

EVATT COMPETITION REGULATIONS

#1: JUDGING CRITERIA

Evatt judging seeks to determine which team is *most effective in achieving their nation's goals through diplomacy.*

Judges understand the effectiveness of a team by assessing the actual (not prospective) achievements of that team throughout a round, taking into account not just the relative difficulty of those achievements from that team's position, but whether the nation's goals were thereby advanced and whether they were achieved by diplomacy.

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide some objectivity as to what makes an effective team. Teams will generally be more effective if they demonstrate the following five elements of effectiveness:

1. **Speaking.** Evatt speeches change the diplomatic conversation by making short, memorable, original, relevant, and logical points. Points of information (questions) must persuade the audience, either supporting allies or undermining an opposing argument through brief and pertinent questions or answers.
2. **Negotiation.** Listening and drawing one's counterpart towards agreement through reasoned, persuasive argument defines negotiation. This element also requires efficient use of Security Council procedure; delegates should manage their limited time to focus on their member state's highest priorities.
3. **Teamwork.** In an Evatt team, both partners participate in all parts of the competition and work harmoniously together. They recognize and take advantage of their complementary strengths and distinctive intellectual contributions through clear team strategy.
4. **Research.** Evatt teams reflect their state's policies, priorities, and agenda in their advocacy with reasonable accuracy. Teams apply their research to demonstrate understanding of their nation and the issues under discussion.
5. **A Diplomatic Manner.** Diplomacy is characterised by a manner of constructive engagement, where disagreement is channelled towards productive results through mature deliberation. In particular, teams must engage with their counterparts as if they would continue to do so long into the future, avoiding tactics like bullying that produce a short-term result at a high long-term cost.

However, these elements will not always tell us the answers. Judges should be aware that each element reflects effectiveness, and that sometimes effectiveness can be achieved in contradiction of the element. Teams are, above all, assessed on effectiveness demonstrated through achievement in context.

Elaboration and Commentary on the Judging Guidelines

Judges are *required* to take commentary below into account in their decisions:

Judging in General

Delegates must be unambiguously informed of when and where they are being judged and when and where they are not. When delegates are being judged, everything they do and say is relevant, and must be disclosed by the judges that witness it.

Evatt judging is not “speculative;” it relies on demonstrated performance. However, Evatt can be retrospective. If an Evatt competition has multiple rounds (preliminary and Grand finals, for instance), and *if and only if* teams cannot be readily distinguished on the basis of their Grand Finals performance, judges may have regard to their performance throughout all the stages of the competition.

Judges should reward consistent performance within a particular round; a consistently good performance throughout a round is always preferable to a superlative session followed by a calamitous one.

1. Speaking

Evatt speeches and points of information are not debate speeches but share many of the same qualities of manner, matter, and method.

First, speeches must persuade with reasoned argument. An absurd speech that sways other delegates only out of whimsy will not be credited. The factual accuracy of a speech is covered by the research element, but logic is integral to persuasion.

Second, speeches should have all of the elements of clarity and style expected of any public speech: it should not be read word for word, speakers should make eye contact with other delegates (their audience), and use the tools of volume, pace, and tone. While florid rhetoric of all kinds is encouraged, it must not detract from clear expression.

Third, speeches must be clearly structured. This structure need not be elaborate, but it should be clear what the speaker is responding to and what point or points the speaker has made. In particular, a speech or point of information **must be brief and pertinent**. It is far better to speak under-time than to ramble. This does not require brevity for its own sake; a long but well-structured answer is more effective than a cringe-worthy pun.

Speeches and points of information are assessed, above all, on their actual impact on the debate, and not their hypothetical impact on an average reasonable person. In such analysis, originality is valuable. A good, original speech changes the conversation either by bringing up new, compelling issues or making an incisive contribution to the debate on a current one.

2. Negotiation

Negotiation encompasses all non-public-speaking interactions in the simulation. The methods of effective negotiation are many, but common measures of effectiveness are:

- **time management**: delegates should prioritise; wasting time on amendments inconsequential to their nation damages a team’s effectiveness.
- **strategy and objectives**: does the team approach negotiation strategically, with clear objectives for each caucus or discussion and good time management?

- **reasoned persuasion:** are the teams advancing their case with other nations using logical arguments drawn from the facts? Abandoning logic to rely on relationships outside the simulation will not be credited.
- **note-passing:** is this used effectively to seek out information and persuade?
- **knowledge:** does the team make effective use of what it knows about its negotiating partners?
- **co-sponsorship:** is the team using co-sponsorship as an asset in negotiation? Are they using it as a tool of time management?
- **use of procedure:** has the team effectively used parliamentary strategy, including points of privilege and order when appropriate, to advance their case?

