

POWER-PAIRING PROPOSAL

Issues to be decided by the WSDC Tournament Committee

Issue A

Should the Rules specify whether the ‘seeded rounds’ (preliminary rounds 1 and 2) must be prepared or impromptu debates?

Option 1: The Rules should state that preliminary rounds 1 and 2 should both be prepared debates.

Implications – This would mean that there will be 2 prepared rounds held on the first day and teams will find out at least 2 weeks before the tournament which side they will be debating on for those 2 prepared rounds (whereas for the other 2 prepared rounds, they will only find out a few hours in advance). This will also mean that there will be a day later on during the preliminary rounds on which there are 2 impromptu debates.

Option 2: The Rules should state that preliminary rounds 1 and 2 should be 1 prepared debate and 1 impromptu debate.

Implications – This would mean that there will be only 1 prepared round for which they will find out 2 weeks before the tournament which side they will be debating on (and for the other 3 prepared rounds, they will only find out a few hours in advance). This will however, mean that the usual WSDC practice of having 1 prepared and 1 impromptu debate on all 4 preliminary round days can be implemented.

Option 3: Don’t specify anything regarding this in the Rules and allow the Hosts to decide which option best fits their logistical needs.

Implications – This would in fact be continuing the status quo. The current WSDC Rules don’t specify which rounds shall be prepared and which rounds should be impromptu. (Hosts usually have 1 prepared debate and 1 impromptu debate each day, but there have been occasional exceptions to this pattern at WSDC over the years.)

Issue B

If a team needs to be ‘pulled-up’ to a higher bracket, how shall that team be determined?

Option 1: As far as possible, the team from the bracket below which has had the ‘easiest’ opponents up to that point in the competition (i.e. the teams whose previous opponents have the lowest average rank on the league table at the end of the previous round) shall be ‘pulled-up’.

Option 2: A randomly selected team from the bracket below shall be ‘pulled-up’.

Issue C

Within each bracket, how should the computer tabulation programme aim to pair teams up for each debate round?

Option 1: As far as possible, the draw within each bracket should be a folding table (e.g., if there are 4 teams in the bracket, 1 vs 4 and 2 vs 3).

Option 2: As far as possible, the draw within each bracket should be a sliding table (e.g., if there are 4 teams in the bracket, 1 vs 3 and 2 vs 4).

Option 3: Teams should be randomly drawn against other teams in the bracket.

Issue D

Should teams be allowed to face debate against each other more than once during the preliminary rounds?

Option 1: No.

Implications – This would mean that no team will face the same opponent multiple times during the preliminary rounds. It might, however, mean that more ‘pull-ups’ are required in order to ensure this.

Option 2: Yes. The tabulation programme should try to avoid repeat match-ups as far as possible, but not prohibit them.

Implications – This would mean that some teams may well face the same opponent multiple times during the preliminary rounds. However it might reduce the number of ‘pull-ups’ in the draw.

Issue E

Should every team be given exactly 4 debates in proposition and exactly 4 debates in opposition over the 8 preliminary rounds?

Option 1: Yes.

Implications – This would mean that every team will have the same number of debates on each side, but more ‘pull-ups’ may be required in order to ensure this.

Option 2: No. The tabulation programme should try to give teams 4 debates on each side as far as possible, but should allow teams to have 5 debates on one side and 3 the other in some cases.

Implications – This would mean a slight imbalance of sides for some teams, but might reduce the number of pull-ups needed.

Note: The original proposal considered in Bali proposed to implement a 4-4 balance using a ‘side-locking’ method. The Draw Working Group, after discussion, has decided not to recommend ‘side-locking’ as a method for creating a 4-4 balance of motions (if the Tournament Committee decides in favour a strict 4-4 balance), and to instead allow the computer tabulation programme more flexibility in the method of creating the balance. So whichever option is selected, there will be a change in the wording of the original proposal.

Issue F

What should happen in the event that there is an odd number of competing nations?

Option 1: The Host and the Chief Adjudicators shall jointly decide whether there shall be a swing team or whether 1 team will be given a walkover victory in each round.

Option 2: A swing team will be added to the draw in order to ensure every team has an opponent.

Option 3: A team will be given a walkover victory in each round (with no team being given a walkover victory more than once).

