3.2 Committees Appointed Annually

3.2.1 Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

The Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee members for 2013-2014 are Kevin Standlee (Chair), Jared Dashoff, Linda Deneroff, Donald Eastlake and Tim Illingworth. The committee is willing to serve for another year. The authority of this committee stems from:

**Standing Rule 7.7: Nitpicking and Flyspecking Committee**

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

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

**Actions:** The Resolutions & Rulings of Continuing Effect is up to date at [http://www.wsfs.org/bm/rules.html](http://www.wsfs.org/bm/rules.html).

**Recommendations:** The Committee recommends passage of the following resolutions:

### 3.2.1.1 Short Title: Allowing Postpone Indefinitely

*Moved,* to modify existing Standing Rule 5.3 to allow the motion to Postpone Indefinitely in its debatable form, but only at the Preliminary Business Meeting, and to require a 2/3 vote to postpone a motion indefinitely.

**Rule 5.3: Postpone Indefinitely.** The motion to Postpone Indefinitely shall not be allowed at the Main Business Meeting, but shall be allowed at the Preliminary Business Meeting. This motion shall have four (4) minutes of debate time and shall require a two-thirds (2/3) vote for adoption.

Proposed by: Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

**Commentary:** The motion to Postpone Indefinitely effectively kills a proposal for the remainder of that year’s Business Meeting. (The proposal can be re-introduced at a future Worldcon.) In standard parliamentary procedure, this motion requires a majority and can be made at any time no other motion attached to a main motion is pending. WSFS has generally banned this motion for reasons having to do with allowing members who have exhausted their right of debate to take an additional shot at a motion. However, Postpone Indefinitely has a potential use at the Preliminary Business Meeting to allow the meeting to control its own agenda without having to use the parliamentary sledgehammer of Objection to Consideration. Allowing Postpone Indefinitely to be introduced in a limited form with a short amount of debate time to be used for the purpose of debating the question, “Should we discuss the main
proposal at the Main Meeting” would allow both proponents and opponents of the consideration of a proposal a brief opportunity to make their cases. The NPFSC thinks that Objection to Consideration is overused, being applied to merely unpopular proposals rather than those that could be seen as embarrassing or harmful to the Society to be discussed. Giving the meeting a tool to control the Main Meeting agenda while still giving proponents an opportunity to make a case for the consideration of their proposals would make the Meeting seem less intimidating to newcomers. This proposal is related to the proposal below to modify the motion to Object to Consideration.

3.2.1.2 Short Title: OTC Voting Requirement

Moved, to increase the required number of votes to kill an item of new business by Objection to Consideration by adding a new standing rule:

Rule 5.x: Objection to Consideration. An Objection to Consideration shall require a three-fourths (3/4) vote to kill a motion without debate.

Proposed by: Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

Commentary: WSFS regularly uses the incidental motion Object to Consideration, mostly at the Preliminary Business Meeting, and primarily as a device of killing, without debate, new constitutional amendments when they are first introduced. (An OTC cannot be lodged against constitutional amendments previously passed and awaiting ratification.) This motion can only be made immediately after a proposal comes to the floor for the first time, and has priority over others who want to speak to the motion. Consequently, it has tended to be made rather forcefully. This can come to a shock to new attendees, because while OTC is defined in Robert’s Rules of Order, it is obscure and rarely used in most organizations. The NPSFC proposes (above, item 1) using a variation of Postpone Indefinitely as an “agenda sweeper,” and raising the threshold on OTC to three-fourths in order to discourage its casual use.

3.2.1.3 Short Title: Hugo Finalists

Moved, to amend portions of Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution to change references to those works or people that appear on the final Hugo Award ballot to “finalist” and to change references to “candidate” to “nominee,” as shown:

Section 3.7: Nominations.

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

3.7.2: The Committee shall include with each nomination ballot a copy of Article 3 of the WSFS Constitution and any applicable extensions of eligibility under Sections 3.2.3 or 3.4.
3.7.3: Nominations shall be solicited only for the Hugo Awards and the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer.

Section 3.9: Notification and Acceptance.

3.9.1 Worldcon Committees shall use reasonable efforts to notify the nominees-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 nominee-finalist shall be asked at that time to either accept or decline the nomination. If the nominee-finalist declines nomination, that nominee-finalist shall not appear on the final ballot.

3.9.2 In the Best Professional Artist category, the acceptance should include citations of at least three (3) works first published in the eligible year.

3.9.3 Each nominee-finalist in the categories of Best Fanzine and Best Semiprozine shall be required to provide information confirming that they meet the qualifications of their category.

Section 3.10: Voting.

3.10.1: Final Award voting shall be by balloting in advance of the Worldcon. Postal mail shall always be acceptable. Only WSFS members may vote. Final Award ballots shall include name, signature, address, and membership-number spaces to be filled in by the voter.

3.10.2: Final Award ballots shall list only the Hugo Awards and the John W. Campbell Award for Best New Writer.

3.10.3: “No Award” shall be listed in each category of Hugo Award on the final ballot.

3.10.4: The Committee shall, on or with the final ballot, designate, for each nominee-finalist in the printed fiction categories, one or more books, anthologies, or magazines in which the nominee-finalist appeared (including the book publisher or magazine issue date(s)).

3.10.5: Voters shall indicate the order of their preference for the nominee-finalists in each category.

Section 3.11: Tallying of Votes.

3.11.1: In each category, tallying shall be as described in Section 6.4. “No Award” shall be treated as a nominee-finalist. If all remaining nominee-finalists are tied, no tie-breaking shall be done and the nominee-finalists excluding “No Award” shall be declared joint winners.

3.11.2: “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.

3.11.3: “No Award” shall be the run-off candidate for the purposes of Section 6.5.

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

Proposed by: Nitpicking & Flyspecking Committee

**Commentary:** Although long-standing tradition has considered the works or people appearing on the final Hugo Award ballot to be “nominees,” an increasingly large number of people are now referring to any works or people receiving any nominations at all (even just one nomination vote) as “nominees,” and there is an increasing confusion in terminology. This year’s Worldcon has deliberately decided to call the works/people appearing on the Hugo Award ballot “finalists” rather than “nominees” in order to avoid the ambiguity. The NPFSC recommends that WSFS explicitly adopt this terminology in order to eliminate the ambiguity between “nominee” meaning “person or work receiving one or more nomination votes” and “person or work appearing on the final Hugo Award ballot.”