3. Teamwork

Teamwork is best approached by asking three questions:

- (1) Is a team avoiding contradictions and conflicts between its members?
- (2) Are both members of the team participating in the simulation?
- (3) Has the team recognised the unique intellectual and diplomatic strengths and weaknesses of their members, and applied these strategically?

The first rule of teamwork is that members must not contradict each other. Teams must prepare and communicate sufficiently that they present a united front, and can be confident that agreements made and lines of argument pursued are consistent.

Second, participation requires that both team members give speeches, ask questions, negotiate in caucus and use the Negotiation Chamber. Strict equality or alternation is neither required, nor desirable; varying levels of ability does not constitute poor teamwork. However, we do require that all delegates give each element of the simulation ‘a go’ throughout a round. A particular member’s clearly apparent failure to participate in one or more roles over multiple resolutions will be penalized.

Third, judges should reward teams for devising strategies based on their personalities, relationships, and strengths to most effectively maximize their impact. In particular, the best teams fully integrate the distinctive intellectual contributions of both members.

4. Research

This element manifests itself in two ways:

- (1) Reasonable accuracy of team stance
- (2) Use of relevant facts to persuade other member states

Delegates must represent the stance (opinion) of their assigned state with **reasonable** accuracy. This means the team’s stance must be persuasively justified in light of the inferences that a secondary student can reasonably make given their resources.

If delegates can present a reasonable justification for their stance then that stance is *always* acceptable. Judges must never substitute what they believe to be the correct stance to that chosen by the delegates, if the delegates provide persuasive justification in light of the resources available to a secondary student.

In addition, teams must *apply* an understanding of the concepts, history, and facts underlying the debate to their contributions. Research should have an impact: the best

teams will use just the right fact to change the terms of debate or persuade another team to side with them. Merely rehashing research already stated is seldom effective.

For a seen resolution, delegates are expected to have access to the free Internet, major national newspapers, and a public library. For an unseen resolution, delegates are expected only to have general knowledge of their country. However, none of the foregoing excuses teams from using clearly inaccurate information. Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be a team's stance or a judge's prejudices, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence. Teams should expect all facts to be rigorously checked.

5. A diplomatic manner

The Evatt Competition is premised playing the roles of a professional diplomat, and teams must comport themselves accordingly. For judges, this means two things.

First, teams should have good manners: a sensitive awareness to the feelings of others. These are fundamental to effective diplomacy. Good manners will undergird an attitude of constructive engagement – whether constantly working with the opposition to get results or making requests of the Chair (polite requests are never penalised).

Second, teams will be penalised for adopting negotiation strategies that reap benefit in the simulation but would do so at substantial long-term cost were this 'real life.' Promising to vote for but voting against, for instance, might be effective in a simulation but would get you fired – or worse – if you did it at the UN. Loud, angry confrontations are similarly ineffective in the long term – no-one likes a bully.

This element requires judges to consider effectiveness as a long-term proposition: if a team is effective in the simulation but would, were the simulation extended indefinitely, become vastly less effective, they are for our purposes a less effective team.

Effectiveness and team comparison

A judge's comparison of multiple teams involves comparing achievement in the context. Achievements are both *legislative* (amendments, votes) and *discursive* (changing how the Council talked about an issue). Context includes only the *resolution* and the *member state assignment*.

The aim of the analysis is to discern the effectiveness of a team beyond the specific circumstances of the particular sessions by examining demonstrated achievement in context. Judges must be careful not to cross the line into judging prospective achievement (what a team might have achieved were the context different) but instead weigh actual achievement against the context of the debate. The contextual adjustment must be limited: delegates control almost all elements of the simulation, including what amendments are considered and who speaks (owing to yielding).

This analysis should be considered through the lens of the elements above: in particular, whether the goals achieved were the nation's goals and whether the team behaved within the bounds of a diplomatic manner. However, all elements are, at bottom, guides and not rules. They help understand whether teams are effective, but in the final analysis effectiveness demonstrated through achievements in context will determine the winning team.

#2: RULES OF PROCEDURE

Officers

1. The President chairs the Security Council and rules on Security Council procedure.
2. Delegates may not appeal the decisions of the President. If a matter is not covered in these Rules, or if these Rules are ambiguous, the President's ruling shall be authoritative.

