

Worldcon 75: 2017 Hugo report #5

Hugo administrator decisions

This is a list of decisions relating to the application of the WSFS Constitution made by the 2017 Hugo administrators on behalf of Worldcon 75. These decisions are not binding on future Hugo administrators, but may provide useful guidance to them.

The decisions are not listed in the chronological order in which we took them, but in order of the section of the WSFS Constitution which informed each decision, with two exceptions:

- Decisions relating to the John W. Campbell Award (which is not regulated by the WSFS constitution, but is administered by WSFS) are listed here immediately after questions relating to §3.3 and its subsections; and
- Decisions relating to the Hugo Voter Packet (which is also not regulated by the WSFS Constitution) are listed at the end of the document.

Questions were raised directly with us both by email and social media enquiries, both from members of the Worldcon 75 team and from other interested parties. We do not disclose the source of individual queries below, nor do we comment on questions that were not brought directly to our attention.

§3.2.4: Applicability of the bar on “series as a whole”

§3.2.4 of the WSFS Constitution states:

Works appearing in a series are eligible as individual works, but the series as a whole is not eligible. However, a work appearing in a number of parts shall be eligible for the year of the final part.

We determined that §3.2.4 of the WSFS Constitution applies only to the four written fiction categories, Best Novel, Best Novella, Best Novelette and Best Short Story.

We determined that §3.2.4 of the WSFS Constitution does not apply to the Best Dramatic Presentation Long Form category, to the Best Graphic Story category or to the special category Hugo awarded in 2017 for Best Series.

(The proposed Best Series amendment, which will take effect for the 2018 Hugos if ratified by the 2017 Business Meeting, explicitly amends §3.2.4.)

§3.2.8 and §3.2.10

The Hugo Administrators may relocate written fiction and dramatic presentations into “a more appropriate category” under certain circumstances. **We did not make any such determination.**

§3.3: Categories, specific eligibility and tallying issues

Before nominations closed on 17 March, we were asked which category was the most appropriate for the **ReMade** series of books and stories published by Serial Box. **We made no determination**, explaining that specific rulings on eligibility would be made only after the votes in each category had been counted for the final ballot.

§3.3.1: Best Novel:

Before nominations closed on 17 March, we were asked about the eligibility of

- **Gentleman Jole and the Red Queen**, by Lois McMaster Bujold;
- **Maresi**, by Maria Turtschaninoff;
- **Humanity's Future: The Next 25,000 Years**, by Tom Kando; and
- **Clade**, by James Bradley.

In each case **we made no determination**, explaining that specific rulings on eligibility would be made only after the votes in each category had been counted for the final ballot.

§3.3.3: Best Novelette

We received a query challenging the eligibility of **The Jewel and Her Lapidary** on the grounds of word length, but **we determined that** it is within the limits for Best Novelette.

§3.3.6: Best Related Work

57 votes for **The Tinged Puppies** include numerous variant names, and 1 transferred Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form nomination for "Chuck Tingles [sic] trolling of VD and the Rabid Puppies"; but do **not** include:

- 10 votes for "Chuck Tingle's Twitter" under various names, or single votes for
 - "Chuck Tingle's coverage of the 2015 [sic] Hugos",
 - "2016 Hugo discussion" by Chuck Tingle,
 - "Chuck Tingle's Hugo Campaign [sic]",
 - "chucktingle.com",
 - **Special Report Billings #3: Voxman and the Bad Dogs Blues**, (nominated in both Best Related Work and Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form, and clearly belonging in the latter category),
 - **Mark [Oshiro] Reads "Slammed By the Substantial Amount of Press Generated By My Book 'Pounded by the Pound'"** (also nominated in both Best Related Work and Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form and also clearly belonging in the latter category),
 - "Chuck Tingle, by Chuck Tingle" [sic], nominated in Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form, or
 - "Chuck Tingle Live-Tweeting the Trump-Clinton Debates" nominated in Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.

Even if these had been combined, they would have collectively been the runner-up rather than a finalist.

§3.3.6: Best Graphic Story

Nominations were received in this category for a number of individual comics issues, for individual published volumes collating several issues, and for storylines as a whole. **We determined that** voters' wishes are best represented by identifying the story element within the series with the most votes, of whatever length, and then assigning to it all votes both for sub-components of that story element, and also for larger elements of which it is part (including the series as a whole).

This approach differs from that which we adopted for other categories, notably for Best Series, where the proposed constitutional amendment (which we adopted for 2017; see below) clearly implies that series and subset series should be tallied separately, and also for the awards for individual achievement, where joint nominations were tallied separately from nominations for the individuals concerned.

