are not going to win on their own have either not made the ballot or (prior to the existence of Best Series) have a late work in the series nominated as a clear attempt to award the series as a whole. (There have been several recent examples of this. . .)

While this amendment seems like a major restriction, what it actually accomplishes is to allow even more works to be recognized on the Hugo Award ballot, and to recognize that the work of writing a Hugo-worthy series is a different endeavor than writing Hugo-worthy installments, even multiple times.

Discussion: Friday: Before the Presiding Officer could set a time limit, Terry Neill (she/her) moved to postpone this motion indefinitely. This generated an automatic debate time of 4 minutes and required a two-thirds (2/3) vote in favor of postponement in order to pass.

Ms. Neill felt it was ridiculous that if any tiny short story at some point won a Hugo Award and later was turned into a series, the series would not be eligible for the Best Series Hugo Award.

Kate Secor (she/her) noted that the point of the Best Series was to give Hugo Awards to works that were worthy as a series and that this amendment was a cleanup to make sure that works that are capable of winning Hugo Awards are not double-dipping. She felt it was worth talking about whether the rule in practice had moved away from its original intent.

Nicholas Whyte (he/him), who has been a several-times Hugo Award administrator, felt that this motion would penalize those series that are too popular or too long-lasting. It

would override voters' wishes and make the administrators' lives much more difficult, and therefore the motion shouldn't be considered.

Dave McCarty (he/him) spoke in favor of considering the amendment. Hugo Award administrators' opinions vary on what's difficult for them. Additionally, he believed that that a work being eligible for two awards in the same year (*e.g.*, Best Novel and Best Series) went against the ethos that have been built into the Hugo Awards.

Ben Yalow (he/him) spoke against postponing. While he felt this amendment was too draconian, he believed it should be debated and then sent back to committee.

Cassy Beach (she/her) felt it was against the spirit of the Worldcon to tie the hands of the voters, and we did not need something so drastic.

Terri Ash (she/her) noted that WSFS writes and makes the rules. The HASC can't keep going without knowing what WSFS wants in order for discussion to go forward.⁸

Ms. Secor raised a point of order: what might be done with this kind of motion should Item C.1 (Making Business Meeting Feedback Possible) be approved to allow debate without a motion for a constitutional amendment? How would the business meeting go about converting items such as this one should Item C.1 pass? The Presiding Officer noted that the rules would have to be suspended to allow Item C.1 to take effect immediately. Then the provisions outlined in C.1 would allow debate without requiring passage of the motion.

The question of postponing indefinitely was then taken up and failed to acquire a two-thirds (2/3) vote in the affirmative.

Andrew Adams (he/him) then made a motion to refer the motion back to a committee to report back at the main meeting, which was seconded. The presiding office named Cliff Dunn to head the new Hugo Awards Study Committee.

Carl Fink asked what the committee needed to discuss and made a motion to give the committee specific instructions. The Presiding Officer noted that that would be an amendment to the motion to refer to committee. But the current motion was just to refer it to a committee, which could do what they wanted with it. However, it would be in order for someone to make a motion to amend to refer to committee to have specific instructions.

Ms. Neill then made a motion, which was seconded, for the new committee to discuss striking the text "any series containing an individual installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format."⁹

⁸ The debate to postpone F.7 indefinitely occurred prior to the debate that resulted in the discontinuation of the Hugo Award Study Committee ("HASC").

⁹ The word "nor" should have been included at the beginning of the deleted material.

Mr. Adams felt it was clear that this motion was made with reservations because they felt they needed feedback from the meeting. They weren't necessarily expecting it to go through without amendments or even to go through this year. But giving them one specific thing to talk about was too limiting. He felt anyone wishing to discuss this amendment further should join the new committee.

Rafe Richards (he/him) asked if this motion to amend was in order, and the Parliamentarian ruled it was.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) spoke in favor of giving specific instructions to the new committee. She said the HASC had discussed this for a year, and without giving them any guidance they would only come back with the same thing.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) felt that this was terrible instruction. There was a general sense from the room that the original motion was too draconian. However, removing the above phrase would remove all distinction between F.7 and F.8. As such, there is the general idea that the amendment should be less draconian. Give the committee its head and let them come up with something.

Martin Pyne (he/him) said that if we want to make the change as noted above, we should defeat the motion to refer to committee and vote on the revised amendment.

Joni Brill Dashoff (she/her) noted that she didn't have time to participate in a separate committee meeting and couldn't we just handle this at first the main meeting.

By a show of hands, the amended motion to give the committee specific instruction to debate the text "any series containing an individual installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format." failed.

By a show of hands, the original motion to refer F.7 to committee to report back on Saturday without specific instructions also failed.

Ben Yalow (he/him) then moved to amend the original motion by striking the text previously noted in the original amendment, which was seconded. The Presiding Officer noted that since this motion was coming up for first passage and not ratification, it was in order.

Rafe Richard (he/him) noted that if the amendment passed, it would give the committee a very clear idea as to what WSFS wants.

Ms. Secor pointed out that the effect of this amendment would be to make F.7 the same as F.8.

Ms. Lurie noted that F.7 is similar, but not identical, to F.8.

Mr. Kronengold said if we're going to make the motion less draconian, the obvious way to do it is to not count the length of the things previously won or that are currently nominated against the series. This isn't that, and we shouldn't do it.

Elsbeth Kovir spoke against the motion to amend because the committee might do it.

By a show of hands, the motion to amend F.7 by striking the text “[nor] may any series containing an individual installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format.” failed.

Debate was then set at 10 minutes.

Monday: Andrew Adams (he/him) moved to suspend the rules and refer both F.7 and F.8 together to a committee as a whole. This was seconded, and the presiding officer set a 15 minute time limit. However, upon a show of hands, the motion to suspend the rules failed.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) asked if the motion could be postponed indefinitely, but that motion is only in order during the preliminary business meeting session.

Kate Secor (she/her) proposed an amendment to the motion to add the phrase “. . . in the last ten (10) years” at the end of “. . . in its nominated format. . . .” as shown below (highlighted only for visual enhancement).

3.3.5: 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 3.3.5.~~ No series may be nominated that has previously won under Section 3.3.5 nor may any series containing an individual installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format in the last ten (10) years. No series may appear on the ballot in the same year as any of its installments.

The presiding officer noted the ramifications of this amendment were such that if a short story in *The Wayward Children* series had won a Hugo Award ten years ago, Seanan McGuire would not have been eligible to be nominated this year in the Best Series category.

Ms. Secor noted that as originally proposed the amendment was too stringent. A series can have a larger impact than one of its components. The intent of the original motion was to reward those works that might not be nominated as individual pieces. Under this rule, a work that won a Hugo Award 20 years earlier would make the series of which it was a part completely ineligible. Therefore, Ms. Secor wanted to insert a restriction on how far apart the first Hugo Award win and its Best Series equivalent must be while allowing us to recognize that an aggregate work has a different skill level, different style and a different way of impacting people from an individual work on its own.

Lisa Hayes (she/her) spoke against this amendment. She did not want to put any additional time restrictions on such works, and she gave a scenario: an author could write

a really good series that is nominated this year. Next year the author adds another piece that moves it in a totally different direction and is ground breaking. Fans might want to nominate that as well, but would not be able to.

Terry Neill (she/her) gave s specific example: She cited Mary Robinette's *Lady Astronaut* short story, which was written in 2012 and won a Hugo Award in 2014. If this amendment had been in effect at that time, it would have disqualified the later series that Mary Robinette might not have even know she was going to write. Therefore she opposed any restrictions.

Brandon O'Brien (he/him) noted that there is a difference in acknowledging the value of an individual work in a series version versus what it does as part of a collected work, and he trusted nominators to be capable of engaging with works on their own terms and, as a result, trust what is nominated and what eventually wins.

The question was called and seconded on the amendment to the original motion, and by a show of hands, the amendment passed.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) then moved a motion by substitution as shown below.

3.3.5: 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 3.3.5.~~ No series may be nominated that has previously won under Section 3.3.5, nor shall any individual written installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format be counted toward the length of the series for this award. No series may appear on the ballot in the same year as any of its installments.

Mr. Kronengold said that rather than disqualifying a work because a component has won in the past ten years, this motion requires that a component that has already won a Hugo Award not be counted in the word count for Best Series eligibility. He agreed that a series is a work different from its installments; however, if enough of the series had been nominated for the award and won the award, we do not need to give it a further award for series. There isn't a series left that hasn't been rewarded.

Tammy Coxen (she/her), a former Hugo Award administrator, noted that this category is very difficult to administer in the first place, and this amendment would only complicate it more. There is likely to be mistakes, and then the internet would fall on our heads.

The question was then called and seconded on the amendment by substitution. By a show of hands, the motion to amend by substitution failed.

Debate then began on the underlying motion.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) believed that the Best Series category was irretrievably broken and that the voters view this category differently from the business meeting. The things that had been previously nominated and won had previous installments that were nominated and won. The people who are voting do not believe the category to be what we believe it to be, and this will make it even worse.

Ron Oakes (he/him) made a motion to refer F.7 to a committee to consider the inclusion of previously nominated-and-won works and also to consider the difference between series that contain complete stories and series that are continuing the same story (*e.g.*, trilogies), and to report back at Chengdu. He believed this partially affects what is and is not being nominated. The motion was seconded.

The presiding officer noted that instructions are not demands; a committee can consider what we recommend, but they can come back with whatever they want.

Linda Deneroff (she/her) spoke against referring to a committee. She noted that this motion originally came from a committee, and we should vote it down if we do not like it.

A motion was made to call all pending questions. The presiding officer explicated that this meant the business meeting would first vote on the motion to refer to committee. If that motion were to fail, the business meeting would then vote on the underlying motion. If the motion to refer to committee were to pass, the underlying motion goes to committee.

By a show of hands, the motion to refer the underlying motion to committee to report back at Chengdu failed.

Then, by a show of hands, the underlying motion itself was defeated.

F.8 Short Title: A Work, By Any Other Name . . .

Moved, to amend the WSFS Constitution by adding and ~~removing~~ text as follows:

3.2.9: ~~No work shall appear in more than one category on the final Award ballot.~~ Unless otherwise expressly provided for, no content shall be placed on the ballot more than once in a given year in whole or in part, except that (1) a periodical publication shall not be rendered ineligible by virtue of a story published within that does not constitute the majority of its content that year; and (2) written works and audio or audio-visual adaptations of those works shall be considered inherently distinct.

Proposed by: The Hugo Awards Study Committee

Commentary: This is the second of two not-mutually-exclusive amendments regarding Best Series that the Committee has put forward. The less sweeping of the two, this amendment is aimed at barring any series from appearing on the final ballot for the Hugo Award for Best Series only in a year where an installment for that series also appears on the final ballot. It was, however, drawn more broadly in order to also restrict (for example) a short story appearing in the same year that a fix-up novel containing such a story was published. Thus, “content” was used in lieu of “work”.

Exceptions were carved out to avoid interactions between, for example, TV shows and novels that might otherwise create difficult judgment calls on eligibility for the Hugo Administrator in a given year, as well as in recognition of the fundamental differences between various presentation formats. An exception was also drawn in order to avoid unintentionally barring a magazine that had published a given story (in part or in whole) from being nominated (or to create a “standoff” between the story and the publication for eligibility). In both cases, in addition to acknowledging the different natures of the content in question, the Committee sought to avoid a situation where two different people or groups would have to decide who got to appear on the ballot (as opposed to the situation with a TV series where, with only two episodes permitted on the final ballot, the individuals in charge of the show can be reasonably expected to make such a decision).

The amendment also contains language to allow for future changes to categories and new categories to have a different intent than that proposed by this amendment, so as to “future-proof” this change. Detailed arguments for and against this proposal can be found in the report of the Hugo Award Study Committee.

Discussion: Friday: Rafe Richards (he/him) moved to postpone this motion indefinitely. This generated an automatic debate time of 4 minutes and required a two-thirds (2/3) vote in favor of postponement to pass.

Mr. Richards felt this motion would limit what the voters could nominate even more so than the previous amendment. He believed it is so obviously wrong, it did not merit consideration.

Dave Hook (he/him), a member of the HASC, spoke against the motion to suspend indefinitely. Although two or three people had strong feelings, he had not heard any clear direction of the overall purpose or the will of the business meeting. Therefore he felt we should have this discussion, regardless of the results.

Ben Yalow (he/him) pointed out that if this motion [F.8] were postponed indefinitely, then the business meeting could move to amend by substitution F.7, take the text from F.8 and add it to F.7, and debate everything at once.

Martin Pyne (he/him) moved to call the question, and was seconded. There were no objections. Then by a show of hands, the motion to postpone indefinitely failed.

