

**PROGRAM GOVERNANCE &
OFFICIAL RULES OF PROCEDURE**

**Eugene Scassa Mock
Organization of American States Program**

2023-2024



Official Rules of Procedure

Eugene Scassa Mock Organization of American States
as approved by the ESMOAS Executive Committee and
General Secretariat

Revised September 28, 2023

RULES OF PROCEDURE CONTENTS

Chapter 1: The ESMOAS Organization

- A. Program Governance
- B. Program Officers & Roles
- C. Executive Committee & Subcommittees
- D. Faculty Sponsors and Participating Institutions
- E. Hosting Institutions

Chapter 2: The Summit of the Americas- Structure

- A. Function & Purpose
- B. Registration & Assignment
- C. Summit Committees
- D. Component Special Sessions
- E. Written Requirements
- F. Order of Precedence
- G. Student Officers
- H. Delegates
- I. Diplomatic Missions

Chapter 3: Summit of the Americas- Rules of Debate & Order

- A. Order & Elements of Debate
- B. Procedural Points
- C. Motions Limiting Debate
- D. Motions Extending Debate
- E. Motions to Consider/Reconsider/Suspend/Adjourn
- F. Hierarchy and Supersession
- G. Amendment Procedures
- H. Voting Procedures

I. Parliamentary Procedural Conflict

Chapter 4: IACHR Moot Court

- A. Competition Structure
- B. Session Structure
- C. Rules of Courtroom Procedure
- D. Written Components- Memorials

Chapter 5: Awards, Eligibility & Committee Jurisdiction

Chapter 6: Duties of the ESMOAS Program Office

Chapter 7: Appendices- Parliamentary Short Form, Templates, Format Guide

2023-2024

CHAPTER I: THE EUGENE SCASSA MOCK OAS PROGRAM

SECTION A: PROGRAM GOVERNANCE

ARTICLE 1.A.1: Definition of the Program

The Eugene Scassa Mock Organization of American States (ESMOAS) Program includes all administrative and participatory activities held under the name of the program. This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, the ESMOAS General Assembly and Summit of the Americas (an academic, competitive simulation of the Organization of American States (OAS) General Assembly, which is the supreme organ of the Organization of American States), the ESMOAS Inter-American Court of Human Rights Moot Court competition, the ESMOAS Academic Conference on Inter-American Relations (an academic conference), the annual ESMOAS Parliamentary Procedures Workshop(s), reunions, official functions, and the necessary activities of the ESMOAS Executive Program Committee, affiliated faculty, and the ESMOAS Program Office.

ARTICLE 1.A.2: Sanctioned Events

All activities or announcements that are not officially listed on the ESMOAS program schedule (to be made available both electronically and in print) must be approved in advance by the Executive Program Director of the ESMOAS Program and the ESMOAS Executive Program Committee and its member faculty and institutions. Any event taking place during or in conjunction with the proceedings of an ESMOAS sanctioned conference that is not approved in this fashion will be considered a non-sanctioned event. Any event related to actual sanctioned events not occurring within the times provided on the official program is also considered “social” or non-sanctioned events. Issues arising from non-sanctioned events are not within the jurisdiction, scope, or liability parameters of the ESMOAS Program. However, disciplinary issues arising from non-sanctioned events may be considered when determining if a participating team or individual has conducted itself in a manner detrimental to the program and its values.

ARTICLE 1.A.3: Program Governance

The ESMOAS Program is governed by an Executive Program Committee consisting of an Executive Program Director, a Deputy Program Director, and a number of specialized coordinators, as well as a representative from the participating faculty sponsors and one elected student officer. Coordinators and the Deputy Program Director are selected by the Executive Program Director, who acts as the head of the committee. Faculty representatives are selected at large by the member faculty sponsors and serve a single-year term, renewable each year with no maximum. The student representative is the Secretary-General for the upcoming Summit of the Americas, who was elected by the General Assembly of students in the previous model and serves a one-year, non-renewable term.

ARTICLE 1.A.4: The ESMOAS Program Rules of Procedure

The rules and bylaws governing the ESMOAS Program, and its constituent officers and committees shall be the Official Rules of Procedure, which shall be reviewed yearly by the Executive Committee and Director, and disseminated to all ESMOAS participants and institutions upon its review and updating. The Rules of Procedure shall govern all aspects of the program and its conferences and competitions.

ARTICLE 1.A.5: Scope of the Rules of Procedure

The Official Rules of Procedure for the Eugene Scassa Mock Organization of American States (ESMOAS) Program apply to all officially sanctioned events of the ESMOAS Program and are applicable to all aspects of the program unless otherwise defined. These rules govern only those activities regarded as an official conference or program activities, and hold neither supersession nor jurisdiction over rules,

policies, or codes of conduct established by individual teams or universities for use within their own activities or with regard to their participation, individual eligibility, or conduct among their students and faculty.

ARTICLE 1.A.6: Temporary Changes to the ESMOAS Rules of Procedure

During the Summit of the Americas competition, a rules committee composed of the Secretary-General, Parliamentarian, and President of the General Assembly (known collectively as the “General Secretariat”) reserves the right to request any changes in the rules necessary to ensure the efficacy of ESMOAS proceedings. If any changes are determined to be necessary during an ESMOAS proceeding, the General Secretariat shall promptly request these changes from the Executive Program Director. If the Director approves these changes, the Head Delegates and Faculty Advisors of each participating team shall be notified of the rule change immediately. Changes to the Rules of Procedure may not directly negate any rule explicitly stated in the current version of the Rules of Procedure; only new interpretations of implicit rules may be developed during the proceedings by the General Secretariat. Temporary changes may only be enacted if the continued operation of the conference proceedings or the academic or competitive integrity of the proceedings are in immediate danger. During the IACHR Moot Court Competition, a referendum by at least three participants may be presented to the Executive Director to make similar temporary changes during that competition.

ARTICLE 1.A.7: Permanent Changes to the ESMOAS Program Rules of Procedure

Changes or amendments to the actual Rules of Procedure that change, or reverse explicit rules stated therein must be made before the next ESMOAS conference and workshop(s) begin. These shall be executed by the Executive Program Director and submitted for final approval of the Executive Committee at its next meeting. The changes made shall go into effect immediately upon their approval by this committee, unless otherwise indicated.

ARTICLE 1.A.8 Dissemination of Changes to the ESMOAS Program Rules of Procedure

The Office of the Executive Program Director shall be responsible for informing all participating institutions and their faculty advisors of any rules changes as soon as possible after their adoption. The preferred forum for this dissemination shall be the annual Parliamentary Procedures Workshop.

ARTICLE 1.A.9: Intellectual Property

All documents produced for the ESMOAS and for the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop are the property of the Eugene Scassa Mock Organization of American States Program, and approval for their use or dissemination must be approved by the Executive Program Director and Executive Committee. This includes photographs, videos, or other recordings made during the proceedings by ESMOAS staff or volunteers, and written work submitted by conference participants. The ESMOAS Program retains the copyright to all intellectual property designed, created, and/or produced in conjunction with its conferences and retains the right to use these items for future educational, training, marketing, or other purposes deemed appropriate by the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 1.A.10: Technological Property

All Internet-based applications, programs, and information are the property of the ESMOAS Program as administered by the Executive Committee and shall be housed within the Eugene Scassa Mock Organization of American States’ official website or other appropriate storage media. This online resource shall be maintained by the Executive Program Director or designated proxy and shall be financially supported by the general budget of the ESMOAS Program through donations or membership/participation fees, not by the conference or workshop host institution. The website and all

associated online content shall be housed through an objective, third-party domain, rather than within any host institution's online framework or domain.

SECTION B: ESMOAS EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

ARTICLE 1.B.11: The Executive Program Director

The Executive Program Director is the Chief Executive Officer of the ESMOAS Program and oversees all aspects of the organization and its conferences and events. The Program Director is responsible for recruiting and supervising volunteers to assist with the execution of the program's annual events, and oversees the Executive Committee, which assists in those efforts. The Program Director serves at the discretion of the Executive Committee and the faculty sponsors of each ESMOAS participating institution.

ARTICLE 1.B.12: Duties of the Executive Program Director

The Executive Program Director shall be in charge of the promotion, planning coordination, and execution of all meetings and sessions of the ESMOAS Program, as well as the subsequent follow-up thereon. Such other volunteer staff as may be named for this purpose by the director shall assist.

ARTICLE 1.B.13: Office of the Executive Program Director- Provision of Documents

Prior to each session of an ESMOAS conference, the Office of the Executive Program Director shall supply each participating institution with the official documents and informative material relating to the meeting. Observers shall be provided with documents and material appropriate to their status.

ARTICLE 1.B.14: Office of the Executive Program Director- Power of Review

Following each ESMOAS simulation, the Office of the Executive Program Director shall maintain the right to undertake, with the assistance of the ESMOAS Program Judging Committee, an evaluation of the performance and cooperation of each student delegation, with a view to determine which institutions shall be invited to take part in the following simulation.

ARTICLE 1.B.15: Office of the Executive Program Director- Limitations of Power

With regard to parliamentary procedures, the Executive Program Director and Committee, as well as participating faculty sponsors, must assume the role of observers once any ESMOAS competitive proceeding has begun, confining advice to the participants to off-floor meetings only. The Executive Program Director, Executive Committee, and support staff may actively address only logistical issues during the conference proceedings and can only support the student leaders in solving procedural or diplomatic issues in an advisory role. Remarks regarding problems that arise should be addressed to the Executive Program Director or members of the Executive Committee only in private. If a member of the Executive Committee is also a faculty advisor for a participating team, he/she retains the rights and privileges of an advisor.

ARTICLE 1.B.16: Office of the Executive Program Director- Removal and Replacement

The Executive Program Director serves at the discretion of the participating institutions and may be removed by a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote of participating faculty. A new program director may be selected by a combination of the Executive Program Committee and the participating faculty representatives from each institution.

ARTICLE 1.B.17: Office of the Program Director- Provision of Support Staff

The Office of the Executive Program Director shall seek to provide the services of Consultants, Technical Secretaries, Rapporteurs, Senior Assistants, and other necessary support personnel during the ESMOAS sessions. The Office of the Executive Program Director may also select from among the Faculty Advisors in attendance at a given session, an individual to serve as Technical Secretary or Committee Special

Rapporteur of each of the working committees or subdivisions of the conference. The Technical Secretaries shall act as liaisons between the respective committees/activities and the Office of the Executive Program Director and assist in the resolution of such problems as may arise in the course of the conference.

SECTION C: ESMOAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ARTICLE 1.C.18: The Executive Committee

The execution of the conferences and competitions associated with the ESMOAS Program shall be the primary duty of the ESMOAS Executive Committee, which is a group of volunteers appointed and overseen by the Executive Program Director and who, collectively, assist in the marketing, logistics, planning, analysis, and judging of the conference events associated with the program.

ARTICLE 1.C.19: The Executive Committee- Composition of

The members of the Executive Committee hold the title of Coordinator. A minimum of six coordinators must be actively serving at any given time to form the Executive Committee. In addition to the coordinators, the Executive Committee shall also include a Faculty Chairman, who represents the faculty sponsors from participating universities, and the Secretary-General, who represents the participating students. All members of the committee hold voice and vote in meetings, but the Executive Director may only serve as a tiebreaking vote, though he/she holds voice in all meetings.