Starting a Debate and the Speakers' List

3. The President shall announce the resolution to be debated and invite a member state in favour to propose the resolution and a different member state also in favour to second the resolution. Proposers and seconders may choose to submit amendments to the resolution to improve it, but should be in favour of its passage on balance.
4. The President shall invite the proposer, and then the seconder, to speak. When the seconder begins their speech the Speaker's List is "opened". Every member state shall write a note to the President with the member state's name and whether they are "for" or "against" the resolution to join the list.
5. After the speech of the seconder, the President shall call one member state opposed to the resolution to speak, and shall then call a period of caucus.
6. Following this caucus, the President shall call on member states in the order of speakers on the Speaker's List (barring any yields), generally alternating between those for and against the resolution.
7. At any time, a member state may request in a note or by a point of privilege that the President move it down the speakers list, change its stance on the resolution or amendment, or read out the speaker's list.
8. At the President's discretion, the Speaker's List may be projected so the delegates can view it, or closed, which means member states cannot be added to it.

Speaking

9. Delegates should be addressed by, and refer to themselves with, the name of their member state (e.g. "China appreciates the force of the point made by the honourable delegate for Australia").
10. Unless the President otherwise declares, the maximum speaking time is 2 minutes.
11. Only one delegate from a member state may speak in a given speech, but delegates may alternate who speaks between speeches, or between speeches and points of information.

12. Member states may only speak once on a resolution, but if a member state has changed their stance, they may speak exactly once more on their new stance. This rule does not prevent a member state from speaking on amendments, making points of order or information, or exercising its right of reply.

Points of Information

13. At the end of every speech except the Right of Reply, the member state whose delegate just spoke shall answer as many Points of Information (questions) as the President determines.
14. For each Point of Information, the President will choose a member state from the member states volunteering a point of information. Points of Information can be asked and answered by either delegate of a member state, but once that delegate has begun speaking on a point, the other delegate cannot join in on that Point.
15. Points of Information must be brief and take the form of a single question that receives a single answer.
16. The delegate answering the Point of Information may request that the delegate asking the Point of Information clarify or rephrase their question.

Yielding

17. Member states other than the proposer and seconder of a resolution must yield the floor after their Points of Information by saying “We yield the floor to...” either the President or another member state on the Speaker’s List who has not yet spoken. The President may disallow a yield.
18. If a member state yields to another member state, then the member state yielded to will give their speech next even if they’re lower on the Speaker’s list. If a member state yields to the President, the President shall invite the next member state on the opposite side of the Speakers’ List to speak.
19. No yield is in order that would let four consecutive member states speak on the same side of the resolution.
20. The proposer and seconder of the resolution may not yield the floor, but the first member state against the resolution and the proposers of any amendments *may* yield the floor.

Amendments

21. At any time during debate while note passing is permitted, a member state may propose an amendment to the operative clauses of the resolution being discussed. Member states cannot amend the preamble.
22. Amendments are submitted as a note to the President and must be clearly from a single proposing member state. Its proposer may withdraw the amendment by note or a point of privilege at any time before it is entertained.

23. The member state proposing an amendment may circulate their amendment to any other member state for endorsement of that amendment's *entertainment* (not necessarily its adoption); if a member state endorses an amendment, they must indicate this on a copy of the amendment submitted to the President. Such member states are referred to as "co-sponsors".
24. The President shall entertain amendments in an order that takes into consideration only the following two factors:
 - a. The number of co-sponsors; amendments with more co-sponsors being preferred to amendments with fewer co-sponsors,
 - b. How consequential the amendment is to the resolution; more consequential amendments are preferred less consequential ones.
25. On a point of privilege or after reasonable request in a note, the President shall read the amendments they have received, the order in which they have placed amendments and their rationale for placing the amendments in that order.
26. Amendments may neither be amended nor cover more than one discrete topic (though that topic may require that multiple parts of the resolution are amended). The President may divide an amendment into multiple pieces, considered separately, so that it complies with this rule.
27. The President may combine similar amendments, and shall award proposer status on the proposed amendment to the state whose amendment copy had the largest number of co-sponsors.
28. The President shall rule an amendment invalid if it:
 - a. is irrelevant to the topic of the resolution,
 - b. would alter the basic nature or purpose of the resolution,
 - c. would have no significant effect on the resolution,
 - d. would simply repeal a passed amendment, unless the amendment expressly indicates that it aims to repeal the past amendment and is accompanied by the co-sponsorship of at least a majority of the Council,
 - e. would, without repealing a previously passed amendment, cover substantially the same point as a passed amendment.
29. If the President entertains a proposed amendment:
 - a. They shall read the text of the amendment to the Security Council; and,
 - b. If the amendment is complex, they may ask the proposer of the amendment to explain in plain language for no more than 30 seconds what the amendment will actually do (which should not be confused with an argument for the amendment's debate or adoption).
30. After the amendment has been read and explained, the President may permit the Security Council to vote on whether the amendment should be debated. Debate on an amendment requires the approval of a majority of member states voting in favour.