Debate was set at 20 minutes.

Monday: Joshua Kronengold (he/him) said this motion was fundamentally different from F.7. There is a long-standing principle that a given single item should not be up for multiple Hugo Awards in the same year. We do this for Best Presentation, where a single item cannot be up for long form and short form at the same time, no matter how much nominators may want to. Similarly we don't allow the same work to be up among multiple categories, even if it is close enough that it could be in one or the other, or both. Therefore, we should not allow a work and another work that is a larger version of the first work, whether for Best Series or not, to be up for an award at the same time. The nominators rely on us to make restrictions so that the result is good. We don't give ten Hugo Awards without categories because for the purpose of the awards, we make restrictions, and we should make this one.

Terry Neill (she/her) noted that it has been the sense of the body in the past that a shorter work is a different work from a longer work. A short story is a different work from a series, and there is no reason why one creator cannot have two different works on the same ballot.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) said that this motion did not say a series cannot have an installment also nominated. It says a single work cannot appear in two places on the ballot.

Nicholas Whyte (he/him) said we have the possibility of restricting the choices made by voters and telling them they've got it wrong and the business meeting has got it right, or we can accept what voters actually vote for rather than putting unnecessary restrictions on them. He believed Ms. Lurie made a very good point: this amendment may not change the status quo at all. He added that Best Series cannot be about recognizing otherwise forgotten works: The Hugo Awards are a popularity contest, and the things that are the most popular should win.

Dave Hook (he him) said he didn't have deep knowledge of how all of these pieces interact, but he wanted to remind the members that when the Best Series award was re-ratified at DisCon III, it was a 35 30 vote, so there were some concerns about how Best Series was working. He believed that this particular motion would help and make us able to move forward with improving the Best Series Hugo Award, which he felt did need some improvement. Clearly it is very popular. He did not feel that the 35 to 30 vote was a ringing endorsement of how the award worked.

The question was called and seconded. Others still wished to speak, but by a show of hands, the debate was closed.

By serpentine vote, with 23 in favor and 32 opposed, the underlying motion failed.

G. ELECTION RESULTS

G.1 Worldcon 2024

The results of the voting for the 2023 Worldcon were provided by Site Selection Administrator, Warren Buff. The electronic voting was very successful; 323 people voted electronically. He announced the results as follows:

Site	Online & Mail In	Friday	Saturday	Total	Winner
Glasgow	303	281	192	776	WINNER
Glasgow Scotch Store					
Moomin Valley	3			3	
Caribou, Maine		2		2	
XERPS in 2010			2	2	
Alpha Centauri	1			1	
Secundus	1			1	
Boston in Christmas (because a winter Worldcon was so much fun last year . . .)	1			1	
St. Petersburg	1			1	
Any country with an Acceptable Human Rights Record	1			1	
Malmö, Sweden	1			1	
Reykjavik in 2042	1			1	
Minneapolis in 73	1			1	
Wonderland	1			1	
Peggy Rae's House	1			1	
Boseman, MT (to celebrate Zefram Cochrane's historic flight)	1			1	
Chamblin Bookmine in 2024	1			1	
Stargate Command in 2024	1			1	
Dark Brandon's Top Secret Lair	1			1	
Derry	1			1	
Davis Base, Antarctica	1			1	
Yngvi is a Louse!	1			1	
Level 15 Illusion		1		1	
Grantville, WV		1		1	
Fabulous Bungalow Blimp			1	1	
Glasgow Scotch Store			1	1	
None of the Above	0			0	
Spoiled	0	0	0	0	

Site	Online & Mail In	Friday	Saturday	Total	Winner
Total With Preference	323	285	194	802	
Needed to Elect (Majority)				402	
No Preference	1	3	3	7	
Total Valid Votes	324	288	197	809	

Glasgow won on the first ballot with a total of 809 valid votes cast, of which 802 expressed a preference. The presiding officer made a motion to destroy the ballots, which was seconded and passed without objection.

Esther McCollum Stewart, the chair of Glasgow 2024, A Worldcon for Our Future, first thanked Vincent Docherty and Colin Harris, who chaired the prior two Glasgow Worldcons. The GOHs will be (in alphabetical order) are Chris Baker, Claire Brialey and Mark Plummer, Ken Macleod, Nnedi Okorafor, and Terri Windling. Additional guests will be announced later. The dates for Glasgow 2024 are August 8-12, 2024, which is close to the end of the Edinburgh Festival. The official tartan is Landing Zone.

PRO was distributed. A Mark Protection Committee member had not yet been appointed.¹⁰

John Pomeranz (he/him) announced that Glasgow 2024 will receive a passalong check from DisCon III for \$27,000.

G.2 NASFiC 2023

The results of the voting for the 2023 NASFiC were provided by Site Selection Administrator, Warren Buff. Again, the electronic voting was very successful; 103 people voted electronically.

Site	Online & Mail In	Friday	Saturday	Total	Winner
Winnipeg	89	115	108	312	WINNER
Orlando	6	5	2	13	
Minneapolis in 73	1			1	
Random Closet of a Resort with a Whole Bunch of Top Secret Documents That Shouldn't Be There	1			1	
Tonopah, NV	1			1	
Any State or Province with an Acceptable Human Rights Record	1			1	

¹⁰ Subsequently, Glasgow appointed Alissa Wales as its MPC representative.

Site	Online & Mail In	Friday	Saturday	Total	Winner
Hawley, PA	1			1	
Xerps	1			1	
Grantville, WV		1		1	
Fabulous Bungalow Blimp			1	1	
None of the Above	2	2		4	
Spoiled		3	1	4	
Total With Preference	103	123	111	341	
Needed to Elect (Majority)				171	
No Preference	1	1		2	
Total Valid Votes	104	127	112	343	

Winnipeg won on the first ballot with a total of 343 valid votes cast, of which 337 expressed a preference.¹¹ Again, the presiding officer made a motion to destroy the ballots, which was seconded and passed without objection.

The presiding officer then thanked the counters for both the 2023 NASFiC and the 2024 Worldcon site selections.

Linda Ross-Mansfield (she/her) began with her acknowledgement that Manitoba is located on Treaty 1 Territory and that Manitoba is located on the Treaty Territories and ancestral lands of the Anishinaabeg, Anishinewuk, Dakota Oyate, Denesuline and Nehethowuk Nations. Manitoba is located on the Homeland of the Red River Métis. Northern Manitoba includes lands that were and are the ancestral lands of the Inuit. We respect the spirit and intent of Treaties and Treaty Making and remain committed to working in partnership with First Nations, Inuit and Métis people in the spirit of truth, reconciliation and collaboration.

She then went on to announce that there will be eight guests of honor. Since one of them only confirmed that morning, there were only seven names listed on PR0. The eight guests of honor are Katherine Vermette, Julie E. Czerneda, Waubgeshig Rice, Nisi Shawl, John Mansfield, Philip John Currie, Lorna Toolis, and Tanya Huff.

The NASFiC will be known as Pemmi-con and will be held July 20-23, 2023.

Linda Ross-Mansfield will be the MPC representative.

¹¹ While the oral report stated that 337 voters had a preference, the count provided by the site selection administrator (as shown above) noted 341.

H. REPORTS FROM WORLDCONS AND BIDS

H.1 Seated Worldcon: Chengdu (2023)

The Chengdu 2023 gave a short slide show presentation. The dates are August 16-20, 2023, and the convention will be held at the Chengdu Century City New Convention. Progress Report 1 will be out shortly. Chen-Shi and Ben Yalow are the co-chairs of the convention. Chengdu is currently accessible by air connections from Beijing, Shanghai and Hong Kong, but they expect direct flights to be restored in the near future.

Ben Yalow (he/him) said he is currently reviewing the first progress report. Unless otherwise noted, Mr. Yalow responded to all questions. Dave Hook (he/him) asked if the convention had a backup plan if Chengdu had to shut down due to Covid. While Chengdu was recently in lockdown, it was one of the shortest in China. Chengdu is also currently planning to be wide open but also have a significant virtual program for people who couldn't attend the convention in person.

Brian Nisbet (he/him) asked if Chengdu could commit to electronic site selection or something similar. No decision had yet been made concerning electronic site selection. Chengdu is interested in auditing the vote at Chicon so they can figure out what is feasible, what complies with all the rules, and how it would integrate into their existing platforms and/or the new platform that, Mr. Yalow said, would be rolling out shortly.

Andrew Adams (he/him) asked if there will be help for people applying for visas and when it will become available. They hope to have something available in the near future, but it will link into whether they can get some government financial sponsorship of the convention. Mr. Yalow hopes that if the government is one of the sponsors, they will assist in finding ways for people obtain visas.

Colin Harris (he/him) asked if the venue was fully contracted for. The Chengdu convention has reached an agreement with the venue, but Chinese contracting practices are different from those in the West. So currently there is no contract, but there is a general agreement that that will be the venue.

Winton Matthews (he/him) asked what percentages of the program is planned to be in English only, Chinese and English, and Chinese only? A great deal of this will depend on sponsorship. However, Mr. Yalow witnessed a panel with four panelists, all speaking their own native languages – English, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean. Everyone, panelists and attendees, had plugs in their ears, and everyone hearing the simultaneous translations their native languages. Right now, no decision has been made as to what program streams will be in what languages.

Mark Richards (he/him) asked what arrangements were being made regarding sending out Hugo Award nomination forms, voting and site selection information. Chengdu has decided that everyone who voted or purchased an advance supporting membership is

automatically an attending member of Chengdu. They are working with DisCon III to deal with the transfer of various data and rolling out a registration platform. Mr. Yalow also thanked the Glasgow committee, which generously gave Chengdu the specifications for the same general construction of their registration database. While the general specification is identical, there are restrictions regarding moving computer code between China and many countries in the West.

Terri Ash (she/her) asked what the timeline was for getting the hotel and venue contracts so that members can make their travel and hotel arrangements. Chengdu is continuing to work on this. Travel arrangements were difficult for the Chengdu team to come to Chicago. They started in one city in China, flew to another, then flew to Seoul, then San Francisco and finally to Chicago. When Mr. Yalow flew home from Chengdu before the pandemic began, he was able to take the non-stop from Chengdu to San Francisco and then to his final destination. That flight doesn't exist anymore, but he expected that more international flights directly in and out of Chengdu will become available in the future, depending, of course, on the pandemic and the airline industry.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Perianne Lurie commended the business meeting for all its hard work.

Dave McCarty made a motion that when the meeting adjourned, it do so in the names of Roger Sims and Erle Korshak. There was no objection.

Perianne Lurie commended the staff for its hard work.

Kevin Standlee noted that this was Mr. Dashoff the Younger's second time at the head table. The first time he was in such a rush to end the meeting that there were no announcements. So, after six years, Mr. Standlee was able to present Jared Dashoff his personal gavel for chairing that first meeting. He also thanked Lisa Hayes for her hard work as videographer under extraordinary conditions.

Jared Dashoff also thanked the assistant videographer (Mr. Standlee) as well as Martin Pyne, who served as floor manager, and the CART operator, Jodie Eckard, for their hard work and service. He thanked Google, for its donation for paying for those cart services.

Elsbeth Kovir thanked everyone who attended the meeting.

Ben Yalow announced that next year's presiding officer will be Don Eastlake, with Kevin Standlee as deputy presiding office.

Todd Dashoff also commended his son, Jared, for his service.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Report of the Mark Protection Committee December 2021-August 2022

Membership and Structure

Members of the Mark Protection Committee (“MPC”) from August 2020 through December 2021 were as follows, with the expiration of membership listed in parentheses after their name: Judy Bemis (elected until 2023), Joni Dashoff (elected until 2023), Linda Deneroff (Secretary, elected until 2024), Cliff Dunn (appointed by DisCon III until 2023), Donald E. Eastlake III (elected until 2024), Dave McCarty (elected until 2024), Ron Oakes (appointed by NASFiC 2020 until 2022), Chris Rose (appointed by Chicon 8 until 2024), Chen Shi (appointed by Chengdu 2023 until 2025), Daniel Spector (appointed by CoNZeland until 2022), Kevin Standlee (Vice Chair, elected until 2022), Jo Van Ekeren (Chair, elected until 2022), Mike Willmoth (elected until 2023), and Ben Yalow (elected until 2022). Bruce Farr is a non-voting member appointed to the board of Worldcon Intellectual Property (“WIP”) since WIP requires at least one California resident as a director, and he is also Treasurer.

Worldcon Intellectual Property is a California public benefit/non-profit corporation (also recognized as a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt charity by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service) controlled by the MPC that holds the MPC’s bank account and WSFS’s service marks in the EU. The WIP Financial Report is appended at the end of this document. A report from the Hugo Awards Marketing Committee (“HAMC”) is included as an appendix to this report. The HAMC is responsible for managing the TheHugoAwards.org, Worldcon.org, NASFiC.org, and WSFS.org websites and social media accounts on Twitter and Facebook.