ARTICLE 1.C.20: Executive Committee Annual Meeting

The Executive Committee meets regularly via remote video conference, and in person annually at the site of the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop. A majority of the members present shall establish a quorum. Other members not in attendance retain the right to vote on all matters, and no matter shall be considered closed until all committee members have had the opportunity to vote on the matter. The committee meeting shall be chaired by the Deputy Program Director, who is selected annually by the Executive Program Director, whose term shall also be renewed annually at the committee meeting.

ARTICLE 1.C.21: Executive Program Committee- Budgetary Discretion & Registration Fees

The Executive Program Director and Committee shall determine participation fees for all ESMOAS Program conference(s) and workshop(s), with the assistance of the appropriate host institutions. From year to year, the committee shall reserve the right to modify this amount as changing economic circumstances warrant, provided they announce changes to the fee schedule a reasonable amount of time before the ESMOAS conference or workshop begins. Participation fees are non-refundable. The committee also holds the power of financial oversight of all available funds belonging to the ESMOAS Program and is the final arbiter on how these funds are to be distributed.

ARTICLE 1.C.22: Distribution of Funds

Funds shall be distributed first to cover necessary costs of the organization (payroll, technology maintenance, etc.) as agreed upon by the committee with the informed consent of the participating institutions and faculty sponsors, with a portion of the received funds annually remitted to the host institution to cover a portion of the hosting fees. Agreement to host does not entitle an institution to the entirety of monies collected for participation, as the tangible and non-tangible benefits of hosting must also be considered as partial compensation.

ARTICLE 1.C.23: Executive Committee- Honorary Positions

Honorary membership can be bestowed by the Executive Program Committee to individuals it feels should hold a seat and vote on the committee due to their longstanding work within the conference. Honorary seats are held for one term but are renewable.

ARTICLE 1.C.24: The Judging Subcommittees

Awards and recognition are determined solely and independently by the ESMOAS Program Judging Committee and/or the ESMOAS Research and Writing Review Committee, which are volunteer committees supervised by the Executive Program Director and reporting directly to the Executive Committee and/or one of its specialized coordinators.

ARTICLE 1.C.25: The ESMOAS Program Judging Committee- Function

The ESMOAS Program Judging Committee is made up of volunteers selected by the Executive Program Director. These volunteers are responsible for observing and reviewing the written and oral performance of conference participants and, based on the information they collect, providing awards and recognition to individuals and teams for their work. The ESMOAS Program Judging Committee is also responsible for providing the faculty advisors of participating institutions with academic feedback regarding their respective teams' quality of participation. This information is educational only and may be used by the faculty advisor in whatever way he/she deems appropriate.

ARTICLE 1.C.26: ESMOAS Program Judging Committee- Membership

The Program Judging Committee is divided into three main groups- the Summit Judging Committee, the IACHR Judging Committee, and the Research and Writing Review Committee. Each of these groups is supervised by a chairperson who is responsible for moderating deliberations, keeping judging on task and fair, and coordinating the submission of the team evaluations to the Program Office. The Deputy Program Director serves as *ex officio* chairperson of the Summit Judging Committee. The IACHR Judging Committee is chaired by the IACHR Judging Coordinator, and the RWR Committee is overseen by the Research and Writing Review Coordinator. In addition to the chairs, the committee may include, at the discretion of the Program Director, the following:

- Social Media Judge- Assigned to be the primary judge of electronic correspondence executed in the context of the competition and ensuring it is taken into consideration during deliberations.
- IACHR Preliminary Round Remote Judge- Judges either Preliminary Oral Arguments (IACHR) or observes part or all of proceedings via Zoom or other telecommunications platform.
- At-Large Judge-Judges either the Summit or IACHR competitions in person.
- Position Paper Reviewer- Member of the RWR Committee for at least one year who is responsible for judging, remotely, team position papers.
- At-Large Resolution Vetter- Member of the RWR Committee who is responsible for vetting and judging submitted resolutions.
- IACHR Legal Memorial Judge- Member of the IACHR Judging Committee responsible for reviewing and scoring legal memorials (remote only).

ARTICLE 1.C.27: Judging Committee- Provision of Lodging & Meal Expenses

As the budget allows, the Executive Program Director, with the assistance of the host institution and the Executive Committee, retains the right to offer complementary lodging or meals to judges serving in person at either the Summit or IACHR competitions. The number of slots shall be limited, and no judge may receive funding for more than two years consecutively. Lodging shall be given to judges in seniority order or by determination of greater need. Judges covering their own expenses may continue to participate at the discretion of the Program Director, and one year of self-payment of expenses by the

judge resets the consecutive years rule and entitles the judge to consideration for lodging/meal provision in the next program year.

ARTICLE 1.C.28: Judging Committee- Selection and Eligibility

Judges are invited and selected by the appropriate coordinator or chairperson of each committee, and confirmed after consultation of the Executive Program Director, provided there is no veto from any faculty sponsors participating in the event. Judges on any of the committees serve at the Director's discretion and under his/her direction, though their deliberations and decisions may not be affected or altered by any other program staff, including the Program Director. Candidates must meet certain criteria for nomination to the judging committees, as outlined below:

Research & Writing Review Committee Resolution Judges must not be actively enrolled as an undergraduate student at any ESMOAS participating institution. They may serve as graduate assistants or associated faculty at said institution, provided they are not directly affiliated with the Summit competition team and are not directly coaching that team. Their nomination must be approved by the Program Director and the RWR Committee Coordinator to be invited to serve.

Research & Writing Review Committee Position Paper Judges must not be actively enrolled as an undergraduate student at any ESMOAS participating institution. They may serve as graduate assistants or associated faculty at said institution, provided they are not directly affiliated with the Summit competition team and are not directly coaching that team. To review position papers, the candidate must also have completed one term as a resolution judge or other approved volunteer position and must be at least one year removed from enrollment at any participating institution. Their nomination must be approved by the Program Director and the RWR Committee Coordinator to be invited to serve.

Judging Committee (Summit) candidates must have served for two conference years in any combination of: any Research and Writing Review Committee or an approved volunteer staff position and must be two (2) years removed from participation as a delegate. In extreme circumstances, the Executive Program Director may ask the Executive Committee and/or faculty sponsors to approve the appointment of a judge not meeting these criteria. The eligibility of this individual to serve as a judge shall be determined by the consulted body either by consensus or vote. Candidates for the optional Judging Ambassador position must have served at least three years as a judge in some capacity.

ARTICLE 1.C.29: Judging Committee- Limitations on Power

The Judging Committee acts independently of program staff and administration as an objective, third-party arbiter. Judges participate only as observers for the purposes of granting awards and for providing academic feedback to conference participants after the close of the conference. Judges may not meet with participating teams during the conference, may not engage in social activities with a team to the exclusion of other teams, and may not interrupt proceedings to provide input, answer questions, or give rulings on questions of procedure.

ARTICLE 1.C.30: Judging Committee- Confidentiality and Conflicts of Interest

Judges have a duty not to disclose confidential information about their observations, deliberations, or discussions with other judges with regards to the proceedings with any conference participants other than the Executive Program Director. Remarks provided in evaluations shall be given only to the respective team's faculty advisor and may not be shared with any other individuals. Judges also agree to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the Program Director before the conference begins or immediately upon discovery.

ARTICLE 1.C.31: Judging Committee- The Committee Chairperson

The Executive Program Director shall name a Judging Committee Chairperson for each sanctioned competition (Summit of the Americas and IACHR Moot Court). This chairperson shall be responsible for overseeing the entire Judging Committee for an event, or for overseeing one portion of the Judging Committee (for instance, there may be two Judging Committee Chairpersons- one supervising the judges for the summit, the other supervising judges for the moot court). The Judging Committee Chairperson(s) shall be responsible for ensuring coverage of all proceedings by appropriate judges, coordinating the writing and submission of team evaluations, and overseeing deliberations. The chairperson retains no special voting rights or privileges with regard to awards deliberation.

ARTICLE 1.C.32: Judging Committee- Provisions for Participation

Judging Committee members agreeing to serve on the committee must attend the conference proceedings pertinent to judging in their entirety and agree to serve on the committee free of distractions or other commitments during that period. In return, the meals and lodging required for the judge's participation shall be the responsibility of the ESMOAS Conference host institution and/or participation/membership fees and dues. Judges may, at their discretion, waive the right to lodging or meals. No monetary compensation shall be provided, either for service or in lieu of waived lodging or meals.

ARTICLE 1.C.33: The ESMOAS Research and Writing Review Committee- Function

The ESMOAS Research and Writing Review (RWR) Committee shall be composed of volunteers selected by the RWR Committee Coordinator, with the approval of the Executive Program Director. These volunteers are responsible for vetting and judging the written components of ESMOAS conferences and, based on the information they collect, providing awards, recognition, and written feedback/evaluation to individuals and teams for their work. The RWR Committee is also responsible for accepting or rejecting submitted written work based on the requirements set out by the Office of the Program Director.

The RWR Committee shall consist of three separate subcommittees:

- a. The Resolution Vetting Subcommittee, which is responsible for evaluating and awarding resolutions submitted for debate in the Summit of the Americas competition,
- b. The IACHR Memorial Vetting Subcommittee, which is responsible for evaluating memorials submitted as part of the IACHR Moot Court competition, and
- c. The Position Paper Review Subcommittee, which is responsible for evaluating position papers submitted by delegations participating in the Summit of the Americas competition.

ARTICLE 1.C.34: RWR Committee- Selection and Eligibility

RWR Committee members are invited and selected by the RWR Committee Coordinator, a member of the Executive Committee appointed and overseen by the Executive Program Director. Though the coordinator reports to the Program Director, his/her decisions may not be affected or altered by any other program staff, including the Program Director. A candidate for the RWR Committee must not be an active team member or advisor for any participating institution and must have graduated or transferred from the institution in which he/she participated as a team member. Candidates for the Position Paper Review Committee must have graduated or transferred from the institution in which they participated as a delegate at least one year prior or served for one term in another approved volunteer position.

ARTICLE 1.C.35: RWR Committee- Limitations on Power

The RWR Committee acts independently of program staff and administration as an objective, third-party arbiter. Committee members participate only as observers for the purposes of granting awards and for providing academic feedback to conference participants after the close of the conference. RWR

Committee members may not meet with participating teams during the conference, may not engage in social activities with a team in exclusion of other teams, and may not interrupt proceedings to provide input, answer questions, or give rulings on questions of procedure.

ARTICLE 1.C.36: RWR Committee- Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest

RWR Committee members have a duty not to disclose confidential information about their observations, deliberations, or discussions with other judges or committee members with regards to the work they reviewed with any conference participants other than the Executive Program Director. Remarks provided in evaluations shall be given only to the Executive Program Director and may not be shared with any other individuals. RWR Committee members also agree to disclose any potential conflict of interest to the Program Director before their work begins. RWR Committee members agree not to attempt to discern the authorship or sponsorship of any of the materials they are given to review.

ARTICLE 1.C.37: RWR Committee- Provisions for Participation

Research and Writing Review Committee members agreeing to serve on the committee must be available during the vetting period for which they are asked to serve and agree to serve on the committee free of distractions or other commitments during that period. In return, the RWR Committee members receive recognition at the conference awards gala, recognition on the program website and in the official conference program, written letter(s) of thanks, and any recommendation or letters of participation requested by the volunteer. Members of any RWR subcommittees may attend the conference or any ESMOAS proceedings as guests free of charge but shall be responsible for their own lodging and meals, though free attendance at the awards banquet/gala may be extended at the discretion of the Program Director and/or Committee. Members of the Position Paper Review Committee may attend the conference free of charge, and are allowed to attend, also free of charge, the faculty and presenters' luncheon and the closing ceremonies and awards gala but are responsible for the cost of their lodging and transportation.