We consequently made the following determinations:

- 221 votes for **Monstress vol 1** include 44 just for the title **Monstress**.
- 147 votes for **Saga vol 6** include 12 just for the title **Saga**; but
 - 1 vote for **Saga vol 5** was not included.
- 109 votes for **Black Panther: A Nation Under Our Feet** include 11 just for the title **Black Panther**;
 - 5 votes for **Black Panther: World of Wakanda** were not included.
- 106 Votes for **Ms Marvel vol 5** include 3 just for the title **Ms Marvel**; but
 - 10 votes for **Ms Marvel vol 6: Civil War** were not included.
- 100 votes for **Paper Girls vol 1** include 24 just for the title **Paper Girls** and 1 for **Paper Girls (vols 1 & 2)**; but
 - 18 votes for **Paper Girls vol 2** were not included.
- 72 votes for **The Vision vol 1** (which collects issues #1-#6) included:
 - 31 for **The Vision vol 1**,
 - 16 for **Vision vol 1**,
 - 10 just for the title **The Vision**,
 - 4 just for the title **Vision**,
 - 6 for **The Vision vols 1 and 2**,
 - 2 for **Vision vols 1 and 2**,
 - 1 for **The Vision #1-#12**, which includes #1-6,
 - 1 for **Vision #1-12**, and
 - 1 for **Vision** issue #4 which was included in vol 1.
 - However, 7 votes for **The Vision vol 2** and 1 for **Vision vol 2** were not included.
- 61 votes for **Stand Still. Stay Silent** also include 7 votes for various components of this webcomic. This was the only case in the top sixteen where the storyline as a whole got more votes than any of its components.
- 52 votes for **The Unbeatable Squirrel Girl Beats Up the Marvel Universe!** include 2 just for the title **The Unbeatable Squirrel Girl**; but
 - 21 votes for **The Unbeatable Squirrel Girl vol 3: Squirrel, You Really Got Me Now**, were not included, and

- 8 votes for **The Unbeatable Squirrel Girl vol 4: I Kissed a Squirrel and I Liked it**, were also not included.
- 49 votes for **The Wicked and the Divine vol 3** include 12 just for the title **The Wicked and the Divine**; but
 - 22 votes for **The Wicked and the Divine vol 4**, 7 votes for **The Wicked and the Divine vol 1** were not included, and
 - 1 vote for **The Wicked and the Divine vol 2** was also not included.
- 36 votes for **Mockingbird vol 1** include 5 just for the title **Mockingbird**.
- 32 votes for **Clean Room vol 1** include 5 just for the title **Clean Room**; but
 - 1 vote for **Clean Room #13**, which was not collected in vol 1, was not included.
- 24 votes for **Injection vol 2** include 3 just for the title **Injection**.
- 30 votes for **Lumberjanes vol 4** include 3 just for the title **Lumberjanes**; but
 - 5 votes for **Lumberjanes vol 3**, and 4 votes for **Lumberjanes vol 5**, were not included.
- 30 votes for **Pretty Deadly vol 2** include 2 just for the title **Pretty Deadly**.

§3.3.7: Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form

Before nominations closed on 17 March, we were asked about the eligibility of **April and the Extraordinary World** in this category. **We made no determination**, explaining that specific rulings on eligibility would be made only after the votes in each category had been counted for the final ballot.

The eligibility of **Hidden Figures** in this category was queried; it was suggested that as “non-fiction”, it belonged rather to Best Related Work. **We determined that** this is, frankly, ridiculous.

In the first place, **Hidden Figures** is not a non-fictional documentary, but a **dramatised** reconstruction of historical events, as have been many other other Best Dramatic Presentation finalists through the years - most recently, two finalists for Short Form in 2014 were about the production of **Doctor Who**, one of them similarly a dramatised reconstruction of historical events (the other briefly featuring this year’s Hugo Administrator in a crowd scene).

In the second place, even if **Hidden Figures** had been a non-fictional documentary, it would **still** have been eligible in this category. A non-fiction finalist won the Hugo for Best Dramatic Presentation in 1970 (the TV coverage of Apollo 11) and there was a non-fiction finalist in Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form as recently as 2012 (**The Drink Tank’s** Hugo acceptance speech).

We noticed some references to “the **Apollo 13** exception”, as if some special allowance had been made in that and other cases. There was and is no special allowance, just implementation of the rules as they are written.

We received a query about whether episodes from a TV series broadcast earlier than 2016 can be included for consideration as part of a nomination of the entire season for the 2017 Hugos. **We determined that** if an entire TV season that ended in 2016 is nominated, all

episodes of that season are part of the nomination, even if some were broadcast before 2016. We note that §3.2.4 could be read to exclude TV series entirely, but (as noted above) **we determined that** it applies to the written fiction categories only.