REPORT

With Chengdu seated as the 2023 Worldcon, Don Eastlake reported that the convention planned to cover most of its expenses through corporate sponsorships, and they requested a formal letter from the MPC stating that they (as Chengdu Worldcon 2023) have the right to host the event and make use of the Worldcon service marks and logos. Don felt the MPC should do this since some cultures place more importance on official certification and the like, and after some discussion consensus was reached on such a letter.

Later, in January, Kevin Standlee proposed spending money to ask Esther Horwich (our attorney) to develop a standard license agreement for Worldcons' use of the WSFS service marks. If we came up with a satisfactory document, we could then consider proposing that bids have to sign on to the agreement as one of the conditions of their

filing. (This would be in addition to the requirements of a facility contract and the other required documents.)

Such a contract would spell out how Worldcons (and Worldcon bids) could use the WSFS service marks and make it somewhat less likely that a Worldcon could make it look like they were selling direct sponsorship of the Hugo Awards (as opposed to the Hugo Awards Ceremony, which isn't the same thing) or other WSFS-reserved functions.

Kevin had suggested that such an agreement would be easier to create if all our U.S. marks were transferred to the Worldcon Intellectual Property entity; Don opposed this due to California law entanglements. He felt the legal status was clear: It is the World Science Fiction Society that licenses the marks. WIP is merely an agent of WSFS and is bound by anything done by the unincorporated association, and the MPC is the Executive Agent of WSFS for mark registration and protection purposes. Nothing came of this proposal.

That same month, Ira Alexandre pointed out that we needed to make a change in the Hugo Award Usage Guide, by changing Hugo Award Winner in the text (“The user agrees that the Hugo Award Winner Logo is proprietary to the **Hugo Award Winner** and that WSFS maintains all rights, title, and interest thereto including, without limitation, all intellectual property and other proprietary rights”) to **World Science Fiction Society**.

Also in January, Linda asked the MPC for clarification as to what verbiage the Worldcon Runners Guide should use since there are U.S. and European versions. The question arose because the current rules say that the MPC is supposed to tell Worldcons what the correct notice is. When we have one U.S. and one non-U.S. Worldcon, we should tell both of them to use the notice appropriate to their convention. We decided to go with the U.S. usage on the Worldcon Runners Guide website and also to add the Lodestar Award verbiage to both versions.

In February, Bruce Farr, on behalf of the MPC, acknowledged receipt of an MPC payment of \$4,338 from DisCon III.

In March, Kevin Standlee reported that our five-year anti-spam protection was ending. CleanTalk Anti-Spam quoted US\$63.77 for a five-year renewal, including a multi-year discount, or \$89.69 for a seven-year license (the longest license they have). This protection works, and the amount of junk we get went down to near zero once we added it to our website.

Anti-Spam Report for www.wsfs.org

Reporting period Mar 10 2022 - Mar 17 2022

Comments

Spam	Legitimate	Total
<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>

Contact enquiries

Spam	Legitimate	Total
<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>

Search Terms

Spam	Legitimate	Total
<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>33</u>

Spam FireWall

Spam	Legitimate	Total
<u>4 400</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>4 473</u>

Additionally, for the four websites we maintain, it would cost us \$40/year (\$10/site/year) from our service provider, Pair Networks, to update to SSL. We have had a small number of complaints about us not providing https: access, especially since we have “contact-us” forms on our site.

In April, JoVan Ekeren notified the MPC that our attorney, Esther Horwich, had contacted her regarding renewing our marks with the USPTO, and expressing concerns as to whether our registered marks were being properly maintained (aka being displayed publicly on the appropriate sites) to prove current use, which is required for renewal.

The issue was whether the black half of the logo appears on the left or the right, and whether it is displayed with black/grey or black/white as registered. Kevin made the appropriate changes to the Hugo Awards website, Facebook, and Twitter accounts, and he liaised with the Chicon 8 committee to get them to reverse the logo as it appears on their website and promotional materials.

We updated the “usage guidelines” to specify on which side (L/R) the black must appear on the rocket.

We also requested Ms. Horwich to add the Lodestar Award to our marks registration. This is likely to be a bit dicey and expensive, since that registration is probably going to have to be very narrow and specific due to other already-registered uses of “Lodestar.” (The more fine-tuned the registration has to be, the more expensive it gets.)

In June, we received notification that our trademark “Worldcon.uk” had been renewed for another nine-year term. It will now renew on June 17, 2031

Also in June, we notified Mike Liu of the Chengdu committee to use the following verbiage:

“World Science Fiction Society”, “WSFS”, “World Science Fiction Convention”, “Worldcon”, “Lodestar Award”, “Hugo Award”, the Hugo Award Logo, and the distinctive design of the Hugo Award Rocket are service marks of Worldcon Intellectual Property, a California public benefit nonprofit corporation managed for the benefit of the World Science Fiction Society.

Domain Names

Domain	Domain Agent	Handle to Renew	Renewal Date
Worldcon.org	World Science Fiction Society	KS2182-GANDI	2028-08-02
Worldcon.co.uk Worldcon.org.uk Worldcon.com Worldcon.uk	Mike Scott, Kevin Standlee, Bruce Farr on behalf of the World Science Fiction Society	KS2182 – Gandi.net Gandi.net	2028-10-17 2028-10-17 2028-10-09 2022-06-17
Nasfic.org wsfs.org hugo.org	Mike Scott, Kevin Standlee, Bruce Farr on behalf of the World Science Fiction Society	Gandi.net	2029-05-09 2028-06-14 2028-08-31
Worldcon78.org Worldcon2020.org	Andrew Adams purchased both on behalf of NZ in 2020	LAPSED	
Worldcon.ie	Dublin in 2019		
wsfs.us	Donald Eastlake	godaddy.com	June 19, 2022
wsfs.info	Donald Eastlake	godaddy.com	July 25, 2023
worldcon.us	Donald Eastlake	godaddy.com	August 11, 2023
worldcon.info	Donald Eastlake	godaddy.com	July 5, 2022

U.S. Marks

Mark	Owner	Action	Renewal Dates
World Science Fiction Convention	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	6/26/23-6/25/24
Worldcon	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	6/26/23-6/25/24
World Science Fiction Society	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	7/3/23-7/3/24
WSFS	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	7/17/23-7/16/24
The Hugo Award Reg. No. 1287322	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	7/24/23-7/23/24
3D Rocket Mark Reg. No. 4620505	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	10/14/23-10/13/24
Rocket Mark Reg. No. 4320959	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	4/16/28-4/15/29
NASFiC Reg. No. 3647140	World Science Fiction Society	Section 8, Section 9	6/30/28-6/29/29

EU Marks

Mark	Owner	Class	Expiry Dates	Trademark No.
Worldcon	Worldcon Intellectual Prop.	Class 16, 35, 41	2025/06/18	014277016
Hugo Award	Worldcon Intellectual Prop.	Class 9, 16, 41	2025/06/18	014278519
The Hugo Award Logo	Worldcon Intellectual Prop.	Class 16, 35, 41	2025/06/22	014270748

Mark Protection Committee/WIP Financial Report
All U.S. Dollars
Period Ending June 30, 2022

	Date	Deposits	Payments	Check No.	Account Balance
Bank Balance July 1, 2021 at U S Bank					\$12,429.52
Deposit, New Zealand Worldcon	11/30/2021	\$2,000.00			\$14,429.52
Pair Networks, Website	1/5/2022		\$91.44		\$14,338.08
Pair Networks, Website refund	1/10/2022		\$(21.89)		\$14,359.97
Deposit, DC 2021 Worldcon	2/7/2022	\$4,338.00			\$18,697.97
State of California, Filing Fee	2/2/2022		\$25.00	1112	\$18,672.97
California Secretary of State, Filing Fee	2/2/2022		\$20.00	1111	\$18,652.97
Cleantalk.Org Website Anti-Spam	3/14/2022		\$135.47		\$18,517.50
Cleantalk.Org., refund	3/16/2022		\$(45.36)		\$18,562.86
PairNetworks,Website	4/4/2022		\$50.00		\$18,512.86
PairNetworks,Website	6/2/2022		\$21.53		\$18,491.33
Gandi, Website	6/3/2022		\$88.92		\$18,402.41
Esther J. Horwich, Trademark Renewal US	6/29/2022		\$825.00	1114	\$17,577.41
Cash balance in US Bank 6/30/22 (Check #1114 outstanding \$825)					\$18,402.41


—Bruce Farr

WSFS Hugo Awards Marketing Committee November 2021-July

The Hugo Awards Marketing Committee (“HAMC”) members this year were Dave McCarty (Chair), Linda Deneroff, Craig Miller, Cheryl Morgan, Mark Olson, Kevin Standlee, and Jo Van Ekeren. The HAMC was established by the WSFS Mark Protection Committee, and its chair and members are appointed by the MPC annually.

The HAMC continued to work with Worldcon committees to support the marketing of the Hugo Awards, to handle inquiries from the press regarding the Awards as needed, and to maintain TheHugoAwards.org, including the list of past finalists and winners, and archiving the “Section 3.11.4” reports of nomination and voting information issued by Hugo Award administrators, and to maintain the WSFS.org, Worldcon.org, and NASFiC.org websites, and to answer general queries submitted through those sites.

The HAMC has discontinued live text-based coverage of the Hugo Awards because Worldcons have now made it standard practice to both live-stream their Hugo Awards ceremony and to make the results available through Twitter and other social media in real time. The HAMC will continue to cooperate with Worldcon committees so that we can update the Hugo Awards website at the first opportunity after the awards are announced as well as to use the @TheHugoAwards Twitter feed to publicize the announcements of the winners in each category.



We continue to attempt to gather all the recordings of past Hugo Awards ceremonies (including any made before online posting of such recordings was possible or common) and to put copies of them in a single place, probably the Worldcon Events YouTube channel set up by Kevin Standlee for this purpose. During this past term, we added the Chicon 7 (2012) Hugo Awards ceremony. Regrettably, the 2017 Hugo Awards ceremony recording was deleted when the 2017 Worldcon’s YouTube channel was deleted. If anyone has a copy of the 2017 ceremony video that they can provide us, we will upload it to the Worldcon Events channel.

We maintain the list of seated, future, and past Worldcons and the lists of bids for future convention to the best of our knowledge. Multiple members of the committee have the credentials for the websites. Bandwidth and disk space usage for the websites we manage were within the allowances for our account. We may see peak loads around the time of the winner announcements and will work with our hosting provider to minimize extra charges, which are borne by the Mark Protection Committee.

We continue to field inquiries directed to Worldcon.org and TheHugoAwards.org, forwarding them to the current Worldcon or the Mark Protection Committee as necessary.

Appendix B – Results of the Mark Protection Committee Election

There were 87 ranked ballots and 3 with a single vote. Sixteen ballots were declared invalid.

Candidate	1st Round	2nd round	3rd round	Total
Ron Oakes	6	—	—	6
Kevin Standlee	42	+4=46	+9=55	55
Nicholas Whyte	19 + 1(20)	+2=22	—	22
Ben Yalow	20+2 (22)	+0=22	+12=34	34

Appendix C – Report of the Hugo Award Study Committee
December 2021-August 2022

Overview	96
Members of the Committee.....	97
Subcommittees Formed.....	97
Subcommittee Reports.....	98
Best Related Work	98
Best Dramatic Presentation	99
Best Audiobook.....	99
Best Game or Interactive Work Subcommittee Report	100
Best Series	101
Minority Report (Author, Nicholas Whyte; joined by Martin Easterbrook).....	105
Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist.....	105
Fan vs Pro.....	106
Minority Report (Author, John Coxon; joined by Alison Scott and Nana Amuah).....	110
Thresholds	111
Minority Report (Author: Alison Scott; joined by John Coxon, Nana Amuah, Nicholas Whyte, and Ira Alexandre).....	115
Automatic Re-Ratification of Categories.....	116

Overview

The Hugo Awards Study Committee had a very successful year. We began operating from a Discord server instead of the more traditional mailing list, and this has allowed fuller, more free-flowing discussion to occur in a polite and respectful manner. This has been a substantial improvement over previous discussion formats, as it has been less prone to discussions “stalling out” for months or getting lost in the weeds of a Google Group, as bedeviled the Committee in several previous years.

We request a continuation of this committee as a whole. It has proved a useful venue to explore and workshop ideas for keeping the Hugo Awards relevant to the Worldcon community as it evolves, and we would like more time to make sure our motions are well-formed and well-founded.

