

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.....	2
A.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee.....	2
A.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee.....	4
A.3 Special Committees.....	4
A.3.1 Formalization of Long List Entries (FOLLE) Committee.....	4
A.3.2 Hugo Awards Study Committee.....	4
B. FINANCIAL REPORTS.....	6
B.1 LoneStarCon 3 (San Antonio).....	6
B.2 Sasquan (Spokane).....	7
B.3 MidAmeriCon II (Kansas City).....	8
B.4 Worldcon 75 (Helsinki, Finland).....	9
B.5 Worldcon 76 (San Jose).....	10
B.6 Dublin 2019: An Irish Worldcon (Dublin, Ireland).....	12
B.7 CoNZeland (Wellington, New Zealand).....	15
B.8 DisCon III (Washington, DC).....	17
B.9 Chicon 8 (Chicago, Illinois).....	19
B.10 Chengdu Worldcon (Chengdu, China).....	24
C. STANDING RULE CHANGES.....	26
C.1 Short Title: Making Business Meeting Feedback Possible.....	26
C.2 Short Title: If You Don't Have To Print, Neither Do We.....	27
D. RESOLUTIONS.....	28
D.1 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>After Yang</i>	28
D.2 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>Strawberry Mansion</i>	28
D.3 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>Neptune Frost</i>	28
D.4 Short Title: Hugo Eligibility Extension for <i>Mad God</i>	29

D.5	Short Title: Solidarity with Ukraine -----	29
D.6	Short Title: Sergey Lukianenko -----	29
E.	BUSINESS PASSED ON	30
E.1	Short Title: E Pluribus Hugo-----	30
E.2	Short Title: 30 Days Hath New Business -----	32
E.3	Short Title: The Statue of Liberty Play -----	32
E.4	Short Title: A Matter of Days-----	32
E.5	Short Title: Non-transferability of Voting Rights-----	33
F.	NEW CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.....	34
F.1	Short Title: The Zero Per Cent Solution -----	34
F.2	Short Title: To Defuse the Turnout Bomb, Cut the Red Wire . . . -----	36
F.3	Short Title: If a Tree Falls in The Woods and Nobody Is Around . . . -----	36
F.4	Short Title: Best Game or Interactive Work -----	37
F.5	Short Title: Fan vs. Pro -----	39
F.6	Short Title: Clearing Up the Artist Categories Forever (No, Really, We Swear It This Time!) -----	40
F.7	Short Title: One Rocket Per Customer, Please! -----	42
F.8	Short Title: A Work, By Any Other Name . . . -----	42
G.	ELECTION RESULTS	44
G.1	Worldcon 2024 -----	44
G.2	NASFiC 2023 -----	44
H.	REPORTS FROM WORLDCONS AND BIDS.....	45
H.1	Seated Worldcon: Chengdu (2023) -----	45
H.2	2025 Bid: Seattle -----	45
H.3	2024 NASFiC Bid: Buffalo -----	45
I.	ANNOUNCEMENTS	46
	APPENDICES	47
	Appendix A – Report of the Mark Protection Committee -----	47
	Appendix B – Results of the Mark Protection Committee Election -----	55
	Appendix C – Report of the Hugo Award Study Committee -----	56
	Appendix D – Best Game or Interactive Work Report -----	77

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

INTRODUCTION

The Business Meeting will be held in the Crystal B Ballroom at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Chicago, Illinois. The Officers are:

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 consists 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 will be recorded per Standing Rule 1.6. Any member may also make their own recordings and distribute them at their discretion.

A. COMMITTEE REPORTS AND MOTIONS

A.1 Standing Committee of WSFS

A.1.1 Mark Protection Committee Report and Nominations

The members of the 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 Treasurer. For the full MPC written report, please see [Exhibit A](#), attached to these minutes.

A.2. Standing Committees of the Business Meeting

A.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The members of the NP&FSC for 2021-2022 were Don Eastlake (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Tim Illingworth, Jesi Lipp, Kevin Standlee, and Jo Van Ekeren. 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.

A.2.2 Worldcon Runners Guide Editorial Committee

The Worldcon Runners' Guide Editorial Committee 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/>.

A.3 Special Committees

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

Long List Committee report for 2021
December 2021 – August 2022

The Long List Committee 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>.

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](#).

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 Woehle, James Stringer – Members-at-large

B.3 MidAmeriCon II (Kansas City)



MidAmeriCon II Financial Statement

No report was received at the time of publication. It may be forthcoming, so check back.

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 €	
Bank Fees	353.06 €	
Storage	129.96 €	
Support for Finncon 2022	5,000.00 €	
Carry-over to Archipelacon 2	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	1,160.01
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
Hospitality	44,337.80
Programming	14,663.96
Publications	69,018.52
Finance	164,504.78
CONVENTION EXPENSES	\$1,470,209.01

EXPENSE	
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)
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

Expenditure	
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)



DisCon III

The 79th World Science Fiction Convention
 Washington, DC • Omni Shoreham Hotel
 December 15-19, 2021 • discon3.org

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
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

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
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

INCOME	U.S. Dollars
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
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

EXPENSES	
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
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	

EXPENSES	
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 CoNZeland, 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 CoNZeland 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

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.)

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).

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 Surface

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 honoured by Worldcon.

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

E. BUSINESS PASSED ON

This 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:

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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 Buhlert, 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 3 in 2021, but because only 762 people voted in the Hugos 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.

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.

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 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.

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.

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.

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).

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.

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.

G. ELECTION RESULTS

G.1 Worldcon 2024

G.2 NASFiC 2023

H. REPORTS FROM WORLDCONS AND BIDS

H.1 Seated Worldcon: Chengdu (2023)

H.2 2025 Bid: Seattle

H.3 2024 NASFiC Bid: Buffalo

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

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.Orgrefund	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

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

Overview	56
Members of the Committee.....	57
Subcommittees Formed.....	57
Subcommittee Reports.....	57
Best Related Work	58
Best Dramatic Presentation	58
Best Audiobook.....	59
Best Game or Interactive Work Subcommittee Report	60
Best Series	61
Minority Report (Author, Nicholas Whyte; joined by Martin Easterbrook)	64
Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist.....	64
Fan vs Pro.....	66
Minority Report (Author, John Coxon; joined by Alison Scott and Nana Amuah)	70
Thresholds	70
Minority Report (Author: Alison Scott; joined by John Coxon, Nana Amuah, Nicholas Whyte, and Ira Alexandre)	75
Automatic Re-Ratification of Categories	76

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.

Subcommittee Reports

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

¹ Note that the names used here are taken from the Discord server and were reviewed by the committee 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 Nominations	Best Series Nominations	Percentage	Votes	Best Series Votes	Percentage	Other
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 (1/4) 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.