§3.3.8: Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form

We received a query about the eligibility of **Splendor & Misery** in this category. **We determined that** it is eligible; it contains a narrative with SFnal themes, was released in 2016 and meets the length requirements.

The final ballot for this category was affected by §3.8.5: Nominee Diversity, as discussed below.

§3.3.9-11, §3.3.15-16 : Joint nominations in Best Editor Long Form, Best Editor Short Form, Best Professional Artist, Best Fan Writer, Best Fan Artist

The ballot categories for individuals (Best Editor Long/Short, Best Professional Artist, Best Fan Writer, Best Fan Artist) are all described in the singular in the constitution. This could be read to invalidate joint nominations. However, voters made a number of joint nominations in several of these categories.

We determined that:

1. **Joint nominations can potentially qualify for the final ballot**, the precedent being Leo and Diane Dillon, joint finalists for Best Professional Artist in 1969 and 1970, and winners in that category in 1971. (We verified that the language defining the Best Professional Artist category in 1969-71 was also technically in the singular, as it is today.)
2. **Joint nominations** of a team in an individual category **will not be aggregated** with nominations for individual members of that team, **but will be counted separately**. Nominations for A, for B, and for A-and-B-as-a-team will be treated as nominations of different candidacies, and will not be combined.

This differs from the approach we took for the Best Graphic Story category, but is similar to the approach we took for Best Series.

§3.3.9 Best Editor, Short Form

This was the only category in which joint nominations, as described above, were a major issue.

There were 179 nominating votes for Lynne M. Thomas and Michael Damien Thomas; 48 for Lynne M. Thomas alone; and 27 for Michael Damien Thomas alone. These were tallied as separate candidacies; the joint nomination easily qualified for the final ballot, and the individual nominations were far behind (in 13th and 27th places respectively.)

Also in this category, Ann VanderMeer received 104 nominating votes, Jeff VanderMeer received 34 and the two together 19. These were also tallied as separate candidacies, and

none qualified for the final ballot (finishing in 9th, 18th and 28th places respectively). Even if the 19 joint nominations had been added to Ann VanderMeer's total, her ranking would have been unchanged and she would not have qualified for the final ballot.

§3.3.10 Best Editor, Long Form

We counted two votes for "whoever edited **Obelisk Gate** at Orbit" as votes for Devi Pillai, who actually did edit it.

§3.3.11: Best Professional Artist

Before nominations closed on 17 March, we were asked about the eligibility of Xin Ye and Lauri Ahonen (as a joint nomination). **We made no determination**, explaining that specific rulings on eligibility would be made only after the votes in each category had been counted for the final ballot.

Tomek Radkiewicz and JiHun Lee each received enough votes to appear on the final ballot, but both informed us before the final ballot was announced that their work had not appeared in a professional publication in the field of science fiction or fantasy during 2016. **We therefore determined that** both were ineligible and must therefore be excluded from the final ballot.

§3.3.11 and 3.3.16: Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist

At one stage it looked possible that one or more individuals might qualify for the final ballot in both the Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist categories - specifically, Galen Dara, a finalist for Best Professional Artist, narrowly missed qualifying also for Best Fan Artist; and Likhain, a finalist for Best Fan Artist, narrowly missed qualifying also for Best Professional Artist.

We determined that if they were otherwise eligible in both categories, they should be finalists in both categories, as the criteria are not mutually exclusive. The famous precedent is Jack Gaughan winning both categories in 1967, the year when Best Fan Artist was first awarded. In the event, both Galen Dara and Likhain qualified for the final ballot only one of the two categories, so we did not need to make a determination regarding their eligibility for the other.

We **observe** that fifty years on from 1967, it is difficult to explain why it is possible for someone to be simultaneously a professional artist and a fan artist. Clearly voters struggled with the definitions; in both categories, two artists received enough votes to qualify for the ballot, but were found to be ineligible. Our view is that the definitions of both Best Professional Artist and Best Fan Artist should be examined carefully and perhaps amended, and we recommend that the WSFS Business Meeting should become seized of the issue.

§3.3.12: Best Semiprozine

Lightspeed received enough votes to qualify for the final ballot. However, its editor confirmed to us (as previously stated elsewhere) that it was ineligible in this category, and **we determined that** it must therefore be excluded from the final ballot.