If you would like to join the committee, please speak to Cliff Dunn or Kate Secor for the Discord invite.

The Committee Chair and Subchair would like to thank the members of the Committee for their frank and respectful conversations this year and extend extra thanks to the Subcommittee chairs who did the hard work of writing up most of this report and its associated motions. We look forward to continuing with our efforts to ensure that the Hugo Awards represent the Worldcon community, fans and pros alike.

Members of the Committee

Committee Chair: Cliff Dunn

Committee Sub-Chair: Kate Secor

Best Game or Interactive Work Subcommittee Chair: Ira Alexandre

Best Audiobook Subcommittee Chair: Alison Scott

Best Series Subcommittee Chair: Dave Hook

Best Artist Subcommittee Chair: Nicholas Whyte

Fan vs/ Pro Subcommittee Chair: Joshua Kronengold

Members¹: Nana Amuah, Terri Ash, Michele Cobb, John Coxon, Todd Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Vincent Docherty, Martin Easterbrook, Farah, Erica Frank, Kat Jones, Joshua Kronengold, Terry Neil, Lisa Padol, Martin Pyne, riverpa, Claire Rousseau, Alison Scott, Sparkle, Kári Tulinius, Jo Van, Nicholas Whyte, Ben Yalow

Subcommittees Formed

We decided that the easiest way to control discussions was to break into multiple subcommittees, one for each major area of discussion. The subcommittees formed were:

- Best Related Work
- Best Dramatic Presentation
- Best Audiobook
- Best Artist
- Best Game or Interactive Work
- Best Series
- Fan vs Pro
- Thresholds

We are open to adding new subcommittees if necessary or desirable, provided someone is found to volunteer to chair them (and write the associated report). Nothing other than expressing interest is necessary to join any given subcommittee.

¹ Note that the names used here are taken from the Discord server and were reviewed by the committee members.

Subcommittee Reports

Each subcommittee has been offered the chance to submit their own report, with minority reports as desired by the subcommittee members.

Best Related Work

Subcommittee Chair: None.

Subcommittee Members: Nana Amuah, John Coxon, Vincent Docherty, Cliff Dunn, Farah, Erica Frank, Joshua Kronengold, Lisa Padol, Alison Scott, Kate Secor, Nicholas Whyte

The discussion here began with a suggestion that a **Best Non-Fiction** category might be a useful thing to “pop out” of Best Related Work (“BRW”). Discussion evolved to replacing BRW with **Best Non-Fiction**, **Best Art Book**, and **Best Other**. There was a desire to retain a “catch all” category to allow for outstanding one-off items and also as a way of gauging whether any category of items might be growing as a part of the nominating space enough to consider giving it its own award.

Some discussion ensued of where Documentaries belonged, but we eventually landed on “the nominators will have to decide whether they go in BDP or a hypothetical Other category.”

The Subcommittee did not make a final decision, but it seems likely that we will continue discussing splitting BRW into at least two categories - one for non-fiction works of any length, and one more explicitly a miscellany category. The subcommittee felt that, at a minimum, the original intent of the category (which was originally “Best Non-Fiction Book”) was being increasingly obscured by a number of non-book nominations, which were (and are) hard to directly compare with books. While the Subcommittee felt that it was highly desirable to continue providing an avenue through which to honor such works, the current category has started to become too broad.

There was also some separate discussion by the same subcommittee about splitting out **Best Illustrated/Art Book** from the rest, but no firm conclusions were drawn. Three main points were drawn. The first is that the trial category for Best Art Book (2019) had a very low number of nominators but a high number of voters. The second is that the category could easily be dominated by one major publication, which would rapidly make the award untenable. The third centered around the difficulty of drawing the line between an Illustrated Book and a Graphic Story. This will require further discussion before the subcommittee is prepared to offer any kind of motion.

Best Dramatic Presentation

Subcommittee Chair: None

Subcommittee Members: Nana Amuah, Terri Ash, John Coxon, Cliff Dunn, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Joshua Kronengold, Lisa Padol, Alison Scott, Kate Secor, Nicholas Whyte

This discussion started with a proposal to remove the word “Dramatic” from the titles of the categories, to make it clearer that the presentations in question did not have to be fictional, merely related to SFF or associated genres.

A suggestion was made to change the categories to “Best Fan Presentation” and “Best Professional Presentation,” which had some support, since fannish works are becoming easier to make and more prominent in our media consumption. However, this discussion got bogged down in a discussion of how to define “fan vs. pro” in this and any other category. (See discussion later in this report.)

There was also some notion of splitting the lengths even more, adding a “BDP - Series” and “BDP - Ultra Short”. It did not generate very much discussion – the sense of the subcommittee appears to be leaning toward an explicitly Fan award rather than adding more lengths.

Eventually, the fan vs. pro discussion overwhelmed any other discussion, and therefore this subcommittee has been put on the back burner until that gets sorted out, but it seems to be the will of the committee that fan presentations should eventually be recognized.

Best Audiobook

Subcommittee Chair: Alison Scott

Subcommittee Members: Terri Ash, Michele Cobb, Cliff Dunn, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Joshua Kronengold, Terry Neill, Kate Secor, Nicholas Whyte

In 2021, the Business Meeting considered a proposal to introduce a Best Audiobook Hugo. The meeting passed a motion to refer the matter to this committee.

The best audiobooks are more than just a simple reading of the book and add value using additional material. Audiobooks are currently the fastest growing segment of the publishing industry.

Audiobooks are the primary way of consuming fiction for people with visual impairments and an award in this space would help raise the profile of good audiobooks and increase access to the genre.

The primary objection raised is that audiobooks are already eligible in Best Dramatic Presentation, and that the Hugo Awards are not enhanced by subdivision.

There is a secondary concern that an award in this space might, in practice, be seen as another chance to vote for a favorite novel. This tendency might be countered by making the award more explicitly given to the narrator or production team rather than the work itself.

It is clear that there is not yet strong support for a Best Audiobook Hugo, either from WSFS members generally or from Business Meeting regulars, and the committee is not offering a proposal for consideration.

However, one option for reworking ‘Best Dramatic Presentation’ –the HASC is continuing to consider but not recommending proposals in 2022 – would be an award for ‘Best Audio Presentation,’ to provide space for audio dramas and professional podcasts as well as audiobooks. The HASC will consider this as part of its ongoing work on Best Dramatic Presentation.

Best Game or Interactive Work Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chair: Ira Alexandre

Subcommittee members: Nana Amuah, John Coxon, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Joshua Kronengold, Lisa Padol, Martin Pyne, Alison Scott, Nicholas Whyte.

Since this subcommittee has finished writing and submitting its motion, the Committee wishes only to say that we endorse the motion and thank Mx. Alexandre for their amazing and dedicated work this year wrangling the discussion around and writing of the amendment.

The proposed constitutional amendments are reproduced below; all further discussion can be found elsewhere in the agenda in the motion itself. (~~Strikeout~~ indicates deleted text and underlined indicates new text.)

3.2.X. An interactive work is

(1) a game, or

(2) a narrative or presentation in which active input or interactive play is an integral component of the work itself or where it impacts the outcome, narrative, or order of elements of the work itself in a non-trivial fashion, and

(3) is not ephemeral, in the sense that the interactive elements of the work are accessible to participants through published or shareable artifacts, and the work is not an event requiring the participation of specific named persons.

3.2.6: The categories of Best Novel, Novella, Novelette, and Short Story shall be open to non-interactive works in which the text is the primary form of communication, regardless of the publication medium, including but not limited to physical print, audiobook, and ebook.

3.3.7: Best Graphic Story. Any [non-interactive](#) science fiction or fantasy story told in graphic form appearing for the first time in the previous calendar year.

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

3.3.9: Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form. Any [non-interactive](#) television program or other production, with a complete running time of 90 minutes or less, in any medium of dramatized science fiction, fantasy or related subjects that has been publicly presented for the first time in its present dramatic form during the previous calendar year.

[3.3.Y: Best Game or Interactive Work.](#) Any [interactive work or interactive substantial modification of a work in the fields of science fiction, fantasy, or related subjects, released to the public in the previous year and available for public participation in the interactive elements of the work in that year.](#)

[Provided that unless this amendment is re-ratified by the 2026 Business Meeting, this Section shall be repealed; and](#)

[Provided further that the question of re-ratification shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the 2026 Business Meeting.](#)

Best Series

Subcommittee Chair: Dave Hook

Subcommittee members: Terri Ash, John Coxon, Cliff Dunn, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Dave Hook, Joshua Kronengold, Lisa Padol, Kate Secor, and Nicholas Whyte

Issue: The HASC believes the Best Series Hugo Award needs improvement. We are asking for feedback on two related but different alternatives to address this. We plan to bring a definite proposal to a future year BM agenda.

The Best Series Hugo Award category was adopted in order to help Hugo voters and nominators give awards to popular series that generally were not able to get Hugo awards for their individual volumes.

The Best Series Hugo Award started with a one-time special Best Series Hugo Award at Worldcon 75 (Helsinki, 2017), followed by “regular” Best Series Hugo Awards since then. The Best Series Hugo Award has been a popular category since then; although the nominations have dropped, the percentage of voters for Best Series has remained quite high.

Year	Total	Best Series	Percentage	Votes	Best	Percentage	Other
------	-------	-------------	------------	-------	------	------------	-------

	Nominations	Nominations			Series Votes		
2017	2,078	1,393	67%	3,319	2,340	71%	Special One-Time Award
2018	1,813	1,000	55%	2,828	1,855	66%	
2019	1,800	966	54%	3,097	2,167	70%	
2020	1,854	676	36%	2,221	1,506	68%	
2021	1,249	727	58%	2,362	1,872	79%	

Due to the original sunset provision, the Best Series Hugo Award needed to be ratified again to remain in the WSFS Constitution. It passed somewhat narrowly by a serpentine vote of 35 for to 30 opposed at the DisCon III (2021) BM. There was substantial disagreement on re-ratification, with these three opinions expressed at the BM:

- The time to read and evaluate the sometimes very extensive volumes of a series makes it onerous to have fully informed voters for Best Series. This may certainly be affecting the nominations.
- Re-eligibility requirements lead to continued elimination of series, leading to a watering down of the quality of those available for nomination and voting.
- The possibility of a work being nominated for both Best Novel/Novella/ Novelette/Short Story and for Best Series (as a component), leading to reduced chances for other works to be nominated or win.

Although there was no express direction given on this point, the HASC felt that this level of disagreement about the Best Series Hugo Award as currently configured required discussion and consideration of improvement. We also felt that the HASC was the best place for this to occur.

After discussion, the HASC believes that the fundamental problem with the Best Series Hugo Award as currently worded is that it is possible for works to receive Hugo Awards for Best Novel/Novella/Novelette/Short Story and for Best Series as a component of a series. We feel this “double-dipping” is not desirable and is counter to the wishes of those who originally voted for its creation to provide an avenue for Hugo Awards for popular series works that could not win individual story awards on their own. We also feel that this can lead to reduced chances for other works to be nominated or win.

We have two alternatives, which are not mutually exclusive, and as a result we have determined that both could be presented alongside one another. Each addresses a different aspect of the “double-dipping” issue. In these alternatives, ~~strikeout~~ indicates deleted text and underlined indicates new text. Our alternatives for consideration and input are:

Alternative 1: To Amend Section 3.3.5 as follows:

3.3.5: 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 3.3.5.~~ No series may be nominated which has previously won under Section 3.3.5 nor any series containing an individual written installment which has won a Hugo Award of any type in its nominated format. No series may appear on the ballot in the same year as any of its installments.

This amendment addresses past-year eligibility issues.

The net effect of this change is to not only prevent the same series from winning more than one Hugo Award for the series itself, but also to narrow the scope of the award to its original intent – to only those works that are Hugo-worthy in their aggregate even though the individual installments may not make it onto the ballot in their individual categories.

It also limits nominations for the series or any of its pieces to one appearance on the ballot in any given year. This is an edge case for Series, but it does seem counter to the spirit of the awards to allow effectively the same work to appear on the ballot in two different categories, as can be seen by the exclusion in Best Related Work that prohibits an item appearing in that category if it is eligible in another.

The Committee recognizes that this is a fairly substantial change and would not be opposed to splitting the motion to consider whether series that include Hugo-winning installments can be eligible and whether a series and one of its installments can appear on the ballot in the same year.

Alternative 2: To Amend Section 3.2.9 as follows:

3.2.9: ~~No work shall appear in more than one category on the final Award ballot.~~ Unless otherwise expressly provided for, no content shall be placed on the ballot more than once in a given year in whole or in part, except that (1) a periodical publication shall not be rendered ineligible by virtue of a story published within that does not constitute the majority of its content that year; and (2) written presentations and audio or audio-visual presentations shall be considered inherently distinct.