31. If an amendment is to be debated, the same procedure is followed as for a resolution except that the Proposer is already known, a new Speakers List (just for the amendment) is established, there is no requirement that member states get on the Speakers List, and there is no Right of Reply.
32. If the President does not grant a debate vote, or the Security Council votes against debate on the amendment, or the President overrules the Security Council debate vote, the amendment shall be, at the discretion of the President, either voted on immediately, or after a brief caucus, or after one or more speeches called by the President in a “mini debate.”
33. Amendments shall be voted on according to the rules of voting described later in these Rules. Regardless of whether an amendment passes or fails, the Council shall return to the debate on the resolution with the Speaker’s List as it stood before the amendment was entertained.

Points of Order

34. At any time during debate, including while another delegate is speaking, a delegate may raise a point of order by standing and saying “point of order.” There are three points of order:
 - a. *Relevance* - the delegate’s comments are irrelevant *to the topic of debate* (they must be completely and totally unrelated to the subjects covered by the resolution, not merely irrelevant to whatever is being discussed at the time);
 - b. *Abuse* - the delegate’s comments are insulting to the delegate or their member state;
 - c. *Procedure* - the delegate or the President is breaking these Rules,
35. After a delegate has raised a point of order, the President may ask the delegates(s) for clarification and shall then issue a ruling. The ruling is final. No point of order may be raised on another point of order.
36. The President may, on their own initiative, require that any delegate withdraw or rephrase remarks the President judges to be irrelevant or abusive.

Points of Privilege

37. When no member state is speaking, a member state may raise a Point of Privilege by raising their hand and saying “point of privilege.” Points of privilege allow the member state to make requests of the President, including but not limited to:
 - a. asking for clarification on procedure,
 - b. changing the member state’s stance on the resolution or amendment,
 - c. moving a member state down the speaker’s list,
 - d. reading the speakers list,
 - e. ending debate (either on the amendment or resolution),
 - f. requesting caucus time, or
 - g. inquiring on the order of amendments.

38. The President shall always refuse points of privilege that interrupt the speaking of another delegate. Otherwise, they may accept or reject requests made through points of privilege as they think prudent.

Caucus Time

39. The President may grant caucus time on a point of privilege, after written request, and they think prudent. In caucus time, debate stops for a period of time specified by the President and member states can interact directly with each other.

Negotiation Chamber

40. The President shall open the Negotiation Chamber of the Security Council before calling on the seconder of the resolution.
41. While the Negotiation Chamber is open, delegates may move to the Negotiation Chamber to meet with other member states. One delegate of each member state must remain in the main debate chamber at all times.
42. The Negotiation Chamber shall be closed during caucus time and when an amendment is being read, explained, and voted on (but not debated), and shall re-open immediately afterwards in both cases. The President may, by an explicit direction, open or close the Negotiation Chamber at their discretion.

Closure of Debate

43. The President decides when to close debate on amendments and the resolution. In deciding when to end debate, they can consider any written requests to close debate, points of privilege requesting to close debate, and, if they choose, a procedural vote of the Council.
44. When debate is closed on an amendment, the Council moves straight to a vote on that amendment. When debate is closed on a resolution, the Proposer may speak again as a Right of Reply:
 - a. They may delegate the Right to any member state in favour of the resolution, unless the Proposer has changed their stance to oppose the resolution, in which case the Right of Reply falls to the earliest-speaking member state still in favour of the resolution.
 - b. If no member state supporting the resolution exercises the Right, the Right of Reply shall not take place.
45. Once the Right of Reply begins, note passing ends and the Negotiation Chamber is closed for the rest of the debate. The member state delivering the Right of Reply cannot take Points of Information. After the Right of Reply, the Council moves to a vote on the resolution.

Voting

46. Voting on resolutions is done by roll-call; voting on everything else is done by the raising or lowering of placards. Abstaining is always allowed.

47. All votes except votes on the resolution itself only require the affirmative vote of a majority of the total number of member states *voting* to pass (the “veto” does not apply and abstentions lower the total number of member states that must vote in favour).
48. Resolutions shall be approved only by the affirmative votes of at least three-fifths of the total number of member states, and no opposing votes from the permanent member states (an abstention does not count as an opposing vote or a vote in favour).

Note-Passing and Miscellaneous

49. A delegate wishing to pass a note shall raise their hand and a note-passer will collect the note. Notes must indicate which member state the note is to and from. If a delegate passes multiple notes at once, the notes must be arranged in alphabetical order by addressee.
50. Speakers may not use laptop computers, mobile phones, electronic tablets, music playback devices, or other similar electronic equipment in either the debating chamber or negotiation chamber while the Council is in session, except by the express permission of the President.