The constitution defines a Semiprozine as:

Any generally available non-professional periodical publication devoted to science fiction or fantasy, or related subjects which 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 Book Smugglers had published only two issues as a Semiprozine before the end of 2016. However, **we determined that** the constitution requires only one issue, which must have been published in the qualifying year, to have met all of the Semiprozine criteria; the material published by **The Book Smugglers** prior to 2016 easily satisfies the criterion of “four (4) or more issues (or the equivalent in other media)” published at any time up to the end of the qualifying year, and **The Book Smugglers** was therefore eligible in this category.

Our view is §3.3.12 of the Constitution is explicitly intended to cover such cases, where an established entity has only recently become eligible for the best Semiprozine category.

§3.3.13: Best Fanzine

File 770 received enough votes to appear on the final ballot for Best Fanzine. Its editor had already stated that he intended to decline nomination if **File 770** qualified, and duly did so formally when we contacted him. **We determined that File 770** must therefore be excluded from the final ballot.

We received a query about the eligibility of **Castalia House Blog** as a fanzine, in terms of format (it is a blog). **We determined that** it is not ineligible for this reason. Other blogs have previously been finalists in this category, and indeed have won. **Castalia House Blog** certainly published the equivalent of four fanzine issues in 2016. It has roughly as much content relating to gaming as to sf literature and films, but games are also of interest to the genre. Despite the name of the blog, only a few posts promote Castalia publications (which anyway would not be disqualifying in itself).

It was reported to us that the editor of **Castalia House Blog** had made a public statement that its contributors are paid, which would have made it ineligible. However, the alleged statement was not provided to us, and **we were therefore unable to make a determination**.

It was also alleged that **Castalia House Blog** is ineligible on the basis that Vox Day, a very occasional contributor to **Castalia House Blog** (less than one article per month in 2016) personally profits from the Amazon links in the sidebar of the **Castalia House Blog** website. However, even if this were the case (and we did not investigate), he would clearly be earning commission from sales made via those links whether or not he was contributing to the blog. In any case, being a paid contributor is clearly a very different matter from recouping (some of) the hosting costs of the blog via Amazon links.

We therefore determined that we do not have evidence that Vox Day (or anybody else) is a paid contributor to the **Castalia House Blog** in the sense intended by §3.3.13 (1) of the Constitution, and that these are not grounds to disqualify **Castalia House Blog**.

§3.3.15: Best Fan Writer

We received a query about the eligibility of Chuck Tingle in this category. **We determined that** his Twitter commentary alone, quite apart from his other 2016 non-commercial output, is sufficient for his eligibility.

§3.3.16: Best Fan Artist

Alex Garner and Mansik Yang are both better known as professional artists, but both received sufficient votes to qualify for the final ballot and both accepted nomination for Best Fan Artist when we first contacted them. However, both artists discovered, in the course of attempting to compile relevant material for the Hugo voter packet, that they simply had not published any non-commercial work in 2016, and informed us to that effect.

With regret, **we therefore determined that** both were ineligible and excluded both from the final ballot.

§3.3.17: Special category: Best Series:

i) Rationale

The WSFS Constitution states:

Special Category. Not more than one special category may be created by the current Worldcon Committee with nomination and voting to be the same as for the permanent categories. The Worldcon Committee is not required to create any such category; such action by a Worldcon Committee should be under exceptional circumstances only; and the special category created by one Worldcon Committee shall not be binding on following Committees. Awards created under this paragraph shall be considered to be Hugo Awards.

We determined that the introduction by the 2016 Business Meeting of a Best Series Hugo Award starting in 2018, clearly **does** constitute an “exceptional circumstance”. It is the first addition to the written fiction Hugo categories since 1968.

We considered the possibility of trialling the YA Award which was also introduced by the 2016 Business Meeting to start in 2018. However, **we determined that** as it is not a Hugo, it clearly falls outside the scope of §3.3.15.

We also considered some other options, but none seemed to justify the “exceptional circumstance” criterion as clearly as the proposed creation of the new Best Series category.

We therefore determined that Worldcon 75 would trial Best Series under the following rubric, lightly adapted from the constitutional amendment passed by the 2016 Business Meeting (wording from that amendment which was not used by us struck through, wording added by us in bold):

"Best Series. A multi-volume science fiction or fantasy story, unified by elements such as plot, characters, setting, and presentation, ~~appearing~~ **which has appeared** in at least three (3) volumes consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words by the close of the ~~previous~~ calendar year **2016**, at least one of which was published in the ~~previous~~ calendar year **2016**. ~~If such a work has previously been a finalist, it shall be eligible only upon the publication, since it qualified for its last appearance on the final ballot and by the end of the previous calendar year, of at least two (2) additional volumes consisting of a total of at least 240,000 words, and further provided it has not won under 3.3.X before.~~ If any series and a subset series thereof both receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot, only the version which received more nominations shall appear."