ARTICLE 1.C.38: The Student Steering Committee- Functions and Parameters

The Student Steering Committee (SSC) shall serve an advisory function by assisting the Executive Program Director and Committee with suggestions on rule changes and logistical changes to make future conferences more fair, equitable, and academically profitable for student participants. Ideally, the Student Steering Committee shall be composed of one representative from each participating institution, though a participating institution reserves the right to opt out of participation in this committee. Student Steering Committee also retains the right to recall the election or nomination of any student officer.

ARTICLE 1.C.39: Student Steering Committee- Meetings

The Student Steering Committee (SSC) shall meet with the Secretary General and Parliamentarian immediately following the Closing Plenary Session of the conference in order to discuss possible changes to the next year's program, or via a scheduled video conference within three weeks of the close of the Summit of the Americas conference. The Secretary General shall then produce a report from the SSC to present to the Executive Committee. After the conference, committee communication will be done through email and/or a designated social media group specifically for the SSC. Student Steering Committee representatives shall be asked to attend virtual meetings in the Winter, Spring, and Summer following the close of the conference (one meeting every three months), during which they will receive information about upcoming changes. The Secretary-General may invite members of the SSC to participate or observe meetings of the Executive Committee, at his/her discretion and with approval of the Program Director or Associate Program Director. The SSC may also be called into special session for the purposes of a recall hearing. Student Steering Committee Representatives will be recognized at the

conference awards reception at the end of their service (the conference held approximately a year after the SSC meeting).

ARTICLE 1.C.40: Student Steering Committee- Terms of Service

Each participating institution shall have the option of nominating one student to serve on the Student Steering Committee for the following program year. Nominated students selected for the SSC begin their term of service immediately after the Closing Plenary Session of the conference at which they were nominated and ending at the Closing Plenary Session of the following year.

ARTICLE 1.C.41: Student Steering Committee- Eligibility

At the time of nomination, students wishing to serve on the Student Steering Committee must be active participants of the current conference and must not be serving as an officer of the General Secretariat (Parliamentarian, Secretary General, or President of the Assembly). Additionally, SSC members may not serve during their term as an officer of the General Secretariat (in other words, an SSC nominee may be neither a current nor an elected member of the Secretariat, as they cannot serve in both capacities simultaneously). Students wishing to run as a General Secretariat officer in the following conference must step down from the Student Steering Committee, and the institution will be asked to replace the student on the committee, should the student win that election. Students nominated for the Student Steering Committee shall also commit to attending the following year's conference (for example, a student nominated to the 2013 committee must be eligible and planning to attend the 2014 conference).

ARTICLE 1.C.42: Student Steering Committee- Motion for a Recall Referendum

Any sitting member of the Student Steering Committee or the Executive Committee may motion for a recall referendum if any of the following occurs:

- a. An elected member of the student secretariat indicates they will be unable to attend the upcoming conference for which they were elected,
- b. An elected member of the student secretariat voluntarily steps down from their elected position before the beginning of the ESMOAS Conference for which they were elected,
- c. An elected member of the student secretariat is perceived to have behaved in a manner counter to the principles of the organization during or after his/her election procedure (i.e. committed perjury during the nomination process, violated rules of conduct for his/her team or university after election, or damaged the reputation or integrity of the ESMOAS organization during the time between their election and their term of service), or
- d. An elected member of the student secretariat fails to perform his/her duties leading up to the conference (not attending planning meetings or performing work required of the elected official leading up to the conference)

ARTICLE 1.C.43: Officer Recall Referendum Procedures

If a recall referendum is formally requested (done via contact with the Program Director or Executive Committee), a special session of the SSC shall be scheduled in a timely manner to allow the greatest possibility of participation and preparation by all parties, not less than one week and no more than three weeks from the referendum request. During the recall session, the individual(s) requesting the recall shall be given an opportunity to present their reasoning, and the student officer in question shall also be given an opportunity to present from their perspective. Committee members may ask questions of either party during this hearing, which shall be chaired by the Program Director. After presentations, the members shall vote, via secret ballot, on whether to recall the election and begin the process to select a replacement. All seated members of the SSC and those attendees from the Executive Committee, as well as invited faculty representatives, may receive one vote. A recall is approved with a 2/3 supermajority.

Members of the SSC who are outgoing officers may not vote (a President from 2023 may not vote to recall a President-Elect from 2024, for example). If the recall is approved, procedures for replacing the candidate shall be followed according to the rules set out for each officer position in Section 2G. A recalled officer may still participate in the conference as a delegate or head of state, at the discretion of the participating institution, and shall not be banned from future participation at any level.

SECTION D: PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS & FACULTY

ARTICLE 1.D.42: The Faculty Advisor

Each participating institution shall appoint a member of its faculty to serve as an advisor to the prospective student delegation, preferably an individual versed in inter-American affairs and the function of international organizations, ideally the OAS. The advisor shall be the primary point of contact for the institution, the student delegation, the Program Director, and the Executive Committee. Institutions may provide one assistant to the Faculty Advisor, who shall be considered part of the faculty delegation. Faculty advisors are not required to travel with the team for competitions or workshops but remain the primary point of contact in the event of disciplinary or emergency reasons.

ARTICLE 1.D.43: Multiple Team Advisors

Institutions participating with more than one level of team (for instance, an undergraduate-level Summit of the Americas delegation and a graduate-level Summit delegation) or participating in multiple competitions (for instance, a Summit of the Americas delegation and an IACHR Moot Court Competition delegation) may provide a primary Faculty Advisor for each team. This allowance does not apply to institutions with multiple teams in one competition (for instance, a university with 3 delegations attending the Summit of the Americas must have no more than two (2) primary faculty advisors). Additional faculty advisors beyond the primary advisor and one assistant may be allowed but shall be assessed additional registration fees.

ARTICLE 1.D.44: Payment of Fees and Reservations

Each participating institution shall ensure prompt payment of the fee established by the Executive Committee and/or host institution for admission to any sanctioned ESMOAS Conference. The Faculty Advisors should make sure that students' reservations for accommodations are made as far in advance as possible. Institutions shall be required to pay a non-refundable deposit upon registering, in order to gain access to conference training materials and information available through their portion of the organization's website. Before the start of the conference, if students or delegations must remove themselves from the competition after payment of fees, these fees may be refunded, minus the deposit fee. In extreme cases and with reasonable notice (before registration fees are expended on conference-related expenses), the Office of the Program Director may authorize partial refunds or reduced registration fees with approval of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 1.D.45: Team Selection

The Faculty Advisors shall select student delegations sufficiently in advance to permit proper preparation for the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas or Inter-American Court of Human Rights Moot Court Competition, choosing as participants individuals enrolled in subject areas with a relationship to inter-American affairs, for which participation in the ESMOAS Conference can prove useful for their academic development.

As needed and when appropriate, the ESMOAS Program Office may form a Unified Team, which shall be a delegation (or delegations) comprised of representatives from multiple universities. This team can be formed in response to a surplus of students at multiple universities, in which institutions do not have

enough registered students to form an additional delegation of their own, but have students who wish to participate in some capacity, or it can be formed as an educational exercise and comprised of either students entirely new to the program or experienced delegates who wish to form an exhibition team. The Unified Team's eligibility for awards shall be determined by the Program Director with these circumstances in mind, and its leadership shall be assigned by the Program Office, with approval from each institution with students participating in the team.

ARTICLE 1.D.46: Team Preparation

The Faculty Advisors are encouraged to take an active role in all phases of preparation for the ESMOAS Conference, scheduling and attending discussion sessions, assigning research topics to individual students, monitoring the progress of their efforts, and stimulating them to work as a team. The quality of the resolution presented by the delegations is affected by the quality of work of the Faculty Advisor. For future institution participation, the faculty sponsor's input will determine the continuity of participation of that institution.

ARTICLE 1.D.47: Team Supervision

At least one Faculty Advisor or an appointed team leader should accompany the delegation to all conference sessions. Additionally, the Faculty Advisors should ensure that their student delegations attend all officially scheduled conferences, meetings, and ceremonies for the entire duration of the ESMOAS Conference. Should conditions make it necessary to leave any event early, the Executive Program Director must be immediately notified. If the primary faculty advisor associated with the team must designate a replacement supervisor for either the workshop or the conference, the institution must provide the necessary contact information for this individual in a timely manner.

ARTICLE 1.D.48: Academic Credit

The Faculty Advisors should seek to ensure that student delegates receive academic credit for participation in sessions of the ESMOAS Program. If students are graded on their performance at the ESMOAS Conference, judgment should not be based on the number of resolutions accepted or the number of times the delegate speaks in committee sessions, but on preparation and academic quality of research and presentation.

ARTICLE 1.D.49: Provision of Candidates

Institutions shall endeavor to provide candidates for Committee Chairperson, Rapporteur, or other officers, particularly those registering multiple delegations at the ESMOAS Conference. In the Summit for the Americas competition, for each two (2) delegations registered, ESMOAS encourages institutions to provide at least one (1) candidate for office. For IACHR Moot Court, universities bringing at least three (3) legal teams will be encouraged to provide one (1) bailiff or court officer.

ARTICLE 1.D.50: Faculty Evaluation

Upon returning to their respective institutions, the Faculty Advisors should meet with the student delegations to evaluate the meeting in terms of the participation. The Office of the Executive Program Director will welcome suggestions and observations and will provide feedback from the ESMOAS Judging Committee in a timely manner.

ARTICLE 1.D.51: Provision of Judging Evaluations

For academic and instructional purposes, the ESMOAS Judging Committee shall provide all registered delegations in the Summit of the Americas competition, and all registered teams participating in the IACHR Moot Court competition, with a copy of their performance evaluation for the duration of the conference. This evaluation will be forwarded to the institution before the close of the fall semester. For the same purposes, the evaluation shall include notes from the RWR Committees, notes from the Summit

and IACHR Judging Committees compiled into a single form, and in the case of IACHR Moot Court, a score sheet reflecting the team's average score in each round of competition.

ARTICLE 1.D.52: Reference Library

The Faculty Advisors shall be responsible for maintaining a permanent OAS reference library composed of background materials provided by the OAS or the ESMOAS Program Office. These documents should be made available to students as freely and as often as possible.

ARTICLE 1.D.53: Provision of Reliable Communication Methods

The provision of correct email addresses and contact information, on both registration forms and in communication to the ESMOAS Program Office, are the responsibility of the institution and its Faculty Advisor. Notices sent to the Faculty Advisor are considered notices sent to all team members. Notices not sent successfully to teams due to the provision of incorrect or invalid email addresses on registration documents are not the responsibility of the ESMOAS Program Office.

ARTICLE 1.D.54: Appeals and Reconsiderations of Awards

Should a delegation feel it was judged unfairly or did not receive the correct ruling regarding awards or evaluations, it is the responsibility of the delegation to inform the Executive Program Director, in writing (mailed, presented in person, or electronically delivered). The appeal must include a detailed description of the disagreement, along with any supporting documentation and/or petitions from additional delegations. The Program Director shall investigate the issue to the fullest extent possible and return a response and final ruling within two (2) weeks of the filed appeal. The Program Director may, for the purpose of correcting decisions deemed to be incorrectly made by the Judging Committee, grant additional awards or other public corrections or commendations. These changes must also be approved by the Chairperson of the Judging Committee or, in case of conflict of interest, the Chairperson of the Executive Committee.