This amendment addresses same-year eligibility issues. Particularly with the addition of Best Series, the risk of material landing on the ballot more than once has emerged. In general, this hadn't previously been an issue: Short stories that are turned into novels (or stories converted from novel to graphic novel form or vice-versa) usually don't get issued in the same year, and most categories are comfortably exclusive of one another. Best Series made an issue with things being "nominated twice" all but inevitable. A given "work" could be interpreted several different ways (i.e., do a series and a component thereof count as separate "works"?), and indeed the prevailing interpretation has been

that they *do* count separately, resulting in situations where works in serial form functionally appear twice.

Unfortunately, were we to shift to disbaring “content”, this would potentially create trouble in the publication categories, as many short stories appear in fanzines or semiprozines. The risk of a publication and a short story getting into a “standoff” of who should get to appear on the ballot would be problematic (and it isn’t quite clear how such a situation would be fairly resolved). However, at the same time a situation where a story is published in serial form (e.g., *The Green Mile*) might find itself eligible under some forms of the category as well as under one of the story-related categories (be it Best Novel or another one) could also emerge (especially if this category were changed significantly). The “majority of its content” exception to a periodical’s eligibility not being affected seeks to “thread this needle”, keeping publications unaffected except in a scenario where the publication is effectively dominated by the publication of a given work.

The other point that this addresses is the risk of a novel and an adaptation coming out simultaneously and both being eligible. If a television adaptation of an ongoing series were to come out in the same year as an installment thereof, a content-related ban could result in some discord over whether a season of a show and the novel it is based on were the same “content”, particularly if the adaptation follows the underlying source material very closely. Both *Game of Thrones* and *The Expanse* could conceivably have run into this issue (as the former’s final installment has been lurking for several years while the latter was still being published as the show went on the air). We feel that the fundamental differences between a written work and a “live” adaptation thereof (whether on TV/film [live-action or animated], radio, or otherwise) creates a sufficiently distinct experience and involves a sufficiently different set of both skills and talents that both should be eligible. The crossover here is generally limited, but the risk of it is far enough above zero that it should be addressed sooner rather than later.

If this alternative is adopted on its own (i.e., without Alternative 1), it should be noted that the effect will be to permit a series which has previously had a component win a Hugo Award to be nominated for Best Series, just not in the same year. However, as indicated above, this alternative addresses a few ancillary elements that make it useful to adopt on its own.

As the two amendments here are not mutually exclusive, neither is dependent on the other for operation, and they do not interfere with one another if both are adopted, we have chosen to present both to this year’s Business Meeting for consideration.

=====

Minority Report (Author, Nicholas Whyte; joined by Martin Easterbrook)

The minority respectfully disagrees that the HASC has successfully identified “the fundamental problem” with the Best Series category as one of multiple eligibility. The first two elements identified in the 2021 Business Meeting discussion are not addressed here (the facts that the length of a series makes it onerous to have fully informed voters, and that re-eligibility requirements are watering down the quality of potential finalists).

Neither of these proposed amendments is desirable or necessary, both will have the effect of yet further reducing the pool of eligible nominees, and both will increase the burden on Hugo Award administrators to make judgment calls rather than implement the wishes of voters. (Nicholas Whyte, Martin Easterbrook)

Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist

Subcommittee Chair: Nicholas Whyte

Subcommittee members: Nana Amuah, Terri Ash, John Coxon, Cliff Dunn, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Joshua Kronengold, Alison Scott, Kate Secor, Ben Yalow

It has been clear for some time that the current definitions of Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist in the WSFS Constitution (3.3.12 and 3.3.17) do not reflect the reality of how both professional and fannish art is produced and consumed today. Administrators have repeatedly been faced with dilemmas regarding artists who have been nominated by voters but turn out not to be eligible under the rather strict limitations prescribed by the rules.

Indeed, the Hugo Awards Study Committee was originally proposed in 2017 to address this single issue, with other areas added to its remit by amendment at that year’s WSFS Business Meeting. A lengthy discussion at the 2018 Business Meeting referred the issue back to the Hugo Awards Study Committee, which has however made no further proposals until now. Separately, the Best Fan Artist definition was clarified and broadened by an amendment ratified in 2021, but the subcommittee felt that there was still room for improvement.

The subcommittee briefly considered, but rapidly rejected, the idea of merging the two categories into a single “Best Artist” award. There was consensus that recognition of fan activity, including art, is core to the Hugo Awards, and that professional art continues to be sufficiently important to the genre community to justify a separate award.

There was also a clear consensus that the pool of potential nominees in the Best Professional Artist category needs to be widened – the current definition effectively restricts eligibility to illustrators of magazines and book covers – but in a way that does not risk potential Best Fan Artist nominees discovering that they have been deemed to be professional by a quirk of the rules – much fannish art is sold, after all.

The subcommittee discussed this dilemma at some length, and also touched on the inclusion of art other than images in Best Professional Artist, the requirement for artists to provide proof of eligibility to administrators (which under current rules applies to Best Professional Artist but not Best Fan Artist), and whether or not groups of artists should be eligible.

Ultimately the subcommittee decided that eligibility for both categories should be decided by the existence (or not) of a qualifying body of work by the creators in the previous year – *i.e.*, someone who has produced sufficient professional art should be eligible in Best Professional Artist, and someone who has produced sufficient fannish art should be eligible in Best Fan Artist.

This leaves open the possibility that a nominee might qualify in both categories, but subcommittee members were prepared to live with that; after all, the very first winner of the Best Fan Artist award, Jack Gaughan, also won Best Professional Artist in the same year (1967).

Bearing all of that in mind, the subcommittee proposes the following amendments:

3.3.12: Best Professional Artist. ~~An illustrator whose work has appeared in a professional publication in the field of science fiction or fantasy during the previous calendar year.~~ One or more collaborators on a body of work first displayed during the previous calendar year and created as i) work for hire, ii) on paid commission, or iii) for sale (either directly or via a paywall-like structure).

3.3.17: Best Fan Artist. ~~An artist or cartoonist whose work has appeared through publication in semiprozines or fanzines or through other public, non-professional, display (including at a convention or conventions, posting on the internet, in online or print-on-demand shops, or in another setting not requiring a fee to see the image in full resolution) during the previous calendar year.~~ One or more collaborators on a body of work first displayed during the previous calendar year in a fashion that did not qualify for Best Professional Artist - *i.e.*, neither work for hire, nor commissioned for pay, nor for sale.

3.10.2 In the Best Professional Artist category and Best Fan Artist categories, the acceptance should include citations of at least three (3) works ~~first published~~ which were first displayed in the eligible year.

Fan vs Pro

Subcommittee chair: Joshua Kronengold

Subcommittee members: Nana Amuah, Terri Ash, John Coxon, Cliff Dunn, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Dave Hook, Alison Scott, Kate Secor, and Ben Yalow

As an adjunct to the discussion of Best Fan Artist, the Hugo Award Study Committee has noted that at the root of the issue is a lack in the Constitution of a single definition for “Professional”, “Non-Professional”, or “Fan”.

There is, of course, a definition of “Professional Publication”, which is used to define “Best Professional Artist,” and we could extend that definition (based on providing one quarter (¼) of the income of any one person) to the general concept of a “Professional” enterprise. However, we have opted not to do this for at least three reasons:

1. It is not clear to us that locking down “Professional” is the way to go (it is, however, the direction we are going for our proposal). The alternative, defining “fan” activity strictly and designating professional (or semi-professional) as everything else, has the advantage of only protecting activities that by their nature, need protecting.
2. The existing rule is intrusive to a given person’s finances, requiring information that isn’t pertinent to the award or necessarily within the knowledge of the general person.
3. The existing rule is neither equitable nor fair – someone with very little income could be deemed “professional” merely by their work being their sole source of income. On the other end of things, someone with quite a lot of income could be nominated for “non-professional” work that provides a handsome income merely because the remainder of their income is more than three times the size.

Instead, we examined a number of different approaches to the professional/fan divide. Central to our thinking was that above all else, there should not be an excluded middle – that is, while the common understandings of “fan” and “professional” leave a gap between them, it is incumbent upon us to decide on definitions that do not exclude a work (or body of work) just because it’s both not “professional” and not “fan”. Of course, there are reasons some things, however popular, might not fit a Hugo Award category. But “it doesn’t make enough money to be professional but doesn’t fit our criteria for fan works” isn’t a great one.

Additionally, we have generally come to consensus that if we err, it is best to err in being too expansive in defining the professional category than being too expansive in defining fan works. This is because the division we make between fan works and professional works is not for the purpose of protecting professional works from overly non-professional works (on the contrary, were the distinction not made we expect that very few non-professional works would win), but instead the reverse. So, if our rule puts a work that doesn’t belong in the professional category into it, the likely result will be in that work losing – while if we incorrectly put a work into a fan category that doesn’t belong there, it is much more likely that it will crowd genuinely fan works out of their own category.

With all this in mind, the committee examined the following possible divisions:

1. Fan works are part of fan sharing culture; professional works are everything else.
2. Professional works make money for (some of) their creators; fan works do not. (optionally with a threshold for how much money).
3. Professional works cost money to access, at least in one (presumably superior in time or quality) form, while fan works are essentially free.
4. Professional works are created/released for the purpose of making money; fan works are released (or created) for fannish purposes.

We rejected (4) on the grounds that it is hard to determine and harder to enforce.

Item 1 deserves a bit more explanation – expanding on the existing and historical definition of fan art as art that appears in fanzines or is given to conventions to use for free in their publications. Under this approach, fan works are works that participate fully in the kind of sharing, volunteer-centered culture of which fan art, fanzines, and conventions themselves are a subset. A definition can thus be formed based on giving a work away for free or sharing it with others who then give it away for free, either via specific gift (giving it away to specific conventions or fanzines, for instance) or via general licensing that allows for such free use, such as releasing a work under an open or creative commons license which allows non-commercial use.

However, while the idea has its own merit, it quickly became mired in corner cases, particularly since determining which venues giving your work to specifically count for the award vs those that don't seems difficult. So, while the kernel of this idea is present in our final ideas, the subcommittee as a whole did not use it directly.

So instead, we tried to thread the needle between items 2 and 3, defining a non-professional enterprise as one in which none of the creators made money and the audience did not need to pay money to enjoy the creation, and a professional enterprise as one that is not non-professional. In doing so, we hope to protect non-professional awards from works made for a profit or by hiring a professional (who earns a profit), both for the current awards and any future non-professional Hugo Awards.

One concern the subcommittee had was that quite a lot of fan activity involves money changing hands, both in order to pay for costs and because in some fields it is relatively standard. The consensus among the committee was that it is far better to exclude that work from consideration as non-professional than to maintain the status quo. However, we also agreed that if one were to include an income threshold below which work should be considered non-professional, it should not be based on percentage of income (as above). Instead, it should either be based on a fixed limit (for simplicity), or a limit based on the country of residency of the creator(s). However, as this was not the direction we chose to go, any work to do this well would have to begin from scratch.

The Committee also considered the occasional issue of a “gap” between the “Fan” and “Professional” categories and has opted to clarify that all work should land in one category or the other. While this may seem redundant at the present time, this would at a minimum be a prophylactic against a future re-definition of the categories (presumably in response to as-yet unforeseeable changes in the contours of fannish culture) resulting in works somehow landing in neither category (which is not fair to the creator(s) in question) or in both (e.g., a work which is originally created for a convention publication but where one might presume that sales of either the original work or prints thereof might follow). The Committee wishes to note that it is quite possible for an artist to produce works which land in both categories (and indeed, we note that in 1967 Jack Gaughan won both awards), and this stricture only applies on the level of a single work or activity, not the entire body of an individual’s work or participation in various activities.

Moved: That the WSFS Constitution be changed by adding and ~~removing~~ text as follows:

~~3.2.11: 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.~~ A professional publication is a publication produced by professional activity. Any category including language pertaining to non-professional or professional activity will be understood to use the definitions in 3.2.X and 3.2.Y [[unless otherwise provided for]].

3.2.X: Professional activity shall be that which was undertaken with the expectation of sale or other direct profit (by the creator or any co-creators), or which can only be accessed after a payment is made (other than incidental fees, e.g., convention membership fees).

3.2.Y: Non-professional activity shall be that which was not undertaken with the expectation of sale or other direct profit (by the creator or any co-creators), and which can be accessed in a full and final version without any payment.

3.2.Z: All activity shall be considered either Professional or Non-Professional. In cases where there is some doubt as to which category applies to a given work or activity, the will of the nominators should be considered, as should the greater need to protect fan (non-professional) activity against professional activity than the reverse.