(As noted above, the amendment also includes an explicit change to §3.2.4.)

The Best Series amendment, as passed by the 2016 WSFS business meeting, excludes any finalist for Best Series from being a finalist again until it has produced another two volumes and another 240,000 words. **We did not determine** if that provision should apply to the winner of the Best Series Hugo for 2017 as well as to subsequent winners if the Best Series category is ratified by the 2017 Business Meeting; that is for the 2017 Business Meeting itself, and/or future Hugo administrators, to clarify.

We determined that the creation of this special category over-rides the bar on series in the WSFS Constitution §3.2.4, which anyway is clearly intended to apply only to the four established written fiction categories, and will be modified by the Best Series amendment as currently proposed.

ii) Implementation

It was suggested to us that the award for Best Series can go to a series of which a part has **already** won a Hugo, only if the parts of the series published **subsequently** would collectively be eligible. We **observe** that a) the rule we are using in 2017 does not include the provision for excluding previous winners; but b) in any case that provision is clearly intended only to apply to previous winners of Best Series, not to cases where one or more of a series' component parts may have previously won Hugos in other categories, and therefore **we**

determined that the previous award of a Hugo to a part of a series has no impact on the eligibility of that series for the 2017 Hugo for Best Series.

Before nominations closed on 17 March, we were asked about the eligibility of

- **A Song of Ice and Fire**, by George R.R. Martin, and
- the **Xuya** series, by Aliette de Bodard.

In each case **we made no determination**, explaining that specific rulings on eligibility would be made only after the votes in each category had been counted for the final ballot.

We determined that nominating votes for a series and a subset series thereof should be tallied separately and not combined, as is implied by the wording of the constitutional amendment (which we adopted).

- The 82 total votes for the **Mistborn** books by Brandon Sanderson therefore do not include 5 votes for the **Cosmere** books (of which **Mistborn** is a sub-set), nor do they include 4 votes for the **Wax and Wayne** books (which are a sub-set of **Mistborn**).
- The 83 total for **The World of the Five Gods** by Lois McMaster Bujold also do not include 1 vote for The **Penric and Desdemona** stories, which are a sub-set of the **Five Gods** series.

Including them would not have changed the composition of the final ballot; **Mistborn** would have placed 11th rather than 12th, but still well behind the top six, and **The World of the Five Gods** would have remained in 14th place

This is similar to the approach we took for the individual achievement categories, but differs from the approach we took for the Best Graphic Story category.

John W. Campbell Award

Before nominations closed on 17 March, we were asked about the eligibility of Maria Turtschaninoff. **We made no determination**, explaining that specific rulings on eligibility would be made only after the votes in each category had been counted for the final ballot.

Some queries were raised about the eligibility of J. Mulrooney for the John W. Campbell Award. His 2014 collection of short stories was self-published, and an earlier story published in 2003 was not in a qualifying market, so neither starts the clock ticking for his Campbell eligibility. Both author and publisher confirmed to us that he had earned in excess of \$3,000 from the 2016 publication of his novel, **An Equation of Almost Infinite Complexity**.

We determined that the phrase "net income" in the Campbell Award's eligibility criteria means net of costs associated with the publication process, before rather than after tax (we are not tax accountants), and that we therefore had no grounds to dispute J. Mulrooney's eligibility based on a first qualifying publication in 2016.

We determined incorrectly that Sarah Gailey was in only her first year of eligibility for the Campbell Award, in the belief that her 2015 sale to **Mothership Zeta** was not a sale to a qualifying market. It transpires that **Mothership Zeta** was in fact a qualifying market in 2015 and that 2017 was therefore the **second and final** year of eligibility for Sarah Gailey, not the first as appeared in the initial announcement. A correction and apology were published, and all votes for her were counted.

§3.7.3: No nomination votes for anything other than the Hugos and Campbell Award

A supporter of the proposed YA Award requested the use of the Hugo voting software to conduct a poll on the name of that award. **We declined this request**, because:

- a) we already faced a challenging timescale to complete the development of the new Hugo voting software; and
- b) we anticipated that voters might be confused as to whether or not this extra vote was a full, formal part of the Hugo voting process.

Arguably §3.7.3 of the WSFS Constitution anyway prevents us from including votes for anything else in the Hugo nominating process, other than the Campbell Award.

Now that it has been developed, the software is open-source and can be used by anyone.

§3.8.5: Nominee Diversity

§3.8.5 of the WSFS Constitution states:

If there are more than two works in the same category that are episodes of the same dramatic presentation series or that are written works that have an author for single author works, or two or more authors for co-authored works, in common, only the two works in each category that have the most nominations shall appear on the final ballot.