SECTION E: HOST INSTITUTIONS

ARTICLE 1.E.55: Term Limits on Institutional Hosting

Institutions acting as hosts for ESMOAS Conferences or Workshops shall be asked to host no less than two (2) consecutive conferences or workshops, and no more than three (3), unless otherwise agreed upon by the entire Executive Committee. An institution submitting a bid for hosting is thus committing to two years of hosting, with an option to extend to a third year during the second year's session. No institution may host both the workshop and the conference in the same period. In the event that other institutions are either unable or unwilling to host, extensions may be made through agreements between the Executive Committee and the current hosting institution.

ARTICLE 1.E.56: Bidding for Hosting the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop

In the event that multiple institutions are seeking to host the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop in the same year, a bid process shall be instituted. Institutions wishing to host the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop will be asked to submit a bid during the fall semester of the last year of the existing host's term (the 2nd year the institution is hosting the workshop). This bid shall be submitted to the Executive Committee in the form of an official document and questionnaire provided by the committee upon the candidate institution's request. The deadline for this bid must be placed far enough before the workshop to allow committee members to consider the application before voting. The bidding application should be provided by the Executive Committee and, at the least, should include an assessment of economic ability and commitment, space availability, proposed dates, and a synopsis of why the institution seeks to host the workshop, along with any other questions the Executive Committee deems appropriate. The Executive

Committee will then hold a vote at the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop and announce the winner at the closing of the workshop. At this time, the ex officio term on the Executive Committee shall commence for that institution.

ARTICLE 1.E.57: Bidding for Hosting of the ESMOAS Summit or IACHR Moot Court

In the event that multiple institutions are seeking to host either the Summit of the Americas (fall) or IACHR Moot Court Competition (spring) in the same year, a bid process shall be instituted. Institutions wishing to act as hosts for the ESMOAS Conference will be asked to submit a bid during the fall semester of the last year of the existing host's term. For example, if Institution A is hosting the Fall 2015 conference and the Fall 2016 conference, the candidates seeking to host in 2017 and 2018 must submit bids during the fall semester of 2015. The Executive Committee should set the deadline for submission well enough ahead of the conference to have time to consider all bids before voting. The bidding application should be provided by the Executive Committee and, at the least, should include an assessment of economic ability and commitment, space availability, proposed dates, and a synopsis of why the institution seeks to host the conference, along with any other questions the Executive Committee deems appropriate. The Executive Committee will then hold a vote before the commencement of the ESMOAS Conference and will announce the winner that year (for example, the host of 2017 and 2018 shall be announced at the 2015 conference). The winner of the bid will be announced at the Closing Plenary Session. The winning institution's ex officio term on the Executive Committee shall commence after the close of the conference immediately preceding its hosting period (in the example case, at the close of 2016's ESMOAS Conference).

ARTICLE 1.E.58: Responsibilities of the Host Institution

The institution selected as the host for any ESMOAS workshop or conference shall work closely with the Executive Program Director to establish the logistical framework required for serving as the physical host. This shall include, but not necessarily be limited to: raising institutional money to help financially support the hosting of the event, arranging for catering services, reserving meeting space, arranging or suggesting accommodations, providing technological and printing/copying support, arranging for an on-campus liaison to work with the ESMOAS Program Office in planning and execution, and other aspects of the conference that must be arranged onsite or within the institution's event planning procedures.

ARTICLE 1.E.59: Host Compensation for Hosting

Those institutions hosting any ESMOAS event are provided free registration for all participating students and faculty. This, along with savings on lodging and travel, is designed to offset the cost of hosting any ESMOAS events. The agreement to host establishes an informal agreement between the Program Office and the host university. While the Program Office promises to remit any portion of monies it has received above and beyond budgeted expenses to the host university to offset costs, the host institution also agrees not to use the conference or its proceedings as a fundraiser or moneymaking venture.

ARTICLE 1.E.60: Host Selection

The Executive Committee shall endeavor to choose a host for both the workshop and conference by consensus. Should the Executive Committee be unable to reach consensus, a vote shall be taken. The Executive Committee shall also endeavor to spread out the selection of hosts and avoid allowing institutions to dominate the hosting duties. The focus of the selection shall be to encourage the maximum number of interested institutions to seek bids.

CHAPTER II: THE SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS

SECTION A: FUNCTION AND PURPOSE

ARTICLE 2.A.61: Definition of the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas

The ESMOAS Summit of the Americas is the primary conference administered by the ESMOAS Program. It is a simulation of one or several organs of the Organization of American States and/or the Summit of the Americas and/or OAS-associated entities. The Summit of the Americas functions as a competition divided into topical committees based upon committees within the actual OAS or other international organizations operating within the Western Hemisphere. The Summit of the Americas is divided into committees, each led by a Committee Chairperson and Committee Rapporteur. These committees are overseen together by an elected set of officers known as the General Secretariat. Committees are composed of committee delegates, working together as a whole unit (a delegation) and led by one Head Delegate.

ARTICLE 2.A.62: Creation of the Committees

The Executive Committee is responsible for the creation of committees and the assignment of resolution topics to each committee. It is the responsibility of the Executive Committee to ensure the committee titles and topics are disseminated to participants in a timely manner. The number of committees shall be determined by the Executive Program Director in conjunction with the Executive Committee based on the anticipated participation for the upcoming conference. Committees may be added or subtracted to correspond to participation levels as needed.

ARTICLE 2.A.63: Common Provision of the Rules

The provisions regarding debate and procedure contained in the Rules of Procedure shall equally and constantly govern all sessions and meetings of the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas.

ARTICLE 2.A.64: Language of Debate

English shall be the official language of the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas and associated conferences. Efforts for simultaneous interpretation and translation services may be made by university students or others willing to volunteer to work as interpreters and translators in Spanish.

SECTION B: REGISTRATION AND ASSIGNMENT

ARTICLE 2.B.65: Member State Representation

Each registered institution shall be allowed to represent at least one (1) OAS member state in all the committees comprising the summit for that year. Institutions shall also be allowed the opportunity to represent multiple states if space allows, pending the approval of the Executive Program Director of the ESMOAS and of the ESMOAS Executive Committee. Universities may register for up to four (4) delegations. Additional delegations are at the discretion of the Program Director. All member states and observer states eligible to attend an OAS meeting for the year are available to be represented in the ESMOAS summit.

ARTICLE 2.B.66: Speaking Privileges in Committees

Each delegation is entitled to send up to two delegates of equal rank and responsibility to each committee (except the General Committee, where only one delegate per delegation is allowed). Only one delegate from each delegation is allowed to speak during debate. The delegate may only communicate with his/her co-delegate by use of notes. Only the delegate seated at the table may make motions or request the floor in any way. Delegates may not swap positions until after an item open on the floor has been voted upon.

Delegates set up in pairs in committees may consist of two delegates swapping positions (“speaking” and “support” delegate back and forth, or with one delegate always having speaking duties and the other permanently in a non-speaking support role.

ARTICLE 2.B.67: Approved Materials in Committee

Delegates may utilize electronic devices during debate but are asked to limit their usage of networking tools like Zoom only to the procedures while in the room, either in person or virtually.

ARTICLE 2.B.68: Attendance of Sessions

All Summit of the Americas committee sessions are held open to properly accredited delegates, alternates, observers, judges, and staff, along with invited guests approved by the Executive Program Director and possessing the proper credentials.

ARTICLE 2.B.69: Observer State Representation

Institutions may be allowed to attend the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas as an observer state. The observer state delegation may have voice in its committee but does not have the privilege of voting rights at any time, nor are its delegates eligible for election to the General Secretariat. Voting and award eligibility privileges may be granted by the Executive Program Director or Executive Committee in the event that there are more participating institutions than there are available member states to represent. All observer states shall be bound by the Rules of Procedure. Observer state delegations receive the same voting privileges as member states during award voting and during General Secretariat elections.

ARTICLE 2.B.70: Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) Representation

Institutions not wishing to represent member states or observer states may be allowed to attend the Summit of the Americas as representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs). NGOs may only be those recognized by the OAS and shall have full voice privileges in all Summit of the Americas sessions but will receive no voting privileges during debate sessions. Delegates representing NGOs may be granted voting and award eligibility privileges by the Executive Program Director or Executive Committee if deemed appropriate, as laid out in Article 2.7, or if NGOs were assigned as a result of running out of available member states to assign. NGO delegations receive the same voting privileges as member states during award voting and during General Secretariat elections.

ARTICLE 2.B.71: Observing Delegations

Institutions not wishing to participate in the Summit of the Americas but wishing to attend for the purposes of research or future conference participation considerations may be allowed to attend all conference proceedings but have neither voice nor vote in any committee. Observing delegates are not eligible for awards or election consideration.

ARTICLE 2.B.72: “Mentor” Delegations

Members of the ESMOAS Alumni Association or Judging Committee may field an observer delegation upon the approval of the Program Director and participating faculty, any of whom may veto the formation of such a team. This delegation would not be eligible for individual or team awards, but would serve as a “mentoring team,” existing to answer delegate questions or provide advice when solicited and, at times, moving debate forward when deemed reasonable and necessary. This is not to be confused with the Unified Team, whose formation and composition is addressed in Article 1.D.45.

ARTICLE 2.B.73: Country Assignment and Selection

Countries shall be assigned to delegations in two stages. The first, called Priority Registration, requires teams to register by a set date. On this date, all registered institutions are placed in a drawing with the most desirable countries available. Each institution draws, at random, one country. Institutions with

multiple registered delegations are then assigned countries for those additional delegations which are most closely related (geographically, culturally, and politically) to the drawn country, thus forming a “bloc”. The second period, Late Registration, allows institutions to add delegations between the Priority Registration Deadline and the Final Registration Deadline. All effort will be made to ensure these assignments are similar—institutions with country assignments already who are adding an additional country will be offered the remaining country which most closely resembles those they already have. Institutions who are registering for the first time will be given the number of countries requested in as similar a fashion as possible.

ARTICLE 2.B.74: Delegation Composition

Each delegation shall consist of at least one and no more than two delegates per subcommittee, and exactly one head delegate serving as the head of state in General Committee. Each participating institution is allowed one or more Faculty Advisors, Committee Chairperson(s), Committee Rapporteur(s), as well as any General Secretariat officers elected during the previous conference. For the purposes of registration fee assessment, up to two (2) Faculty Advisors may be excluded from the delegation’s total. Delegations are also allowed a Public Information Officer in some cases, as outlined in Article 3.5.

ARTICLE 2.B.75: Summit Registration and Credentials

The Head Delegate of each delegation shall report to the registration desk at the ESMOAS conference’s designated arrival time in order to receive his/her delegation’s credentials and other registration materials. Credentials are defined as the items allowing students to participate in the conference. These can include a nametag, committee assignment, printed conference materials, meal card and/or meal allowance, parking permit, and all other items provided to delegates during the conference.

ARTICLE 2.B.76: Credential Disputes

The Executive Program Director is the sole arbiter in the case of disputes involving credentials. Students’ credentials are established through the submission of the delegation’s Official Roster Form. Questions involving credentials and eligibility for awards or for participation in the conference should be submitted to the Executive Program Director in private, immediately upon their discovery. The ESMOAS Program is not responsible for accommodating students not included on the official roster form submitted by the institution.