[[3.3.13: Best Semiprozine. Any generally available ~~non-professional~~ periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects ~~which~~that does not provide, and is not owned by an entity which provides, at least a quarter of the income of at least one person, 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,]]

The Committee initially intended to present this motion as an item for discussion in the form of a draft amendment, albeit without moving for that amendment to be adopted and with an eye toward further revisions. At this time, the Committee made as much progress on this item as it thinks it can without further feedback, and there appears to be a loose (albeit not unanimous) consensus that it would be comfortable with the adoption of this version if the Business Meeting saw fit.

Subsequent to the initial presentation of the proposal, a “complicating” interaction was raised in the form of Semiprozine (which does not “cleanly” resolve in favor of being purely fan or purely professional). As one member of the Subcommittee put it in the subsequent discussions, the Semiprozine rules are “not pretty”. The category itself is quite popular among several segments of fandom, and we sought to find a course of action that would leave the Semiprozine “status quo ante”, but no satisfactory solution to this was forthcoming that was able to achieve a consensus. The Committee would like further instruction on this matter, both as to the core of the Fan vs Pro approach (that is, seeking out a single definition across categories, which the majority of the Subcommittee felt to be a desirable result) and to handling Semiprozine. Mr. Kronengold drafted the subsequent amendment to 3.3.13, which can, in debate, be added to the initial proposal if debate proceeds.

Ms. Secor additionally proposed to amend 3.2.11 to add the words “unless otherwise provided for”, as a matter of additionally future-proofing the definition against new categories that might otherwise straddle the line between fan and pro. While this is not foreseen at this time, something like this is also not unimaginable. If this were done, that section would instead read:

“Any category including language pertaining to non-professional or professional activity will be understood to use the definitions in 3.2.X and 3.2.Y *unless otherwise provided for.*”

Both Mr. Kronengold’s amendment and Ms. Secor’s amendment have been included above. The amendment as originally submitted is the proposal without either set of double-bracketed language, while the amendments are surrounded by double brackets so that reader may envision the various possible permutations of language.

Minority Report (Author, John Coxon; joined by Ira Alexandre, Nana Amuah, Martin Easterbrook, Alison Scott and Nicholas Whyte)

We dissent from the committee decision.

We agree that the current rules are inequitable and regressive for the reasons put forth by the wider committee (particularly points 2 and 3), and so we believe that some change to address that is necessary. (Nicholas Whyte respectfully dissents from this paragraph.)

However, we believe that a careful consultation with the community is necessary in order for the consequences of any proposed changes to be assessed in advance of an amendment to the constitution. This is necessary to prevent unintended consequences from any amendment.

Putting it to a vote before any consultation, as has effectively happened here, has led to the conversation being vastly less constructive than it needs to be before such a change is made. This motion's inclusion on the WSFS agenda has meant that people are, rightly, extremely worried about it passing in its current form, which has several unintended consequences. Specifically, the proposal as written may have a negative effect on the Semiprozine category; this should have been identified and fixed prior to any motion being brought to the Business Meeting.

We believe that the HASC needs to properly consult the community in advance of re-introducing an improved motion next year, including (but not limited to) careful consultation with Semiprozine editors.

Thresholds

This is not a subcommittee report *per se*, but rather something that arose in parallel to existing subcommittee discussions. Over the course of the last few years, concerns have been raised (specifically by writers at the Hugo Book Club Blog, Olav Rokne and Amanda Wakaruk) that Section 3.12.2 of the WSFS Constitution might constitute a “Hugo Kill Switch” or a “time bomb” (to quote two different phrasings used in discussion). That section reads as follows:

3.12.2: “No Award” shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category (excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place) is less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received.

The Committee notes that 3.12.2 was brought into being in the late 1970s (the exact year is lost to time, but it was either in 1978 or 1979), when the burdens of participating in Hugo Award nominating and voting were somewhat higher (e.g., electronic voting did not exist) and not long after Worldcons had begun to approach their current size. For example, due to travel distances and burdens at the time, Aussiecon One (in 1975) only had 616 members and would necessarily have had a somewhat lower level of participation in the Hugo Awards that year (as not all members of a given year's Worldcon vote). In the late 1960s, participation levels were often only a few hundred; as a result, 25% of the electorate in a given year could have been less than 100 members.

While a separate clause, 3.6, exists that allows a category to not be awarded if there is “a marked lack of interest in that category on the part of the voters” in a given year (at either the nominating or voting stage), but “a marked lack of interest” is a subjective standard and any Hugo Administrator who invoked it would be courting extreme controversy by any nominees at the voting stage.

3.12.2 has very rarely been triggered in the “main” Hugo Awards: Technically, it could be said to have come into play during the 2015 and 2016 Hugo Awards when a slate of nominees swept the nominations in several categories, resulting in the vast majority of votes being cast for No Award, but the fact that No Award won “outright” meant that the question was moot. As a stand-alone item (i.e., excluding races where participation was high but No Award won), it has never been invoked, though in a few years some categories have come close to triggering it (e.g., Best Editor - Long Form and several of the “Fan” awards have come within a few percentage points).

3.6, on the other hand, has been invoked on multiple occasions in the Retro Hugo Awards (for example, the 1944 Retro Hugo Awards did not feature a final ballot in seven categories - six which had an extremely small number of nominating ballots cast (including zero ballots for Best Fancast), and Best Series, which despite more significant participation suffered from only having four eligible nominees with more than two votes after three of the top seven nominees were found to be ineligible. 3.6 had not, however, ever been invoked in final ballot voting.

As such, we propose the following language:

3.12.2: “No Award” shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category (excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place) is less than twenty-five per cent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received and the total number of valid ballots cast for that category, excluding those cast for “No Award” in first place, is fewer than 200.

This will retain the 25% rule for any year in which the total number of valid final ballots cast is less than 800, but if that number is above 800 then any category receiving 200 votes or more shall not be automatically “defaulted” to No Award. This should act to defuse the “time bomb” mentioned above and avoid the related undesired outcome(s) associated with it. The Committee does not disagree that the number of 200 is somewhat arbitrary, but as indicated above it is roughly in line with where this threshold might be expected to have applied during the era in which it was first adopted.

The Committee took note of the ongoing parallel efforts by Olav Rokne and Amanda Wakaruk, but these only came to our attention after substantial debate had progressed in parallel. The Committee’s proposal is broadly in line with the initial suggestion by Mr. Rokne. Given that both amendments deal with the same topic, we therefore recommend that one be tendered as an amendment by substitution for the other (we offer no strong views as to which should be which and defer to the judgment of the Business Meeting with respect to this).

=====

There is, at some level, a logic that in order to give out a Hugo Award there should be some “base level” of participation, and that we should not give out a prestigious award on

the basis of a few dozen votes. The decision of a voter not to participate in a category could likewise be interpreted as a signal as to voter interest in the category.

Yet with the rise in general participation in the Hugo Awards (more nominating ballots have been cast each year in the last decade than were ever received in the 1980s, let alone the 1960s or 1970s) and the expansion of the number of award categories (three categories have been added since the turn of the century, and multiple others have been proposed and/or trialed), an increasing share of voters have only cast ballots in a handful of categories such as Best Novel or Best Dramatic Presentation. Those categories that have been at risk of hitting the 25% threshold for No Award being issued do not generally lack for voters *per se*, but rather suffer because of increased turnout (which, we should take pains to note, is a good thing). Also not helping some categories' relative performance has been the tendency to add categories over time; while there is no "Law of Hugo Conservation", adding categories is likely to increase instances of "ballot fatigue" and, as a result, categories further down the ballot will "leak" more voters. This is a phenomenon noticed in many elections (e.g., people who come out to vote for President may not make it down to a local bond referendum) and likely applies in addition to any questions of personal interest.

If one accepts that this is a potential problem, there are a few alternatives which could be pursued:

- One option would be to drop the rule entirely. This might seem attractive, but it would shift the onus onto the Hugo Administrator to determine what a "marked lack of interest" in a final ballot under Section 3.6 would look like (rather than having a clear, objective standard that fills that function). Were 3.6 to be used to fulfill the same objective that 3.12.2 currently does, it seems inevitable that its use would be controversial in all but the most extreme situations. This is, we note, the route that the authors of the initial blog post have opted to pursue with their amendment.
- Another alternative would be to shift to a "fixed number of ballots" standard. This has the advantage of being objective, but a standard that is "reasonable" under current voting levels might prove to be troublesome if there were ever a sudden drop-off in turnout. A fixed standard of, say, 250 votes cast is relatively low if 2500 ballots are being cast in a given year, but if a single Worldcon were to have less than 800 ballots cast then the threshold would end up at a higher share of ballots cast than it presently is. This shouldn't be considered unimaginable: Turnout was between 1000 and 1100 in 2009 and 2010, so a reversion to this level could easily happen with a relatively remote Worldcon and/or if interest in the higher-profile categories proved to be unusually low in a given year.
- A third choice would be to drop the threshold from 25% to a lower share of ballots cast (perhaps to 10%). Here, the risk would be that in the event of a participation drop a category might end up having to "run" with a very low turnout (since the

odds of a Hugo Administrator invoking the “marked lack of interest” standard without hitting that threshold seem remote).

Arguably the least-intrusive solution to this would be to keep the 25% threshold, but to “cap it off” at some level of votes cast. A level of 200-250 votes would be in line with what would have triggered the category in most years prior to the mid-1990s, while preserving the percentage threshold in the event that a given year came in with lower turnout. Thus, we have opted to go this route, the least intrusive available to us while addressing the issue.

=====

The “No Award” standard embodied in this section of the constitution might also be said to act as a signal for whether a category is “unhealthy” in various respects. Looking in the opposite direction from the above, rising turnout raises the question of whether a category ought to be run if (for example) only a few hundred ballots are cast in that category out of multiple thousands. “High turnout” years tend to feature perhaps 3000 ballots being cast, but it isn’t implausible to imagine another “jump” in turnout (to 5000-6000) in which most ballots are cast in a handful of categories.

Alongside this, we noted earlier that there is a tendency to add categories but not remove them: Only two regularly recurring categories have been abolished over the history of the Hugo Awards: Best Professional Magazine (which was abolished after 1972, largely due to the small pool of eligible publications and the fact that in all years that the award was given, one of three magazines won), and Best Original Art Work (which was established in 1992 but which never really “took off” and was abolished several years later). Attempts to abolish any category frequently draw strong emotions from those who are eligible in the category in question and proposing to abolish a category is likely to impose a social cost on the proposer(s).

Related to the above issue is the consideration that the net addition of award categories is not without cost. In addition to the financial cost of the physical awards themselves, the cost of the pre-award reception, and the Hugo Losers’ Party, other considerations include the length of the Hugo Award Ceremony, time needed for pre-ceremony photos, and the question of including more and more winners on programming. For voters, the cost (in time) of evaluating more categories is also a concern – Best Series has run into this issue (because of the time needed to get fully read up on an ongoing series which could potentially feature a dozen or more books), and the increase from five finalists to six finalists also received a similar criticism.

The committee considered several slightly different ways to tackle this issue, but we have opted to propose the following option:

[3.12.3: In the event that the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category \(excluding those cast for No Award in first place\) is fewer than ten percent \(10%\) of the total number of final Award ballots received in a non-Retro Hugo vote in two years out of](#)

three successive years, an amendment effecting the removal of that category from the list of enumerated Hugo Award categories shall be automatically placed on the agenda for the next Worldcon's Business Meeting.

Our desire is to take into account several considerations:

- First, there was a desire to have a lower threshold than the current 25% threshold, which several categories have been in danger of triggering in recent years. 10% is low enough (less than 40% of the lowest as-yet 'achieved' participation level) that it is not likely to be triggered anytime soon.
- Second, there was a concern that a category coming up for an expedited removal process might lead to an award "vanishing" without proper consideration (e.g., with a single vote potentially being held at a Worldcon which many regular attendees were unable to attend for various reasons). As such, we opted not to vary from this process but to have the process start "as normal" for the next year.
- Third, we chose to require that a category fall below the threshold in two out of three successive years instead of a single year in order to avoid having a one-year aberration (e.g., a particularly heavy turnout for Best Novel or Best Dramatic Presentation - Long Form) unexpectedly flood the Business Meeting with a slew of unwarranted motions.
- Fourth, we deliberated over the inclusion or exclusion of No Award votes in this case: On the one hand, an award which is generating a lot of "No Award" votes is still generating interest (even if the interest is negative), and it is possible to envision a category being "trolled" (as was the case with the Rabid Puppies in 2015 and 2016). On the other hand, the requirement that a category fall short in two years out of three means that the category would likely only show up at the Business Meeting once in such a situation (and if the result is very obviously the result of such an issue, the Business Meeting could always remove the business item or swiftly vote it down at the Preliminary Business Meeting through a motion such as postponing the item indefinitely).
- Finally, we opted to retain similar language between this section and 3.12.2 in order to reduce the opportunity for a potential "mix-up" between the two standards (that is, both categories use the same denominator for their fractions).