We determined that this means that if authors A and B have two jointly written stories in the same written category, neither of them is excluded from further nominations on their own, or jointly or separately with other co-authors, except that no single author or specific combination of authors can have more than two finalists in the same category.

We also believe that:

- the two works with “the most nominations” should be determined by a count of the raw nomination votes, without regard to the operations of EPH; and that
- if disqualification or removal of a potential finalist might have potentially brought a third work by already-qualified authors or from an already-qualified TV series onto the final ballot under §3.9.4, that third work should not be regarded as an “available finalist” and would be skipped.

Neither of these issues arose in 2017.

Three episodes of **Game of Thrones** received sufficient votes to qualify for the final ballot. Under §3.8.5 of the constitution, only two episodes from any series may be on the final ballot in any one category. We informed the creators of **Game of Thrones** that unless they chose otherwise, **we had determined that The Door**, which had the fewest nominations, would be excluded from the ballot (we did not otherwise inform them of the numbers of nominating votes cast for the three episodes). The creators of **Game of Thrones** chose instead to decline the nomination for **The Winds of Winter**, and **we determined that** that episode was therefore excluded from the final ballot.

§3.8.6 and §3.8.8: Transferred nominations

In preparing the counting software, several issues required determination.

Q1) If a nominator has made 4 nominations to Novelette, and then mis-made what should've been Novelette nominations one each to Novella and Short Story, are both or just one of the mis-nominations moved to Novelette?

We determined that the clear intent of the rules is that voters get no more than five nominations for the "right" category, so whichever of the possible fifth nominations for Novelette is reallocated first stands, and the other does not.

Q2) If a nominator makes 5 Novella nominations, 2 Novelette nominations, and mis-nominates a Novelette as a Short Story, and if that mis-nominated Novelette is then relocated to be a Novella, does the "receives a nomination in its default category" requirement take into account the correction to the mis-nomination, or just the nominations made on the original ballot?

We determined that §3.8.6 and §3.8.8 are sequential. So once the nomination has been transferred to the Novelette category under §3.8.6, it is treated as if it had always been there, and is transferred to Novella with other nominations under §3.8.8. (In fact, we made no transfers under §3.2.8 or §3.2.10, so §3.8.8 was not invoked.)

Q3) if instead the mis-nominated-as-Short-Story work was a Novella that was relocated to be a Novelette, does the nominator's 5-nomination limit of Novella nominations preclude the mis-nomination from counting for the relocated work?

We determined that it does, for the same reason.

§3.8.7: Nominees nominated in more than one category

We determined that under §3.8.7 of the WSFS constitution, nominees which received votes in more than one category would be assigned to the category in which they received the most votes (which for all finalists was also the appropriate category in terms of length). NB that this applies more widely than the transfers between the written fiction and dramatic presentation categories specified in §3.2.8 and §3.2.10: in particular, a number of nominating votes were moved to those categories from Best Related Work, and there was some movement also

between Best Fanzine and Best Semiprozine. Cases where this happened to the top sixteen nominees in the relevant categories are listed below.

Votes can only be transferred to another category if the voter has made fewer than five nominations in the new category (unless the administrators invoke §3.8.8; and we did not).

Best Novel

- 125 votes for **Babylon's Ashes** include 1 for Best Novella
- 94 votes for **Gentleman Jole and the Red Queen** include 1 for Best Novella
- 99 votes for **Infomocracy** include 1 for Best Related Work

Best Novella

- 511 votes for **Every Heart A Doorway** include 15 for Best Novel and 2 for Best Novelette.
- 302 votes for **The Dream-Quest of Vellitt Boe** include 3 for Best Novel.
- 187 votes for **This Census-Taker** include 1 for Best Novel.
- 224 votes for **A Taste of Honey** include 2 for Best Novel.
- 227 votes for **The Ballad of Black Tom** include 5 for Best Novel.
- 130 votes for **The Dispatcher** include 1 for Best Novel.
- 96 votes for **Penric's Mission** include 17 for Best Novel.
- 88 votes for **The Last Days of New Paris** include 35 for Best Novel.
- 79 votes for **Forest of Memory** include 3 for Best Novelette.
- 61 votes for **The Vanishing Kind** include 1 for Best Novelette.

