

# **POWER-PAIRING PROPOSAL**

## **Amendments which will need to be made to the text if the WSDC Tournament Committee decides to make changes**

### **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.**

2.9 to be added which reads:

“2.9 Preliminary rounds 1 and 2 shall both be prepared debates.”

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

2.9 to be added which reads:

“2.9 Preliminary rounds 1 and 2 shall be a prepared debate and an impromptu debate.”

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

No changes required to the original proposal.

### **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’.**

No changes required to the original proposal.

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

3.7 to be amended to read:

“3.7 Subject to the conditions outlined in within these guidelines, if a team needs to be ‘pulled-up’ to a higher bracket, the team which is ‘pulled up’ shall as far as possible be a randomly selected team from the bracket immediately below.”

### **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).**

No changes required to the original proposal.

**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).**

3.8 to be amended to read:

“3.8 Subject to the conditions outlined in within these guidelines, the computer tabulation programme shall divide the teams in each bracket into a top half and bottom half of the bracket (based on teams’ rankings in the league table) and shall then pair them up in a manner which is as close as possible to the following system:

- (a) The highest-ranked team on the top half of the bracket against the highest-ranked team in the bottom half of the bracket,
- (b) The 2nd highest-ranked team on the top half of the bracket against the 2nd highest-ranked team in the bottom half of the bracket, etc.”

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

3.8 to be amended to read:

“3.8 Subject to the conditions outlined in within these guidelines, each team shall be drawn to face a randomly selected opponent from within the same bracket as them by the computer tabulation programme.”

### **Issue D**

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

**Option 1: No.**

If, for Issue C, option 1 or option 2 is selected – no changes required to the original proposal.

If, for Issue C, option 3 is selected – 3.9 to be amended to read:

“3.9 Teams shall not debate against each other more than once during the 8 preliminary rounds, so the computer tabulation programme shall, if necessary, make randomised adjustments to random pairings outlined in 3.8 to avoid repeat matchups.”

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

3.9 to be amended to read:

“3.9 As far as possible, the computer tabulation programme shall avoid having teams debate against each other more than once during the 8 preliminary rounds; however the computer tabulation programme shall, where necessary, allow teams to debate each other twice during the preliminary rounds in the following circumstances:

- (a) Having the 2 teams debate against each other for the 2nd time during the preliminary rounds is the only way to prevent additional ‘pull-ups’ being required for that round,
- (b) The 2 teams debate no more than twice during the preliminary rounds, and
- (c) The 2 teams do not debate against each other in 2 consecutive preliminary rounds.”

**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.**

3.10 and 3.11 shall amended to read:

“3.10 The computer tabulation programme shall ensure that all teams have 4 debates in proposition and 4 debates in opposition over the 8 preliminary rounds.

3.11 The computer tabulation programme shall ensure that all teams shall have 2 prepared debates in proposition and 2 prepared debates in opposition as well as 2 impromptu debates in proposition and 2 impromptu debates in opposition over the 8 preliminary rounds.”

**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.**

3.10 and 3.11 shall amended to read:

“3.10 As far as possible, the computer tabulation programme shall ensure that as many teams as possible shall have 4 debates in proposition and 4 debates in opposition over the 8 preliminary rounds; however, where necessary, the computer tabulation programme shall be able to assign some teams to have 5 debates on 1 side and 3 debates on the other side in order to meet other provisions within these guidelines.

3.11 As far as possible, the computer tabulation programme shall ensure that as many teams as possible shall have 2 prepared debates in proposition and 2 prepared debates in opposition as well as 2 impromptu debates in proposition and 2 impromptu debates in opposition over the 8 preliminary rounds; however, where necessary, the computer tabulation programme shall be able to assign some teams to have 3 prepared debates on 1 side and 1 prepared debate on the other side and/or 3 impromptu debates on 1 side and 1 impromptu debate on the other side in order to meet other provisions within these guidelines, provided that the requirements of 3.10 are met.”

## **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.**

No changes required to the original proposal.

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

Section 4 shall be amended to read:

“4.1 In the event that the number of competing teams is an odd number, the Host shall arrange for a ‘swing team’ debate in the preliminary rounds in order to ensure an even number of teams.

4.2 The swing team shall be made up of 3 to 5 students who shall meet the age criteria and education status criteria for debaters set out in the WSDC Rules, however the members of the swing team do not necessarily have to come from the same nation.

4.3 Adjudicators shall judge the swing team in the same way as a competing team in the Championship, however the swing team and its members shall not be considered to be an official competing team and thus shall not be eligible to qualify for the break rounds or receive any team or individual speaker awards.

4.4 For a swing team participating in preliminary round 1 and preliminary round 2, the Chief Adjudicators shall determine whether it is more appropriate to place the swing team in Group A, B, C or D based on the background of the debaters in the swing team.

4.5 In the event of a team being unable to participate in a round, the following shall happen:

- (i) The team which is unable to participate in the round shall awarded a 3-0 defeat for the round along with (for the purpose of rankings at the end of the preliminary rounds) a team score which is equivalent to the team’s average score for the preliminary rounds in which the team did participate.
- (ii) The team’s opponents in the draw for that round shall be awarded a 3-0 victory along with along with (for the purpose of rankings at the end of the preliminary rounds) a team score which is equivalent to that team’s average score for the preliminary rounds in which the team did participate, unless the Chief Adjudicators decide that it is possible to amend the draw for the round to ensure that every competing team

participating in the round has an appropriate opponent by adding or withdrawing the swing team in a manner which, in the Chief Adjudicators' opinion, does not significantly affect the fairness and integrity of the draw.

4.6 Where a team is involved in a walkover, for the purpose of rankings at the end of the preliminary rounds the team shall be given a team score for that round equivalent to their average score for the preliminary rounds in which the team did debate.”

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

Section 4 shall be amended to read:

“4. Procedures regarding walkovers

4.1 In the event that the number of competing teams is an odd number, a system where at each preliminary round 1 team will be awarded a walkover win shall be implemented.

4.2 In preliminary rounds 1 and 2, a team shall be awarded a 3-0 walkover win in each round.

4.3 The Chief Adjudicators shall determine which group(s) the teams awarded walkover wins in preliminary rounds 1 and 2 shall come from, and the teams from the group(s) given the walkover in each round shall be randomly drawn.

4.4 In preliminary rounds 3 - 8, a randomly-selected team from the lowest-bracket in the draw (or the lowest-available bracket if no team in the lowest-bracket is eligible to receive a 3-0 walkover due to other provisions in these guidelines) shall be awarded a walkover win in each round.

4.5 No team shall be awarded a walkover win more than once during the preliminary rounds (with the exception of situations where the team is assigned an opponent in the draw for the round but their opponents withdraw from the round).

4.6 In a situation where a team is assigned to debate against another team in a round but that team then withdraws from the round, the following shall happen:

(a) The team which withdraws shall be awarded a 3-0 walkover defeat for the round, and

(b) The team they were due to debate against shall be awarded a walkover win unless the Chief Adjudicators decide before the draw for the round is released that it is possible to amend the draw in a way which allows that team to have an opponent and this is done in a manner which, in the judgement of the Chief Adjudicators, does not compromise the fairness of the draw for all teams affected.

4.7 Where a team is involved in a walkover, for the purpose of rankings at the end of the preliminary rounds the team shall be given a team score for that round equivalent to their average score for the preliminary rounds in which the team did debate.”