ARTICLE 2.B.77: One Voice per Delegation

For all delegations, only one delegate at a time is recognized as the “speaking delegate.” The speaking delegate is the only member of a delegation who may make motions or request the floor in any way. If a team has two delegates assigned to a committee, the two delegates may not trade positions when a resolution is still open on the table, but only between resolutions. The delegate sitting in the speaking position must remain the speaking delegate throughout debate on a resolution. For these purposes, “debate” shall be defined as any period between the reading of the resolves by the rapporteur and the final voting on the resolution. Delegations may only trade positions between resolutions or between sessions. Teams with two delegates may alternate speaking duties however they wish or may opt to have one delegate responsible for all speaking and the other delegate in a permanent support role.

SECTION C: SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS COMMITTEES

ARTICLE 2.C.78: Committees and Structure

The Summit of the Americas shall include a “General” Committee and any number of “Regular” Committees. The number of regular committees shall be determined based on the anticipated size of the

conference each year. Regular committees are responsible for the debate of resolutions brought by committee delegates. This debate takes place under the direction of the Committee Chairperson and is further facilitated by the Committee Rapporteur. Debate follows the format and parameters set forth in these Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.C.79: Regular Committees

Regular committees are topical in nature, and generally shall be simulations or representations of actual committees within the Organization of American States and can include, but are not limited to, committees on security, integral development, democracy, or finance. Delegations may send a minimum of one (1) and a maximum of two (2) delegates to each of the committees.

ARTICLE 2.C.80: General Committee

The General Committee consists of the Head Delegates of each registered delegation only. The General Committee utilizes, in most cases, the same rules and procedures of debate as the regular committees but is also responsible for dealing with the Crisis Scenario and its associated Joint Declaration. General Committee delegates may also consider funding for resolutions, determine the agenda topics for the next model, and vet candidates for student officer positions. These special circumstances may require modifications to the Rules of Procedure that are particular and exclusive to the General Committee. General Committee representation is limited to one delegate per country.

ARTICLE 2.C.81: General Committee- Head Delegates

The delegates participating in the General Committee are referred to as “Head Delegates” and are asked to represent themselves as their assigned country’s Head of State during conference proceedings. Thus, the Head Delegate for the United States does not come simply as a delegate, but instead represents him/herself as the President of the United States. Special rules regarding what is appropriate for this type of simulation follow in the section on Head Delegates.

SECTION D: SPECIAL COMPONENT SESSIONS

ARTICLE 2.D.82: Summit of the Americas- Proceedings and Sessions

The annual ESMOAS Summit of the Americas shall include in its proceedings the following sessions, in chronological order:

1. Opening Committee Sessions
2. Inaugural Plenary Session
3. Committee Debate Sessions
4. Awards Voting Sessions
5. Officer Election Session
6. Closing Plenary Sessions

It may also include the following sessions, which may vary in their chronological sequence or scope:

7. Conference Work Agenda Session
8. Budgetary Approval Session(s)
9. Crisis Session
10. Crisis Response (Joint Declaration) Session(s)
11. Officer Candidate Confirmation Session

ARTICLE 2.D.82: Summit of the Americas- Opening Committee Sessions

The initial sessions for each committee in the summit shall include the following matters of business:

1. Opening statement by the Committee Chairperson
2. Introduction of committee officers and staff
3. Drawing of the committee's Order of Precedence (if this has not already been done previously)
4. Setting of the committee's *Modus Operandi*, if such motion is made
5. Setting of the committee's agenda, if there is not an agenda already in place

ARTICLE 2.D.83: Summit of the Americas- Inaugural Plenary Session

The Inaugural Plenary Session is an optional session that may include opening statements by the Secretary General and the President of the General Assembly, host institution dignitaries, members of the Executive Committee, as well as any pertinent announcements by the Executive Program Director. These functions shall be carried out by the Secretary General and presided over by the President of the General Assembly. The Inaugural Plenary Session should also include the setting of the *Modus Operandi* for the conference, the establishment of the committee's agenda, and, at the President of the Assembly's discretion, general statements by those Head Delegates who request the floor as part of the General Speakers' List.

ARTICLE 2.D.84: Summit of the Americas Committee Debate Sessions

The committee debate sessions shall serve as regular meetings of the committee, during which debate on submitted resolutions is carried out according to the Rules of Procedure. Committee debate sessions may include debate on resolutions, crafting of joint declarations, and/or budget approval of passed items.

ARTICLE 2.D.85: Summit of the Americas Awards Voting Sessions

The awards voting sessions shall be the last sessions of the individual committees' respective proceedings. During these sessions, the committee delegates shall be given the opportunity to vote on the best delegates in their respective committees. Elections shall be governed by the Rules of Procedure and secret balloting shall be conducted by the Secretary General, the Parliamentarian, or both. Ballots shall be counted by members of the Executive Committee with at least one faculty sponsor acting as observer. Ties shall be broken through a revote with only the two tied candidates considered. If the tie is not broken in this vote, the tie stands and both individuals win the award.

ARTICLE 2.D.86: Summit of the Americas Closing Plenary Session

The Closing Plenary Session shall include at least the following matters of business:

1. Final business of the General Committee, including the adoption of all passed declarations from all committees,
2. Reports from each Committee Chairperson on the proceedings of his/her respective committee,
3. Optional closing remarks of the President of the Assembly, Parliamentarian, and Secretary General,
4. Election of General Secretariat officers for the subsequent conference, conducted by the Secretary General and Parliamentarian,
5. Announcement of the meeting times for group photos, SSC meeting, awards gala, or other proceedings to be held after the close of the conference.

ARTICLE 2.D. 87: Summit of the Americas- General Committee Work Agenda Session

The General Committee may be given the task of determining the topical work agenda (committee debate topics) for the next ESMOAS Summit of the Americas meeting. In such a session, delegations are asked to submit suggestions, either through formal debate or caucus, for the agenda topics for each committee for the following year. Topic suggestions may then be compiled and/or truncated by the Program Office Executive Committee in order to ensure a reasonable number of agenda topic suggestions without redundant or unfeasible candidates. This edited list shall be provided to the General Committee at the

same time as the posting of Debate Resolutions for other committees. During the Agenda Topic Committee Debate session, the General Committee shall be responsible for determining one agenda topic per regular committee for the next year's Summit of the Americas competition. The agenda topics chosen by the General Committee shall be announced during the Awards Gala or other Closing Plenary Session of the conference. Unless otherwise stated or adopted, the rules for agenda topic debate shall be the same as those used in the creation of joint declarations.

ARTICLE 2.D.88: Summit of the Americas- Budgetary Approval Session(s)

The General or Budgetary Committee may be asked to approve funding for resolutions passed in previous sessions. In such a case, resolutions shall be assigned monetary values by the RWR Committee prior to the conference and disseminated to delegates no later than one (1) week prior to the conference. Resolutions' author names will be changed from the original authoring country to the name of the country tasked with defending the resolution's funding. The committee will receive, prior to or during the proceedings, a "budget window," with a minimum and maximum amount of funding required to complete the task. Through reconsideration, tabling, and other voting strategies, the committee is required to pass enough resolutions' funding to meet the requirements of this window.

ARTICLE 2.D.89: Summit of the Americas- Crisis Session

At some point during the conference, all delegates (known collectively as the General Assembly) shall be called to a meeting during which a hypothetical or historically based crisis is announced. After the initial announcement, and throughout the remainder of this session (during which updates and additional information may be released), head delegates are asked to meet with their delegations to craft a strategy within their country's political agenda and position. These meetings must be held in a way that is open to the judges, for them to judge the team's response strategy and the head delegate's leadership abilities.

ARTICLE 2.D.90: Summit of the Americas- Head of State Addresses Session

After meetings have concluded, heads of state shall line up at the speakers' podium in their General Committee Order of Precedence. At this time, in order, the heads of state are given the option to address the room in response to the crisis. These speeches are optional, but are judged, eligible for awards, and limited to a maximum of two (2) minutes. The time limit shall be set by the President of the Assembly prior to the start of the addresses.

ARTICLE 2.D.91: Summit of the Americas- Crisis Response (Joint Declaration) Session

After the addresses (usually the following day), the General Committee only shall meet in order to craft a joint declaration in response to the crisis. This joint declaration will be crafted in special session, and must be passed by consensus vote, though the appending of reservations to the final document will be allowed.

ARTICLE 2.D.92: Summit of the Americas- Officer Confirmation & Election Session

For the purposes of selecting a President of the Assembly and a Secretary-General for the next Summit of the Americas conference, the General Committee may be asked to meet in special session after all other business is concluded, but prior to the closing plenary session, for a Secretariat Confirmation Session. During this session, candidates for both offices will be required to give a campaign speech before the committee, and then yield to questions from the head delegates. Questions may be procedural, ethical, or personal in nature. Anything that pertains to the suitability of the candidate for serving in one of the two offices the following year is an admissible question. Questions may not be disseminated to the candidates ahead of the session; doing so may result in the forfeiture of the candidacy of a nominee who received information about the hearings not commonly provided to all candidates. Candidates or voting members of the General Committee may challenge the admissibility of confirmation questions posed by other

delegates through a Point of Order. The admissibility of questions and other Points of Order regarding the procedure or content of the Confirmation Hearings shall be adjudicated by the President of the Assembly, who shall preside over the Confirmation Sessions. Any decision made after a Point of Order must also be confirmed by the Parliamentarian, who shall preside over the Confirmation Hearings as the General Committee's Rapporteur.

ARTICLE 2.D.93: Summit of the Americas- Secretariat Election Session Voting

The session moves into voting procedure once either the questions have been exhausted or the President of the Assembly moves to close debate. In the voting procedures for any Secretariat position, each participating institution is allotted one (1) vote—thus, universities with multiple delegations must confer with one another and submit a single vote. Voting must be conducted by secret ballot, with the seated Parliamentarian, a member of the Executive Committee, and a faculty observer present to count ballots. If no candidate receives a simple majority on the first ballot, a runoff vote will then be conducted between the two candidates receiving the most votes. A tie after this round may be broken by the three members of the current Secretariat, who shall then each receive one (1) vote.

SECTION E: WRITTEN COMPONENTS

ARTICLE 2.E.94: Draft Resolutions- Definition

Delegates may submit draft resolutions on behalf of their respective delegations for debate in any of the committees comprising the Summit of the Americas. Resolutions are short, written suggestions to be considered as part of the committee's approved projects, and should be programs, allocations, or policies designed to address the committee topic at hand. Resolutions shall be vetted by the Research and Writing Review Committee and assigned a budgetary value for later use in debate. Those deemed to be off-topic will be returned to the submitter for correction.

ARTICLE 2.E.95: Draft Resolutions - Requirements for Participation

The submission of a draft resolution is not required for a delegate to participate in the ESMOAS Conference. Individual delegates may be considered for all awards (other than for White Papers, by nature), and teams shall not be penalized if not all delegates submit resolutions but shall instead be judged only on the written work submitted. However, a team submitting no or very few resolutions in comparison to its number of delegates (less than half) may be penalized in the written work portion of their score.

ARTICLE 2.E.96: Draft Resolutions- Form and Style

Resolutions must adhere to the stylistic standards of the ESMOAS, as illustrated in the resolution template included in these Rules of Procedure. Resolutions not adhering to these stylistic standards may be rejected by the RWR Committee, and those lacking the proper signatures shall be rejected by the Secretary-General or Committee Rapporteur and are then subject to demotion in, or deletion from, the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas agenda. Corrections made to bring the resolution into compliance may be made and must be resubmitted electronically to the committee with the approval of either the Secretary-General or the Executive Program Director. Once this digital file is received by the committee, the Committee Rapporteur may review the changes and deem the resolution either eligible or ineligible for debate.