Best Novelette

- 268 votes for **You'll Surely Drown Here if You Stay** include 5 for Best Short Story.
- 160 votes for **The Jewel and Her Lapidary** include 12 for Best Novella.
- 129 votes for **The Tomato Thief** include 1 for Best Novel and 1 for Best Short Story.
- 78 votes for **The Art of Space Travel** include 4 for Best Short Story.
- 74 votes for **Touring With The Alien** include 2 for Best Short Story.
- 73 votes for **Sooner or Later Everything Falls Into the Sea** include 6 for Best Short Story.
- 72 votes for **Foxfire, Foxfire** include 1 for Best Short Story.
- 66 votes for **Everyone from Themis Sends Letters Home** include 3 for Best Short Story.
- 62 votes for **The Visitor from Taured** include 2 for Best Novella and 1 for Best Short Story.
- 59 votes for **Spinning Silver** include 1 for Best Novella and 3 for Best Short Story.
- 58 votes for **A Dead Djinn in Cairo** include 1 for Best Novella and 3 for Best Short Story.
- 51 votes for **The Venus Effect** include 3 for Best Short Story.
- 48 votes for **Red as Blood and White as Bone** include 1 for Best Novella and 1 for Best Short Story.

Best Short Story

- 106 votes for **A Fist of Permutations in Lightning and Wildflowers** include 3 for Best Novella and 1 for Best Novelette.
- 88 votes for **Things With Beards** include 1 for Best Related Work.
- 34 votes for **Red in Tooth and Cog** include 12 for Best Novelette.

Best Related Work

- 26 votes were cast for the book **Hidden Figures** by Margot Shetterley, 6 for the film **Hidden Figures** which (as noted above) qualified under Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form, and 2 just for “Hidden Figures” with no further details.
 - **We determined that** the 6 votes explicitly for the film **Hidden Figures** should be transferred to count for the film under Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form;
 - **We determined that** the 2 Best Related Work votes for “**Hidden Figures**”, with no further details, should be transferred to count for the film;
 - however the 26 votes for the book were tallied separately as a nomination for Best Related Work.
- As noted above, 57 votes for **The Tinged Puppies** include 1 transferred Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form nomination for “Chuck Tingles [sic] trolling of VD and the Rabid Puppies”; but do **not** include single votes for
 - **Special Report Billings #3: Voxman and the Bad Dogs Blues** in Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form,
 - **Mark [Oshiro] Reads "Slammed By the Substantial Amount of Press Generated By My Book 'Pounded by the Pound'"** in Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form,
 - “Chuck Tingle, by Chuck Tingle” [sic], in Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form, or
 - “Chuck Tingle Live-Tweeting the Trump-Clinton Debates” nominated in Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.

Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form

- 1030 votes for **Arrival** include 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 660 votes for **Rogue One** include 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 402 votes for **Hidden Figures** include, as noted above, 8 for Best Related Work, and also 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 297 votes for **Ghostbusters** include 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 240 votes for **Stranger Things, Season 1** include 10 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 233 votes for **The Expanse, Season 1** include 5 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 195 votes for **Moana** include 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 156 votes for **Captain America: Civil War** include 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.
- 110 votes for **Westworld, Season 1** include 8 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form.

Best Dramatic Presentation, Short Form

- 91 votes for **Splendor & Misery** include 15 for Best Related Work and 1 for Best Dramatic Presentation, Long Form.

Best Semiprozine

- 434 votes for **Uncanny Magazine** include 2 for Best Fanzine.
- 116 votes for **The Book Smugglers** include 9 for Best Fanzine.

- 53 votes for **Shimmer** include 1 for Best Fanzine.
- 41 votes for **Daily Science Fiction** include 1 for Best Fanzine.

Best Fanzine

- 57 votes for **Journey Planet** include 2 for Best Semiprozine.
- 39 votes for **Black Gate** include 14 for Best Semiprozine.
- 25 votes for **Ansible** include 3 for Best Semiprozine.

§3.8.8: Relocation of nomination votes if a finalist is relocated

As noted above, this was not invoked by us this year. However, **we determined that** although §3.8.8 refers to “§3.2.7 or §3.2.8”, in fact the correct articles are §3.2.8 and §3.2.10. We have requested the Secretary of the Business Meeting to correct this drafting error (it does not require a formal amendment).

§3.9.4: Replacement of Finalists

It was put to us that, in the early stages of processing nominations at least, in case a finalist turned out to be ineligible, or declined nomination, EPH should be re-run for that category with the former finalist removed *ab initio*, and a new final ballot determined on that basis.

We **observe** that any "re-run" of EPH, with one or more candidates removed, carries the significant risk that nominees originally determined to have qualified for the final ballot (and meantime notified of their status as finalists) might be removed from it by a recalculation. We also **observe** that the 2016 Business Meeting explicitly removed a provision for re-running EPH for this purpose from §3.9.4 of the constitution.

We determined that the only mechanism in the constitution for replacing ineligible finalists is that described in §3.9.4 - finalists which are removed from the final ballot, for any reason, are replaced in reverse order of elimination from the available nominees, in the order determined by EPH immediately after nominations close.