=====

Minority Report (Author: Alison Scott; joined by John Coxon, Nana Amuah, Nicholas Whyte, and Ira Alexandre)

The committee has focused its work around the assumption that the existing provision – introduced when participation rates were far lower than they are now – has some intrinsic merit and should therefore be amended rather than abolished. Constitutions should be

simple and nothing inessential should appear in them. Nothing in the majority report persuades us that this provision is essential.

The community is largely in agreement that the current threshold could have unintended consequences and does not reflect WSFS's perception of the value of categories that might be caught by it.

The majority proposal complicates the constitution for no clear benefit. The suggested 200 votes/25% threshold is unlikely to trigger; but it is not obvious what benefit there is, or could ever be, to eliminating a category after nominations and voting is completed. The '200' vote threshold in particular is wholly arbitrary.

We also consider that the second proposal, to have a threshold below which categories must be referred back to the Business Meeting, to be pointless. The WSFS Business Meeting is free to consider the abolition of Hugo categories at any time.

We would therefore support the simpler proposal:

PROPOSAL – Eliminate 3.12.2

Strike the following words from the WSFS Constitution:

~~*3.12.2: "No Award" shall be given whenever the total number of valid ballots cast for a specific category (excluding those cast for "No Award" in first place) is less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the total number of final Award ballots received.*~~

This matches the alternative proposal brought forward by the Worldcon community and this is not an accident: we do not think it is necessary for HASC to report on areas where robust community proposals have emerged.

Automatic Re-Ratification of Categories

A discussion was held on the question of amending the amendment process in order to make the increasingly standard practice of giving new categories a sunset clause, either automatically or as a standard procedure. We note that, for example, the newly proposed category this year (Best Game or Interactive Work) has such a clause. Due to the volume of other discussions, this did not progress, but given the prevalence of sunset clauses in recent years, this is something that the Committee will consider taking up next year.

Appendix D – Best Game or Interactive Work Report **December 2021-August 2022**

The Best Game or Interactive Work Committee consisted of Ira Alexandre (chair) and Nana Amuah, John Coxon, Martin Easterbrook, Erica Frank, Joshua Kronengold, Lisa Padol, Martin Pyne, Alison Scott, Nicholas Whyte.

This proposal is being put forward by Ira Alexandre, Dave Hook, Nana Amuah, Erica Frank, Joe Sherry, Adri Joy, Kit Stubbs, Caz Abbott, Aleta Pérez, Owen Blacker, Marguerite Kenner, Alasdair Stuart, Darusha Wehm, Phoebe Barton, Jaime O'Brien, Sarah Elkins, Matt Arnold, and enne queu.

The proposal for this category in the present formulation is proceeding at the recommendation of the Hugo Award Study Committee.

The viability of a Best Video Game category was thoroughly demonstrated at DisCon III in 2021, with 40.5% of voters casting ballots in that category that year. In the nomination phase, nominations in this category were comparable to Best Dramatic Presentation: Short Form while outperforming many established categories, such as Best Graphic Story and most of the artist, editor, and fan categories. The finalists comprised three AAA titles (an informal label used for games produced by large publishers with substantial budgets), two indie games, and one free browser game. Extensive research into existing game awards (see gameshugo.com/report for more details) has shown that this is a typical and representative spread, demonstrating that a Hugo Award for Best Game or Interactive Work would not be dominated by AAA titles. **The viability of this award's participation in the Hugo Voter Packet was also demonstrated** that year, with three of the finalists providing free full copies of their games and two finalists working with Worldcon staff to put together representative promotional and explanatory material.

The present proposal is not for a permanent Best Video Game category, but for a permanent expanded, medium-neutral category, Best Game or Interactive Work. Another trial year is not necessary, as the proposed category will build on the success of the Best Video Game category's trial year, while expanding the category's accessibility to voters and lowering the burden on Hugo Award administrators. An expanded, medium-neutral category offers more types of games and interactive works a better chance to be recognized, and it is more future-proof and more in keeping with the WSFS community's relationship to games and gaming. The proposed category does not require Hugo Award administrators to legislate the increasingly blurring line between physical and virtual play, and it **provides a category in which analog/physical games and interactive prose are more likely to get recognition** than in Best Related Work or the story categories (where they are respectively currently eligible). While digital titles are expected to make up the majority of nominees and finalists, standout analog titles such as

Arkham Horror, *Gloomhaven*, or new versions of *Dungeons and Dragons* would have a better chance at recognition.

This category is accessible in terms of time, finances, and ability. Many public libraries and other institutions lend games and even gaming systems, and many Hugo Award voters interested in games already own the equipment and games themselves. As discussed above, roughly half of nominated and finalist titles are expected to be more inexpensive indie titles. While games tend to take longer to get through than other single eligible works in other Hugo Award categories, there are also fewer of them, and playing a representative slice of a given year's games is comparable to average reading patterns for a representative slice of a year's prose output. Playing 12 games (twice the number that populates a Hugo Award category in the nomination stage) takes 223 hours on average, while reading 24 novels of a typical length for adult readers (assuming a conservative 2 books a month for a year, with an average of 400 pages) takes 264 hours.

Finally, for those who are not able to or prefer not to play games or parts of games themselves, watching playthroughs is a thoroughly accepted and normalized practice within the gaming community for enjoying and evaluating games. It is comparable to how those who cannot attend live performances of musicals can still enjoy and evaluate the work through reading the script, listening to the soundtrack, and watching recordings. While individual Hugo Award voters may not want to use playthroughs as their own personal means for evaluating games, this should not prevent others from doing so and should not preclude the category for existing. Policing the means by which people experience a work is ableist, classist, and generally exclusionary: playthroughs, like soundtrack recordings of musicals, are a democratizing force that makes games more accessible to more players and fans. WSFS does not attempt to control the means by which people experience a work, nor how much of it they must read, hear, or watch before voting, and **it is antithetical to the democratic spirit of the Hugo Awards to say that this well-established means of experiencing games is not a valid way for any given Hugo Award voter to evaluate games.** A full discussion of using playthroughs to evaluate games is provided at gameshugo.com/faq/playthroughs.

The “substantial modification” and genre requirement are necessary parts of a Best Game or Interactive Work Hugo Award category definition. Modifying games is essential to the culture and craft around games and gaming in both virtual and physical spaces, permitting both professional and fan participation. Explicitly including this clause, which is based on an identical clause in the Best Related Work category, recognizes this essential aspect of games and alleviates the burden on Hugo Award administrators of determining whether a given entry is sufficiently standalone separate from its base game. We can trust the voters to gravitate towards truly significant modifications that add substantial content or meaning to the base work, rather than superficial additions.

In terms of the genre requirement, what makes a game speculative is a notably blurry boundary, so this stipulation is intended to provide similar guidance to the language used

in categories such as Best Dramatic Presentation (Long Form or Short Form) and Best Related Work. The definition is also structured to exclude conventions and certain other works that are not in the spirit of the category via the “specific named persons” clause, which entails that a work in this category not hinge on a particular ephemeral execution but instead be a broadly reproducible experience or a platform to provide such, similar to how a musical hinges on the script, direction, etc. of the production, rather than whether a particular actor or their understudy performs a given part.

The Games Hugo Award campaign has thoroughly analyzed all concerns raised at previous Business Meetings and within the WSFS community in the intervening discussions. **This category is viable, accessible, and necessary.** Please see gameshugo.com for any further questions or concerns.

Appendix E – Report of the E.2 Committee

This is the report of the committee created at Saturday's session to examine the amendment to E.2 and report back on Sunday.

This report restates some things that may already be known to make sure that everyone has the same information.

Our Standing Rules currently contain Rule 2.1 – Deadline for Submission of New Business. The text of this current standing rule is largely identical to what is in amendment E.2, other than some slight changes for clarity.

Anything in the Standing Rules can be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote. So, as our Standing Rules currently say, the deadline to submit new business is 30 days prior to the meeting, and the presiding officer can choose to accept late new business anyway.

If the presiding officer does not accept late new business, the Business Meeting can, by a two-thirds (2/3) vote, move to suspend 2.1 and take up the business anyway. They could also, if the presiding officer *does* allow a late item, vote to suspend 2.1 and **NOT** take up the item. This ability to suspend the rules is not stated explicitly in 2.1, because *all* Standing Rules changes are subject to being suspended in that matter.

At last year's Business Meeting, we decided to codify this Standing Rule into the Constitution, pending its ratification at Chicon 8. As part of doing so, it was pointed out that we would still want the ability to suspend this rule. It was the sense of last year's Presiding Officer that, due to a rather arcane provision in Robert's Rules, it actually would still be possible to suspend the rules on this new part of the Constitution. However, for clarity, Don decided to move to amend the item in order to actually explicitly add the language that it could be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote.

The suspension by a two-thirds (2/3) vote is not any different than the suspension that is already possible under the Standing Rules. It does not create a time loop issue, because it is not asking the Business Meeting to hold the vote to suspend at that 30-day-prior point. Rather, just as happens now, the vote to suspend would happen at the Business Meeting in order for the body to consider a late item that the Presiding Officer had not accepted.

Inserting a paragraph break before the last sentence of E.2, and then adding the amendment at the end of that, would accomplish something else entirely. It would break the rule into two parts. The first part, stating the deadline for new business, would no longer be suspendable. Only the second part, stating that the Presiding Officer can decide to allow late business, would be suspendable. So while the

Business Meeting would still have the ability to say, “No, Presiding Officer, we actually won’t be considering that late item that you allowed”, it would no longer have the ability to say, “Yes, Presiding Officer, we actually *will* be considering that late item that you *dis*allowed.”

As such, it is the opinion of this committee that the amendment to E.2 should stay exactly as originally proposed, and simply add the words "This rule can be suspended by a two-thirds (2/3) vote." to the end of E.2.

**Appendix F – Minutes of the Committee of the Whole for
F.1 The Zero Per Cent Solution and
F.2 To Defuse the Turnout Bomb, Cut the Red Wire . . .**

There was no objection to allowing cameras to record this meeting. The motions could not amend or alter the text of the resolutions directly, but the committee could recommend changes as part of its report. Given the instructions and the fact that F.2 was the item immediately before the business meeting, the deputy presiding officer suggested that if the committee of the whole (“COTW”) arrive at an amendment it liked but wasn’t the exact text of F.2 as currently constituted, that it should propose an amendment by substitution to turn F.2 into whatever the COTW recommended. The deputy presiding officer also explicated that the only motions that would be in order during the COTW were the motion to adopt, *i.e.*, (a) to include something in the report to be given to the presiding officer of the business meeting, (b) to amend what the COTW is proposing in the report, and (c) to rise and give the report. Also in order were privileged motions, such as a point of order or appealing a ruling. The COTW could also, by a two-thirds (2/3) vote, extend debate past the 15 minutes allotted. In addition, the deputy presiding officer noted that straw polls were permissible.

Rafe Richards (he/him) made a motion to adopt a recommendation from the COTW to suspend the rules to remove F.2 from the agenda and take up F.1 immediately. Mr. Richards felt that doing one of these two motions was a good idea, and he felt F.1 was the better of the two motion.

Cliff Dunn countered that, preferring the COTW adopt F.2 rather than F.1. He noted that F.1 will still leave situations where, hypothetically, a Worldcon had trouble accepting and supporting the memberships and end up with a relatively small voting base. We could end up having a Hugo Award winner with only a couple of hundred voters, as was the situation as recently as about a decade ago. We could end up with a situation where a Hugo Award was voted on by only a handful of people. He agreed wholeheartedly with the underlying sentiment of both motions. If there are thousands of people potentially voting, we should not be discarding the votes cast by hundreds and hundreds of people. But he felt there was a point where a small group of people that voted in a large enough pool was not representative of the community, and if nothing else the community has spoken by a broad disinterest. He believed those two points speak to choosing F.2 over F.1.

Olav Rokne (he/him) claimed to have more reading on this subject than most. He started with a position relatively similar to F.2 but he came to realize there are already mechanisms for removing categories when there is insufficient interest: the business meeting. He felt this was an accident waiting to happen, no matter which version of the rules was chosen. Denying a richly deserved Hugo Award came way too close to happening last year in the Best Editor Long Form. Additionally, as far as Mr. Rokne could was aware, the lowest number of votes ever received by a Hugo Award finalist was

for Roy Krinkle for Best Artist. He received 12 votes at the first Washington, D.C., Worldcon in 1961. No one says he didn't deserve the Hugo Award. There were 600 people at that convention. They panicked and added clauses to the Constitution, trying to prevent that, and so it was formalized. Mr. Rokne argued that this clause does not do what it needs to do, and we should get rid of it.