ARTICLE 2.E.97: Draft Resolutions- Substance

Resolutions must be germane to one of the topics under consideration by the committee. They must also

fall within the parameters and functions of the actual OAS, meaning the resolutions cannot seek to achieve something outside the jurisdiction of the organization or antithetical to the foundational ideas as set out in the OAS Charter or other foundational documents. Approved resolutions, for instance, may not demand certain actions from member states, breach national sovereignty, or work completely outside the boundaries of the existing OAS organizational structure.

ARTICLE 2.E.98: Draft Resolutions- Submission Process

A due date by which resolutions must be submitted shall be established by the Office of the Executive Program Director. All resolutions from a single delegation should be submitted together and must be accompanied with the proper contact information for the head delegate, faculty sponsor, and author(s). The program office will determine whether this will be achieved via a printed form or an online submission process, and it is the responsibility of the Program Office to disseminate the information and instructions to participants. After submission, resolutions shall be directed to the Research and Writing Review Committee for evaluation within the parameters of these Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.E.99: Draft Resolutions- Vetting Decision Appeal

Should a draft resolution be rejected for being off-topic, the author of the resolution or authorized delegation primary point-of-contact may appeal the committee's decision by presenting a written defense to the program office via e-mail. From here, the entire resolution, along with the initial rejection comments provided by the RWR Committee member who rejected the resolution, shall be sent to the entire RWR Committee for further review. The committee may then render a judgment on the appeal by majority vote. In the event of a tie, the RWR Committee Coordinator shall serve as the tiebreaker.

ARTICLE 2.E.100: Draft Resolutions- The Debate Packet

Resolutions submitted before the assigned deadline and either approved for form and substance or edited properly within the allotted grace period and then approved shall be placed in the "Debate Packet". The Debate Packet is the collection of all resolutions eligible for presentation sometime during the committee's debate business. All provisions shall be made to debate all resolutions placed in the Debate Packet. It is up to each Chairperson to steer his/her committee toward the adoption of an agenda that allows for the fair consideration of the most resolutions in the Debate Packet possible. Debate Packet Resolutions shall be made available electronically, through the program website, to all participating delegations after their final review and approval, usually 3-5 days before the start of the competition. Delegates will be responsible for providing their own printed copies of the Debate Packet, including a printed copy of their own resolution for the purposes of signing. The only official version of the resolution is the one provided online; failure to use the proper version shall render the resolution ineligible for debate, as reviewed by the Secretary-General.

ARTICLE 2.E.101: Definition of the Late Packet

Resolutions not initially approved by the RWR Committee and not corrected before the deadline, or those resolutions crafted and submitted after the submission deadline, and any resolutions created during the conference proceedings, are all assigned to the "Late Packet" and may not be "upgraded" to Debate Packet status during the conference.

ARTICLE 2.E.102: Consideration of the Late Packet

The Late Packet may not be considered for debate until all resolutions from the Debate Packet have been debated and either tabled or voted upon. Only at this point may a motion to enter into the Late Packet be considered by the Committee Chairperson. Late Packet resolutions may be considered by the committee only after all Debate Packet resolutions have had the chance to be considered. "Considered" shall be

defined as “read and reviewed by the committee and having some action taken on their behalf, whether it is debate, motion to table, or removal from consideration by motion of the author”.

ARTICLE 2.E.103: Resolutions- Signing of

Approved resolutions placed in the Debate Packet must receive the signatures of exactly three (3) delegates representing three (3) distinct delegations before they can be approved for debate by the Committee Chairperson. Time will be allowed during the first evening of the Summit of the Americas Conference for delegates to solicit signatures for their respective resolutions. Authors may also solicit signatures for their resolutions outside of the conference official proceedings, in any manner appropriate. Once the resolution receives the proper number of signatures, it is eligible for debate once its place in the order of precedence comes up during committee debate. Any delegate registered as part of a delegation may sign any resolution. No matter what delegation member signs the resolution, his/her delegation is then bound as a whole by that signature. No more than three signatures will be considered binding signatures on a resolution.

ARTICLE 2.E.104: Resolutions- Binding of Cosignatories

Becoming a signatory to a resolution binds the delegation to vote in favor of the resolution, unless it is successfully amended. This rule shall not be the case for co-signing of amendments (co-signers of amendments are not bound). Becoming a signatory on a resolution does not prohibit the delegation from becoming a signatory on an amendment to that resolution. Cosigning a resolution or amendment does not bind the delegation to vote in favor of funding during subsequent debates on funding or budgetary approval, as the cosigning is interpreted as supporting only the substance of the resolution, and its funding is considered a separate debate entity.

ARTICLE 2.E.105: Resolutions- Eligibility for Debate

If a Draft Resolution is approved by the Research and Writing Review Committee for substance, it becomes eligible to be signed by other delegates at the conference, and also must be signed by the Secretary General (who ensures the correct version of the resolution is being used). The signed resolution shall then be kept by the delegate until his/her debate time, determined by the setting of the Order of Precedence. Immediately before the delegate is allowed to present the resolution, the signed copy must be submitted to the Committee Rapporteur, making it eligible to be presented as part of the debate agenda. A resolution not signed by the Secretary General may be signed by the Rapporteur only if all formatting errors causing its initial rejection have been corrected and electronically resubmitted to the committee. If all requirements to render the resolution eligible have not been completed by the time the resolution is to be presented in committee, the proponent of the resolution must forfeit his/her time to the next resolution in the order of precedence and agenda. Once the resolution's original debate time as determined by the order of precedence and agenda has been forfeited, the resolution may not be considered until all other First Packet resolutions have been debated. If the resolution receives the proper signatures and approval after its assigned time has been forfeited, it may be presented before those in the Late Packet.

ARTICLE 2.E.106: The Joint Declaration- Definition

Committees may be asked to craft a Joint Declaration during committee proceedings. This declaration shall be a compilation of individual resolves adopted by the committee and must be adopted by consensus vote before the close of committee proceedings. A “resolve” is defined as an individual line item of intended action listed as part of a resolution or joint declaration.

ARTICLE 2.E.107: The Joint Declaration- Creation and Editing Process

The Joint Declaration shall be created and maintained by the Committee Rapporteur using a collaborative

editing software (i.e., Google Docs). The declaration should be made visible to all delegates through sharing remotely or on screen in the committee room. During the process of debate, items may be added or deleted from the declaration, and may only be officially done by the Committee Rapporteur. No other delegate or officer may edit or modify the joint declaration.

ARTICLE 2.E.108: The Joint Declaration- Voting and Approval Process

Upon completion of debate on all resolutions on the agenda or once debate time has been exhausted, the final Joint Declaration must be voted upon and approved by the committee. This shall be done by division of the question, after which time no substantive speeches may be approved by the chairperson. The committee shall vote in turn on each resolve in the declaration. Delegates may vote “yes” to approve, “yes with rights” to approve the resolve, while reserving the ability to write a reservation to append to the end of the joint declaration, or “no” to reject the resolution. For the resolve to stay on the declaration, all delegations must vote “yes” or “yes with rights”.

All rejected resolves shall then be stricken from the declaration document, and time given to delegations voting “yes with rights” to submit written reservations to append to the document. Once the reservations are appended and the rejected resolutions removed, the declaration must be approved as a whole with a single roll call vote (options shall be “yes” or “no” only). The committee’s business is not considered complete until the declaration has been finalized and adopted by the committee. This same format may be used for the Crisis Response Joint Declaration crafted in General Committee.

ARTICLE 2.E.109: The Joint Declaration- Reservations

A reservation is a statement appended to the end of the Joint Declaration indicating a delegation’s objections to a particular line item. To allow for the successful completion and adoption of the declaration, delegations may opt to vote in favor of a resolve and append a reservation, rather than reject the resolve and prevent the committee from moving forward. Delegations are not required to use reservations, however, and may choose to reject the individual resolve and not allow the entire joint declaration to move forward.

ARTICLE 2.E.110: Joint Declaration- Form and Substance

Joint Declarations shall follow the format provided in the template attached to these Rules of Procedure. The Joint Declaration shall consist of a preambulatory clause section, a list of resolves, a list of signatories that should include all delegations in attendance, and a section for reservations. Joint Declarations must pass by consensus (all delegates vote “yes” or “yes with rights”).

ARTICLE 2.E.111: The Team Position Paper

Each delegation shall be given the opportunity to submit a Team Position Paper, which is a statement about the delegation and its government’s agenda, political stance, and historical relationship to each of the committee topics on the agenda for the Summit of the Americas. Position papers are not required for a delegation to attend the conference but are required for a delegation to win any team award.

ARTICLE 2.E.112: Position Papers- Form and Substance

Position Papers shall follow the format provided in the template attached to these Rules of Procedure. Position Papers may be annotated using any format (MLA, Turabian, Chicago, Parenthetical, Footnotes, etc.), but must retain the same reference format throughout. Position Papers found to include plagiarized material or uncredited source material may be considered null and void by the Research & Writing Review Committee. If plagiarism is determined to have occurred by the RWR Committee as a whole, the Program Director and Executive Committee may take actions ranging from dismissal of the position paper alone from award consideration to dismissal of the team from any award consideration.

ARTICLE 2.E.113: Position Papers- Submission

A due date by which Position Papers must be submitted shall be established by the Office of the Executive Program Director. Position Papers are to be submitted to the Executive Program Director and shall be reviewed by the RWR Committee (Position Paper Review Subcommittee). Delegations may submit only one (1) Position Paper, and this paper must be submitted in its final form, before the due date, to be considered eligible for awards.

ARTICLE 2.E.114: Position Papers- Awards and Judging

All delegations wishing to be considered for overall team (delegation) awards must have an approved Position Paper submitted and by the deadline and approved by the review committee. Delegations without an approved Position Paper shall be ineligible for team awards. The Position Paper Review Subcommittee, as part of the Research & Writing Review Committee, is responsible for the evaluation and review of all submitted Position Papers. This committee is also responsible for granting an Outstanding (1st Place) and Distinguished (2nd Place) award for position papers each year and may add a Recognized (3rd Place) award when more than sixteen (16) delegations are participating.

ARTICLE 2.E.115: Position Papers- Provision to Other Delegations

Position Papers shall be made available after their submission and approval, before the beginning of the Summit of the Americas, for all participating delegations to review. Position Papers may be referenced during debates during the Summit.

ARTICLE 2.E.116: Position Papers- Topical Agenda Proposal

Each team position paper may include, in its final section (not counting appendices), a nomination by the delegation for the next year's agenda topic in each debate committee (excluding the General Committee). These nominations will be compiled by the Executive Committee. Those chosen by the committee as the best candidates shall be debated and voted upon by the General Committee in their first debate session for the purpose of determining the next year's agenda topics. Nominations deemed similar in substance shall be combined by the Executive Committee, with credit given to all delegations who authored them. Should a delegation fail to include topical agenda nominations in its position paper, it forfeits its right to propose agenda topics in the General Committee debate session, and may be penalized if its failure to nominate agenda topics is seen as detrimental to its stated agenda or its government's stance on issues at hand.

SECTION F: THE ORDER OF PRECEDENCE**ARTICLE 2.F.116: Drawing the Order of Precedence**

The Secretary General shall establish a "lot" to determine the Order of Precedence for delegations during the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop, occurring roughly 5-6 weeks before the opening of the ESMOAS competition. This lot will be drawn separately for each committee during the workshop's Closing Plenary Session. Each committee, including General Committee, shall then possess its own unique Order of Precedence—all committees will have their respective orders of precedence recorded by the Parliamentarian, and these orders of precedence will be made available to faculty advisors.