As noted above, although the situation did not arise, we believe that if disqualification or removal of a potential finalist might have potentially brought a third work by already-qualified authors or from an already-qualified TV series onto the final ballot under §3.9.4, that third work would not have been regarded as “available” and would be skipped because of the effect of §3.8.5.

§3.11.1: identification of voters

§3.11.1 of the constitution states:

Final Award ballots shall include name, signature, address, and membership-number spaces to be filled in by the voter.

We determined that this is adequately satisfied by the electronic ballot developed by Worldcon 75, which pre-fills name, email address and membership-number spaces, but still requires an electronic “signature”.

We **observe** that this provision of the Constitution could reasonably be updated to take account of today's technology.

§6.2: Multiple memberships in the same name, and other edge cases for the voting population.

Many nominating voters had memberships of more than one of the qualifying conventions. A number of people had bought multiple memberships of the same qualifying convention in their own name. Several societies and exhibitors had bought multiple memberships without giving separate names. A few voters had also bought additional memberships for unnamed guests. Sadly, some voters were deceased.

§6.2 of the Constitution states:

In all matters arising under this Constitution, only natural persons may introduce business, nominate, or vote, except as specifically provided otherwise in this Constitution. No person may cast more than one vote on any issue or more than one ballot in any election

On that basis, **we made the following determinations:**

- In the case of a person holding membership of more than one of the qualifying conventions, the vote was attributed to their W75 membership, or to their MAC2 membership if they did not have a W75 membership, unless the MAC2 membership details were clearly out of date in which case it was attributed to their W76 membership.
- In the case of several memberships in the same convention held in the same name, provided it was clear that the same person is involved and not a namesake, the vote was attributed to the membership bought first.
 - Where there were reasonable grounds to believe that we were dealing with two or more different people with the same name, they all got votes.
- In the case of organisations which had bought multiple memberships without giving separate names, no votes were attributed to any of those membership unless and until names of individual voters (“natural persons”) were supplied.
- Members identified as "Guest of X" and not otherwise named did not get votes (they are not “natural persons” unless and until they are identified by name).
- Members known to be deceased did not get votes.

§6.4: Tallying of votes

The description of the preferential vote tallying process in §6.4 is incomplete. **We determined that** it should be interpreted with the following interpolations in bold type below, based on the the standard counting rules procedures for a preferential vote election:

Votes shall first be tallied by the voter's first choices.

If no majority is then obtained, the candidate who places last in the initial tallying shall be eliminated and the ballots listing it as first choice shall be redistributed to **remaining candidates** on the basis of those ballots' second choices.

This process shall be repeated, **using the next available preference from eliminated candidates' ballots**, until a majority-vote winner is obtained. **If a preference below the first preference in the ballot has been left blank, no further preferences are counted for that ballot.**

If two or more candidates are tied for elimination during this process, the candidate that received fewer first-place votes shall be eliminated.

If they are still tied, all the tied candidates shall be eliminated together.

A number of ballots were submitted with blank first preferences. **We determined that** as it was not clear what the voters' intentions had been, such ballots would not be counted at all in the relevant categories. The constitution clearly states "Votes shall first be tallied by the voter's first choices". No first choice therefore means that the vote cannot be tallied.

We are aware that standard counting rules for a preferential vote election allow for multiple eliminations, when there is no possibility of e.g. the second-last-placed candidate overtaking the third-last, even if they were to get all of the last-placed candidate's votes. **We determined that** the Hugo tallying rules explicitly allow for only one candidate at a time to be eliminated, except in the event of a tie for both final and first preference votes as per the last sentence of §6.4.

The Hugo Voter Packet

Several finalists in the individual categories submitted material for the Hugo Voter Packet that did not contribute towards their eligibility in the category for which they were finalists. **We determined that** this material should be excluded from the Hugo Voter Packet, and made this clear to the individuals concerned in each case (all of whom accepted this ruling gracefully). The former 2017 Hugo Voter Packet Coordinator compiled a separate and substantial debriefing document, which we encourage her, with thanks, to share with future Hugo administrators.

We observe that the Hugo Voter Packet is not mentioned in the constitution, and the Business Meeting has never offered formal guidance on it. Yet it represents a significant element of the visibility of the Hugo Awards within and outside fandom, and therefore carries potentially significant reputational risk for the Hugos and the administering Worldcon. A future Business Meeting may wish to write rules or offer guidance about the packet, as part of the WSFS Constitution or as a separate document.

Nicholas Whyte and Kathryn Duval, 2017 Hugo Administrators