Ben Yalow (he/him) said that if the number of votes cast has no statistical significance to the result, that we would be giving an award randomly. He did not feel this was appropriate. Therefore he proposed to keep the safety net against statistical randomness and giving out random Hugo Awards.

Kat Kourbeti (she/her) said that there are categories that simply attract more votes; *e.g.* Best Dramatic Presentation, Best Novel, Best Short Story. They are easy to access, easy to read, easy to understand what they are nominating. Some people don't engage with some categories because of the difficulty to access. The smaller community categories tend to attract a smaller number of votes. That did not make them statistically irrelevant. It might show a weakness in attracting attention and making sure all voters know what the categories are, but she considered that a separate issue.

A motion was made to suspend the rules and adopt the report to remove F.2 from the agenda and immediately take up F.1. However, there was an objection. But by a show of hands, debate was closed.

The deputy presiding officer restated the motion: to adopt a report recommending a suspension of the rules in order to remove F.2 from the agenda and immediately take up F.1.

A final motion was made and seconded to rise and report to the business meeting to which there was no objection, and the meeting of the COTW concluded.

Appendix G – Minutes of the Committee of the Whole for F.5 Fan vs. Pro

The Committee of the Whole (“COTW”) was instructed to provide feedback on the motion F.5 Fan vs. Pro, and report back to the business meeting with some direction as to how a new committee should approach this item before reporting back to the business meeting at Chengdu.

Andrew Adams (he/him) was not sure on trying to put a bright line definition was the way to proceed where the work itself is what is going into a category. He felt there was a missing element, where you can have a publication that contains some of both, and that there was no guidance in this definition as to where those works should go.

Ben Yalow (he/him) noted that we had moved the fan/pro art motion into a committee to come back next year. He believed one way for us to find out what the general sentiment of the field was would be to see what that committee came back with. Therefore he felt that the COTW should report back that this motion should be killed and see what happens with the art fan pro distinction before creating another motion.

Lisa Hertel (she/they), a member of the fan/pro art committee, said that committee would work with any new committee that’s created.

Kat Kourbeti (she/her) agreed with Mr. Yalow. She is a content creator in various forms and felt this amendment was murky. She did not believe it is an accurate reflection of what is pro and what is fan, particularly relating to money. Whether or not an effort is rewarded is not an accurate reflection of something is pro or fan and felt this needed a longer discussion.

Ira Alexandre (they/them) agreed that it was a good idea to see what the fan and pro artist committee said. They also thought it made sense to send both items to a single committee since we need a definition of fan and pro that works across many different [fan] cultures and around different types of activities in different spheres of creation, medium, and commercialization. Therefore, they moved that the COTW report back with the recommendation that F.6 be moved to the same committee as F.5, to be chaired by Sara Felix. The motion was seconded.

If passed, this motion would be made part of the report from the COTW, but it would not conclude the work of the COTW.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) argued against the motion. While she understood the issues were related, single committee would have too many members on it and nothing would be accomplished.

By a show of hands, the report from the COTW would include referring F.5 be added to the remit of the committee for F.6.

Jared Dashoff (he/him) made a motion to amend the COTW report to include the instruction that the committee not distinguish its definitions based on the expectation of sale or not sale as that it very hard for anyone other than the creator to determine, but perhaps base it on first usage or first presentation. This was seconded.

Mr. Yalow asked if the instructions already given to the F.6 committee applied to F.5. Would this motion give instructions to the committee on what to do in the art categories when the F.6 committee was created without said instructions, even though it's the same committee. He asked whether the COTW was or was not instructing the committee on what to do in the art category. Mx. Chairperson noted that the COTW only be instructing the committee regarding F.5, and it would be up to the committee if they wanted to reference these instructions with regard to F.6.

Dave Howell (he/they) spoke against the motion to amend. Including the maker's intent is relevant, but so are the opinions of others, and none should be excluded for the committee to consider.

Terry Neill (she/her) noted that based on the reports coming from the Hugo Award administrator, it appears to be common for the administrators to discuss eligibility with potential finalists. Several people this year were eliminated because they said they were not eligible, even though they were nominated. I think we can trust the creators and the Hugo Award administrators to work out things where they know more than the nominators do.

John Lorentz (he/him), a former Hugo Award administrator, noted that the people nominated don't always know whether or not they are eligible, because the rules are so fuzzy. He felt we really need to come up with guidance that works for them as well as for us.

Ms. Lurie noted that even if the people being nominated know what category they are in, the nominators do not always know, and we need to give clearer guidance to the people doing the nominating in the first place.

Joshua Kronengold (he/him) said he used the word "expectation" in F.5 because there were problems with dealing with something first released under a table¹ and then released for free and therefore generally perceived as free by the populous. But it may also have some amount of money coming in. And it may be something where it is nominated for a fan award. But the rules, if not carefully considered, might put it in a pro category. He was not against this particular wording, but it's worth thinking about where the committee wants it.

Ms. Kourbeti disagreed with the money/no money definition proposed in F.5 because it disregards the current economic climate content. A fan writer or fan publication should

¹ In context it is unclear whether this meant for a fee.

be able to fundraise. Fan labor is labor, and she felt we need a better definition that allows for this. Things cost money, even if they are online, and fans raising money to support their fan labor should not be excluded from the fan categories. To lump them into a pro category is not correct for the kind of content that they produce. Fancasts are like this; fanzines and fan publications very clearly create fan content. They talk about fannishness and science fiction in general and analyzing things. Therefore a better definition that did not involve money should be considered.

The question was called to amend the recommendation of the COTW that F.5 be referred to the F.6 committee, with the remit to discuss ways of defining the categories without involving money. By a show of hands, the motion passed.

Nicholas Whyte (he/him) proposed another amendment to F.5: to consider whether a global definition of fan vs. pro was necessary or if a category-by-category was preferable. This was seconded, and Mr. Whyte proceeded to defend his motion. In particular, the fan artist category is in urgent need of definition because both nominators and nominees are uncertain if they are eligible. He also agreed with Ms. Kourbeti that fan work is labor. In that regard, he felt it would be difficult to construct a definition that applies equally to the art categories, which are a special, and to the writing, fan casting and fanzine categories. Therefore, he asked only that consideration be given to updating the definition by category.

Mr. Kronengold spoke against this amendment. He argued that our fan categories are distinguished from professional categories monetarily. Those who are paid for their labor and charging for their labor, even if they consider themselves fans, are not producing work in a fan category unless we make the distinction in a different place. We want to distinguish between things we do for love versus things we do for money. He also noted that we have already created a committee that is largely interested in art, and now we might be sending this measure to that committee. He added that it was possible that the committee might change its structure and invite more members in order to better deal with the larger issue (F.5), but now Mr. Whyte's amendment would add a requirement to decide whether there should be a different definition for art and everything else, or whether every fan category should have its own definition, or whether there should be a global definition. He believed we should not take the easy path; we should take the good path.

A motion was made to extend debate time to a total of 10 more minutes, which was seconded and passed without objection.

When Dave Howell (he/him) asked if the committee would be bound by these instructions, the response was that it would not be so bound.

Ron Oakes (he/him) noted that the definitions for fan vs. pro were added relatively recently (around 2008) in part to help with the definition of the semiprozine category. They have not been in the constitution for very long, and prior to that time the definitions

were defined category by category. Since that time, he added, the definition of fan art, fanzine, fancast (which was added since then) and their appropriate definitions of their professional equivalence, have shifted, both within fannish culture and popular culture. These are distinct items, and each one needs its own definition Therefore he felt it was reasonable that we reconsider those definitions.

Dave McCarty (he/him) moved to expand on Mr. Whyte's motion to add that it was the sense of the business meeting that things have multiple uses over their life. If something is used as fan art or fan writing at one time, being sold at a later time does not disqualify it from still being fannish, and that things can be both. There's a duality, and we can make fan art and feed ourselves. The motion was seconded.

Perianne Lurie (she/her) said she agreed with Mr. McCarty's idea, but felt it did not actually provide any guidance to the committee.

The two matters now up for a vote were Mr. McCarty's amendment to Mr. Whyte's motion, to be followed by Mr. Whyte's motion to amend the COTW's report to the business meeting. The COTW would still be in session.

By a show of hands, Mr. McCarty's amendment passed.

By a show of hands Mr. Whyte's amendment to F.5 passed.

The presiding officer reiterated that the report of COTW would now be to refer F.5 to same committee as F.6, with the following instructions:

- to consider NOT defining based on "expectation" of an item being for sale or not for sale, but perhaps first usage or presentation,
- to consider whether to have a global definition of fan vs. pro or a category-by-category definition,
- to consider the distinction between collecting money for expenses related to the work vs. for the benefit of creator, and
- that it is the sense of the COTW that things have multiple uses over their life. If something is used as fan art or fan writing, later sale does not disqualify it from being fannish. Things can be both fan and pro.

Donald Eastlake (he/him) made a new motion: the committee should consider the benefit of a vague definition that depends solely on the nominators. This was seconded.

Clark B. Wierda (he/him) spoke against the motion. He noted that the debate issue was what we were trying to resolve.

Lew Wolkoff (he him) wished to amend Mr. Eastlake's motion to considering a very specific and well-documented set of rules that already exists regarding dividing professional from amateur activity: the U.S. Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") or its counterparts/equivalents in other countries. The effect of this amendment would be to not

only have the committee consider the benefits of a vague definition, but also consider the benefits of a specific definition, such as those of the IRS or its counterparts/equivalents in other countries.

Rafe Richards (he/him) felt the COTW was starting to overload the committee with too many recommendations and instructions.

The question was called to close debate and seconded, but there was an objection, thus requiring a two-thirds (2/3) vote in favor to end debate. By a show of hands, debate closed. Then, by a show of hands, Mr. Wolcoff's amendment to Mr. Eastlake's motion was not adopted.

Discussion of Mr. Eastlake's motion then began.

Leslie Turek (she/her) supported Mr. Eastlake's amendment, noting that we have struggled to find a definition to include what we have traditionally understood to be fan work. She wished to leave the committee the option of concluding that it might not be possible. The rules that talk about earnings exclude many things that we have traditionally considered to be fan work Fans sell fanzines; fans put their art in the art show for sale. Defining the difference is difficult, and she believed it should be left open in case the committee could not come up with a universal definition of what we traditionally have considered to be fan work.

Lisa Hertel (she/they) the problem is that in the past we have been vague, and past Hugo Award Administrators have asked us to not be vague.

A motion to end debate was made and seconded. There was no objection, and Mr. Eastlake's amendment was put to a vote. By a show of hands, the motion failed.

Dave Wallace (he/him) then proposed an additional amendment to ask the committee to consider the distinction between collecting money "to put food on the table" for the personal benefit of the creators and collecting money to cover expenses related to the work. The motion was seconded. This was seconded. Mr. Wallace noted this was a kind of profit versus non profit distinction.

Mr. Dunn asked to amend Mr. Wallace's motion to include the language ". . . and which ensures that all activities shall be considered fan or pro." This was seconded.

Mr. Adams believed this was contradictory to Mr. McCarty's amendment that was now included in the report. The presiding officer ruled that the amendment included an inclusive "or," not an exclusive one. The point was not to have things that were neither fan nor pro.

Mr. Dunn then explicated that this verbiage would ensure that all activity was defined in order to avoid there being a gap between the two terms because Hugo Award administrators have sometimes found themselves in the position of ruling something not fan and not pro.

A motion was made to close debate on both Mr. Wallace's motion and Mr. Dunn's amendment to that motion, and then to rise and report. This was seconded, and there were no objections.

First, by a show of hands, Mr. Dunn's amendment passed.

Second, by a show of hands, Mr. Wallace's amendment also passed.

Before the COTW voted on rising and reporting to the business meeting, the presiding officer restated the report:

To refer F.5 to same committee as F.6, with the following instructions: (a) to consider NOT defining fan vs. pro based on an expectation that an item would be for sale or not for sale, but perhaps based on first usage or presentation; (b) to consider whether a global definition of fan vs. pro is necessary or whether it is preferable to have a category-by-category definition; (c) to consider that things have multiple uses over its life, such as fan art or fan writing, and later sales do not disqualify them from being fannish; things can be both fan and pro; (d) to consider the distinction between collecting money for expenses related to the work vs. for the benefit of the creator, and (e) to ensure that all activity be defined either fan and/or pro (*i.e.*, all works be defined as fan, or pro, or both fan and pro, but that no work should be considered neither).

Then, by acclamation, the COTW voted to rise and make its report.