ARTICLE 2.F.117: Use of the Order of Precedence

The Order of Precedence shall be used for:

1. Determining the order in which speeches on the General Speaker's List may be made,
2. Determining the Interim President, should the need arise,
3. Determining the ordering of resolutions for presentation within the parameters of the set agenda,
4. Determining the order of Crisis Speeches made by Heads of State during Crisis Sessions,

5. Determining the order of voting during roll call votes.

ARTICLE 2.F.118: Supremacy of the Order of Precedence

Once the Order of Precedence is drawn, it may not be amended nor changed during the conference. The drawing may be appealed if any participant(s) feel it was done in error or that the procedure was structured unfairly. Appeals will be heard by the Parliamentarian and the Executive Program Director. If both agree an appeal is warranted, the Committee Chairperson and Committee Rapporteur shall be given permission to conduct a new drawing.

SECTION G: THE STUDENT SECRETARIAT**ARTICLE 2.G.119: Term Limits**

Elected officers may not run for an office they have already held at a previous Eugene Scassa Mock OAS proceeding.

ARTICLE 2.G.120: The President of the Assembly- Duties

The President of the General Assembly serves as the Committee Chairperson for the General Committee and may, at other times, act as a master of ceremonies during conference proceedings.

ARTICLE 2.G.121: The President of the Assembly- Privileges of Office

The President participates in the proceedings of the General Committee and all Plenary Sessions with voice but no vote. As an official Committee Chairperson, the President of the General Assembly is eligible for the same awards and privileges as other Committee Chairpersons, though he/she shall be judged on an elevated scale, in deference to the higher position the President of the Assembly implies.

ARTICLE 2.G.122: The President of the Assembly- Election of

A special session consisting of the campaign address, confirmation hearing, and secret ballot election shall be scheduled prior to the Closing Plenary Session for the purpose of electing the President of the General Assembly for the subsequent session of the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas. This officer shall serve for the duration of the conference session for which he or she has been elected.

ARTICLE 2.G.123: The President of the Assembly- Eligibility for Nomination

Prospective candidates for President must submit appropriate, approved election forms to the Executive Program Director. These forms must include the signature of at least three (3) delegations that support the candidate's decision to run. These signatures are not binding during voting, but only signify the delegation's willingness to hear the candidate's campaign message. Prospective Presidents must agree to attend both the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop and the Summit of the Americas the following year. Candidates for President do not have to be current members of the General Assembly.

ARTICLE 2.G.124: The President of the Assembly- Enumerated Powers and Duties

The President shall:

1. Preside over the General Assembly as its Committee Chairperson,
2. Preside over Inaugural and Closing Plenary Sessions as the Committee Chairperson,
3. Recognize speakers in the General Assembly,
4. Direct the General Committee and/or the General Assembly in the setting of an agenda,
5. Submit points under discussion to a vote and announce the results thereof,
6. Ensure parliamentary order in the Plenary and General Committee sessions,
7. Assist other members of the General Secretariat in the creation of the annual Crisis Scenario,
8. Act with the same authority as a Chairperson with regards to the General Committee,

9. In general, comply with and enforce the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.G.125: The President of the Assembly- Replacement of

In the event that the President is: (a) unable to attend the conference for which he/she was elected, (b) voluntarily stepping down from his/her position for personal reasons, or (c) deemed unfit to serve by referendum of the Student Steering Committee, the Student Steering Committee and representative(s) from the Executive Committee shall interview and elect a replacement, with one vote given to each Student Steering Committee member and one vote given to each Executive Committee member in attendance. Sitting student officers serving on the SSC may vote on replacement candidates, but may not vote in the referendum to recall any officer election. Replacement candidates shall be gathered, by the Executive Committee, from those who applied for the position already and lost in the election, head delegates serving in the upcoming model, or recently graduated delegates. Recent graduates may serve as officers in subsequent models, but forfeit any eligibility for individual performance awards. Officers elected in the year of graduation may serve their term after their graduation at the model for which they were elected, and retain eligibility for awards, but this shall not count toward volunteer service when considering eligibility for Judging Committee appointment.

ARTICLE 2.G.126: The Secretary General- Duties

The Secretary-General is the supervisor of all Committee Chairpersons and serves as the master of ceremonies for plenary sessions, as well as the first emergency chairperson in the event that a chairperson must vacate his/her position. Additionally, the Secretary-General is the final arbiter with regard to the approval of resolutions for debate and may refuse to approve a resolution based on formatting or submission errors.

ARTICLE 2.G.127: The Secretary General- Privileges of Office

The Secretary General may participate in any committee with voice but without vote. The Secretary General reserves the right to relieve a Chairperson he/she deems ineffective or disruptive, pending the approval of the Executive Program Director. The Chairperson can be replaced either by the Secretary General, the Parliamentarian, or a Committee Rapporteur, at the discretion of the Secretary General and Program Director. If the Secretary General must replace the Chairperson during the conference, the Secretary General is not eligible for a Chairperson award while serving in this capacity. If the Secretary General is asked to replace a chairperson before the start of the conference, the Executive Program Director may make him/her eligible for a chairing award. Relief of the Chairperson may be appealed in the same way a delegate would appeal the decision of his/her chair and would follow the same procedures.

ARTICLE 2.G.128: The Secretary General- Election of

A special session consisting of the campaign address, confirmation hearing, and secret ballot election shall be scheduled prior to the Closing Plenary Session for the purpose of electing the Secretary-General for the subsequent session of the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas. This officer shall serve for the duration of the conference session for which he or she has been elected.

ARTICLE 2.G.129: The Secretary General- Eligibility for Nomination

Prospective candidates for Secretary General must submit the appropriate, approved election forms to the Executive Program Director. These forms must include the signature of at least five delegations that support the candidate's decision to run. These signatures are not binding during voting, but only signify the delegation's willingness to hear the candidate's campaign message. Prospective Secretary Generals must agree to attend both the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop and the Summit of the Americas the following year. Failure to attend either of these proceedings in their entirety shall render the Secretary

General ineligible for office. A replacement officer may be provided, within the parameters of the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.G.130: The Secretary General- Enumerated Powers and Duties

The Secretary General shall:

1. Preside as master of ceremonies at the Inaugural and Closing Plenary Sessions and any other sessions deemed appropriate by the Summit of the Americas organizing staff,
2. Introduce distinguished speakers and guests,
3. Act as host and liaison for any invited dignitaries, as assigned by the Executive Program Director,
4. Convoke the Inaugural and Closing Plenary Sessions,
5. Approve all nominations for positions within the General Secretariat,
6. Assist in the coordination and selection of Committee Chairpersons when needed,
7. Assist in the coordination and appointment of Committee Rapporteurs when needed,
8. Assist in the approval of all resolutions submitted to the Research and Writing Review Committee and approving the format of said resolutions, thus approving them for presentation in committee,
9. Assist other members of the General Secretariat in the creation of the annual Crisis Scenario,
10. Act as a replacement Committee Chairperson if deemed necessary,
11. Appoint additional volunteer staff to assist in the functioning of the Secretariat, pending approval of the Program Director,
12. Mediate the annual meeting of the Student Steering Committee,
13. Submit a summary report to the Executive Committee after the meeting of the Student Steering Committee,
14. In general, comply with and enforce the provisions of the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.G.131: The Secretary General- Replacement of

In the event that the Secretary-General is: (a) unable to attend the conference for which he/she was elected, (b) voluntarily stepping down from his/her position for personal reasons, or (c) deemed unfit to serve by referendum of the Student Steering Committee, the Student Steering Committee and representative(s) from the Executive Committee shall interview and elect a replacement, with one vote given to each Student Steering Committee member and one vote given to each Executive Committee member in attendance. Sitting student officers serving on the SSC may vote on replacement candidates, but may not vote in the referendum to recall any officer election. Replacement candidates shall be gathered, by the Executive Committee, from those who applied for the position already and lost in the election, head delegates serving in the upcoming model, or recently graduated delegates. Recent graduates may serve as officers in subsequent models, but forfeit any eligibility for individual performance awards. Officers elected in the year of graduation may serve their term after their graduation at the model for which they were elected, and retain eligibility for awards, but this shall not count toward volunteer service when considering eligibility for Judging Committee appointment.

ARTICLE 2.G.132: The Parliamentarian- Definition

The Parliamentarian shall preside over issues of parliamentary procedure and ensure the continuity of the parliamentary order within the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas proceedings. The Parliamentarian officially serves as the keeper of the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.G.133: The Parliamentarian- Privileges of Office

The Parliamentarian may freely observe all Summit of the Americas committee sessions but retains neither voice nor vote in procedures. The Parliamentarian acts as the final authority on the Rules of

Procedure but may only adjudicate issues regarding the Rules of Procedure when officially requested (via the procedure outlined in the Rules of Procedure) by delegates or Committee Chairpersons. The Parliamentarian may be called upon to replace an ineffective Committee Chairperson by the Secretary General but would not be eligible for Chairperson awards while serving in this capacity. Should the Parliamentarian be called upon to chair a committee session before the conference actually begins, the Executive Program Director may make him/her eligible for a chairing award.

ARTICLE 2.G.134: The Parliamentarian- Appointment Procedures

Prospective Parliamentarians are interviewed by the Executive Committee between the Closing Plenary Session and the Awards Reception/Gala of the ESMOAS Program. Members of the Executive Committee, along with selected faculty sponsors, conduct interviews and are ultimately responsible for the appointment of the Parliamentarian, which is announced along with the election results for President and Secretary General during the Awards Gala proceedings.

ARTICLE 2.G.135: The Parliamentarian- Eligibility for Nomination

Prospective candidates for Parliamentarian must submit appropriate, approved nomination forms to the Executive Program Director. These forms must include the signature of their Faculty Advisor or another registered Faculty Advisor in attendance at the conference. Prospective Parliamentarians must agree to attend and assist in the execution of both the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop and the Summit of the Americas the following year. Candidates unable to attend the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop may not apply for the position of Parliamentarian under any circumstance. Failure to attend at least one Parliamentary Procedures Workshop in its entirety shall render the Parliamentarian ineligible for office. A replacement officer may be provided, within the parameters of the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.G.136: The Parliamentarian- Enumerated Powers and Duties

The Parliamentarian shall:

1. Assist in the coordination and implementation of at least one Parliamentary Procedures Workshop,
2. Present the Rules of Procedure to attendees at the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop,
3. Assist in the coordination and selection of Committee Chairpersons,
4. Adjudicate disputes and answer questions regarding parliamentary procedure in committees during approved recesses and caucuses, as illustrated in the Rules of Procedure,
5. Assist the other officers of the General Secretariat in the creation of the annual Crisis Scenario,
6. Assist the Secretary General in the meeting of the Student Steering Committee,
7. Serve as the Rapporteur for the General Committee during the Officer Confirmation Hearings portion of the conference (and hold the authority to vote against decisions made by the President during this portion. If there is a split vote between the Rapporteur and President, they must confer to determine the proper course and adopt it by consensus, or call upon the Secretary-General to render a final decision),
8. Serve as the final interpretive authority of the Rules of Procedure during the simulation,
9. Ensure parliamentary order in the Summit of the Americas proceedings.

ARTICLE 2.G.137: The Parliamentarian- Replacement of

In the event that the Parliamentarian is: (a) unable to attend the conference for which he/she was elected, (b) voluntarily stepping down from his/her position for personal reasons, or (c) deemed unfit to serve by referendum of the Student Steering Committee, the Executive Committee alone shall interview and elect a replacement. Replacement candidates shall be gathered, by the Executive Committee, from those who applied for the position already and lost in the election, head delegates serving in the upcoming model, or

recently graduated delegates. Recent graduates may serve as officers in subsequent models, but forfeit any eligibility for individual performance awards. Officers elected in the year of graduation may serve their term after their graduation at the model for which they were elected, and retain eligibility for awards, but this shall not count toward volunteer service when considering eligibility for Judging Committee appointment.

ARTICLE 2.G.138: The Social Events Chairperson- Definition

The Social Events Chairperson shall act as the conference's chief information officer, disseminating information to students and faculty through various social media platforms, and organizing networking opportunities for delegates to develop closer ties before the conference begins. The Social Events Chairperson is also the organization's liaison to media and press and may also act as a host liaison for dignitaries and special guests.

ARTICLE 2.G.139: The Social Events Chairperson- Privileges of Office

The Social Events Chairman may freely observe all Summit of the Americas committee sessions and may participate as a full voting delegate if he/she so desires. In the event the services of the SE Chairperson are required, however, this service takes precedence over committee work.

ARTICLE 2.G.140: The Social Events Chairperson- Appointment Procedures

Prospective SE Chairs are interviewed by the Executive Committee during the final day of the conference, or if necessary, after the close of the conference but before spring the following year. The Executive Committee is responsible for the appointment of the SE Chair and announces the appointment along with the other officers during the Awards Gala proceedings. The Social Events Chairperson is an optional officer position and is not required to form a complete Student Secretariat.

ARTICLE 2.G.141: The Social Events Chairperson- Eligibility for Appointment

Prospective candidates for SE Chairperson must submit appropriate, approved nomination forms to the Executive Program Director. These forms must include the signature of their Faculty Advisor or another registered Faculty Advisor in attendance at the conference. Candidates must agree to attend and assist in the execution of both the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop and the Summit of the Americas the following year, along with the planning and execution of online networking opportunities throughout the next year.

ARTICLE 2.G.142: The Social Events Chairperson- Enumerated Powers and Duties

The SE Chair shall:

1. Assist in the coordination and implementation of the following year's Parliamentary Procedures Workshop,
2. Help coordinate marketing to current and future participants regarding upcoming ESMOAS events,
3. Create (if necessary), activate, and monitor relevant social media platforms to provide both information and marketing on the ESMOAS program's upcoming events,
4. Communicate with the Program Director and disseminate any information deemed appropriate through other social media channels (the Program Office shall be responsible for sending information out via text, email, and Facebook—all other social media platforms will be the responsibility of the Social Events Chairperson,
5. Maintain the confidentiality of participants' contact information and any other personal information obtained during service as the SE Chairperson,
6. Assist the other officers of the General Secretariat in the creation of the annual Crisis Scenario,
7. Assist the Secretary General in the meeting of the Student Steering Committee.

ARTICLE 2.G.143: The Social Events Chairperson- Replacement of

In the event that the Social Events Chairperson is: (a) unable to attend the conference for which he/she was elected, (b) voluntarily stepping down from his/her position for personal reasons, or (c) deemed unfit to serve by referendum of the Student Steering Committee, volunteers to replace the chairperson may be appointed by the Executive Committee, or the office shall be vacated for the conference year.

ARTICLE 2.G.144: Committee Chairpersons- Duties

Committee Chairpersons preside over all sessions of each respective committee with the assistance of Committee Rapporteurs. Committee Chairpersons serve as the primary arbiter of procedure and debate during Summit of the Americas committee sessions.

ARTICLE 2.G.145: Committee Chairpersons- Privileges of Office

The Committee Chairperson retains voice but no vote within his/her respective committee and acts as the supreme authority for interpreting the Rules of Procedure within his/her committee, barring an official appeal (within the parameters outlined in the Rules of Procedure). While the committee is in session, the Chairperson retains this supreme authority. Only a Motion to Appeal the Decision of the Chair may interrupt the committee session, and only a successful appeal within the parameters of the Rules of Procedure may override the Chairperson's interpretation.

ARTICLE 2.G.146: Committee Chairpersons- Appointment Procedures

Prospective Committee Chairpersons are interviewed by representatives of the Executive Committee and participating Faculty Sponsors during the last day of the ESMOAS Conference. The Executive Committee is responsible for the appointment of the chairs and their assignment to respective committees and announces the appointments along with the Secretariat selections during the Awards Gala proceedings. These selected chairs will serve as chairs of the next ESMOAS session.

ARTICLE 2.G.147: Committee Chairpersons- Replacement of

Should a chair require replacement before the next year, or provided there are not enough chair candidates selected the previous year, additional chairs may be considered and added during the time between the conferences. These Replacement or Supplemental Chairpersons are interviewed by the Executive Committee and the General Secretariat during the registration period preceding the Inaugural Plenary Session, or during the Parliamentary Procedures Workshop (whichever comes first). This group is responsible for the appointment of Chairpersons and is responsible for announcing their appointment and assignments as soon as possible, but no later than the Opening Committee Sessions.

ARTICLE 2.G.148: Committee Chairpersons- Eligibility for Appointment

Prospective Chairpersons must submit the appropriate nomination form with the signature of their respective faculty advisors by the stated due date at the ESMOAS conference to be considered, or before the final day of registration if being added as a replacement or supplemental chair. Those not selected as Committee Chairpersons may become committee delegates, at the discretion of their Faculty Advisor. In the event that all delegate spots are filled already, the Committee Chairperson must either act as a Public Information Officer, a Committee Rapporteur, or as an assistant to the Faculty Advisor, or may replace a registered delegate who then, in turn, must serve in one of the aforementioned offices.

ARTICLE 2.G.149: Committee Chairpersons- Enumerated Powers and Duties

The Chairperson shall:

1. Open and close each committee session,
2. Moderate discussion in his/her committee,
3. Recognize speakers,

4. Submit points under discussion to a vote and announce their results,
5. Decide upon points of order within the committee,
6. Ensure parliamentary order and, if necessary, request the adjudication of the Parliamentarian,
7. In general, comply with and enforce the provisions of the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 2.G.150: Implicit and Explicit Rules and Powers

The Committee Chairperson is bound by the rules explicitly stated in the Rules of Procedure. Rules not explicitly stated in the Rules are to be interpreted by the Chairperson, who retains supreme authority in his/her committee on rulings regarding implicit rules and the interpretation of explicit rules, barring an official Appeal of the Chair's Decision. The official appeals process is outlined in later articles.

ARTICLE 2.G.151: Committee Chairpersons- Supervision of

The Committee Chairpersons receive training and instruction from, and report directly to, the Coordinator of Competition Standards, a member of the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 2.G.152: Committee Rapporteurs- Definition

Rapporteurs are responsible for ensuring the accuracy of votes within committees and in assisting the Committee Chairperson in timing speeches, ensuring order, and keeping up with quorum and speaking privileges. Additionally, Committee Rapporteurs provide the final approval for resolutions to be debated in committee and may approve a resolution on behalf of the Secretary General once committee sessions have begun.

ARTICLE 2.G.153: Committee Rapporteurs- Selection of

Committee Rapporteurs are selected by the Executive Committee under the guidance and supervision of the Coordinator for Competition Standards, who is the supreme authority with regard to selection or rapporteurs and are preferably students who applied for Committee Chairperson but lacked the experience to be one of the final selections. Rapporteurs may also be brought with Committee Chairpersons as a team, or they may be appointed by the Coordinator for Competition Standards from the pool of program alumni who wish to volunteer. In the event that the rapporteur is a graduated alumnus, that individual forfeits the less experienced candidates for chair.

Rapporteurs retain no voice or vote but are eligible to run for office. They may also be appointed as Emergency Chairperson by the Secretary General. When serving as Emergency Chairperson, a rapporteur is eligible for chairing awards along with his/her newly assigned rapporteur. Rapporteurs shall be allowed to chair one session of the regular committee to which they are assigned, unless they refuse the offer. During this session, the sitting chairperson shall act as the rapporteur. Rapporteurs may also be appointed by the Executive Program Director or Committee, with the approval of their Faculty Sponsor.

ARTICLE 2.G.154: Officers Serving Independently

Officers of the General Secretariat elected or appointed during the previous ESMOAS Conference may serve in their offices even if their respective institutions do not participate in the following conference. The cost of attending the conference, however, shall fall upon the individual should his/her institution not attend or provide for the expense. Committee Chairpersons or Rapporteurs from non-participating institutions may also be selected, but preference is given to those from participating institutions when selecting these positions.

SECTION H: DELEGATES**ARTICLE 2.H.155: Duties of the Committee Delegate**

Committee delegates are defined as any registered delegate participating in the sessions of any committee

of the summit other than the General Committee (in other words, any delegate who is not designated as the Head Delegate). Committee delegates are responsible for the authoring and presentation of individual resolutions, cooperation with other delegates in joint resolutions or joint declarations, and for presenting their member states' respective agendas in a professional and diplomatic manner. Registered committee delegates are eligible for committee awards voted on by their respective committees, and their individual performance is also taken into account by the Judging Committee when giving team awards.

ARTICLE 2.H.156: Duties of the Head Delegate

Each delegation's Head Delegate shall be responsible for the general conduct of his/her delegation, as well as the coordination of the team's overall agenda. It is the Head Delegate's responsibility that his/her delegation represents its member state in a coherent and consistent manner. The Head Delegate shall hold the title of Head of State and must represent the delegation in the General Assembly; Head Delegates may only sit on the General Committee. Those selected to chair a committee are not eligible to be Head Delegates.

ARTICLE 2.H.157: Head Delegates- Performance Parameters

Head Delegates are also judged on their ability to emulate the political agenda and speaking style of their respective Head of State. Head Delegates should endeavor to match the individual style of their country's head of state, but should limit that emulation to professional, diplomatic speech and dress. Head Delegates may imitate speech patterns, inflection, style of dress, level of diplomacy and inflammatory speech, in addition to talking points and political policy speech.

ARTICLE 2.H.158: Head Delegates- Appropriate Execution of the Office

Dressing and speaking in a way that is disruptive to the proceedings or detrimental to the professional and academic nature of the conference shall not be allowed, nor shall the use of language other than English (except for short phrases). Head Delegates are not required to be the same gender as the Head of State they are emulating, and no special consideration or credit shall be given to a team for selecting a Head Delegate of the same gender as the actual Head of State. Inappropriate dress or speech shall be defined by the Executive Committee with, optionally, input from the Judging Committee. Inability to follow these rules shall result in the Head Delegate being called to order during committee proceedings and/or penalized by the Judging Committee.

ARTICLE 2.H.159: Duties of the Public Information Officer

Institutions participating in the ESMOAS may be given permission to retain a Public Information Officer as part of their registered delegation. All provision should be made first to enroll students as committee delegates. Should the makeup of a delegation make it impractical for all students to serve as delegates and would result in a student not being able to participate at all, the institution may ask permission of the Program Director to designate a Public Information Officer. Institutions are allowed a maximum of one Public Information Officer. Each institution's Public Information Officer shall have free access to all committee sessions, though he/she shall have neither the right to speak nor vote. His/her duties will be to contact the local media to disseminate information about the ESMOAS and the participation of his/her institution in this event, as well as to assist the Faculty Advisor and the Head Delegate in the coordination of the delegation.

SECTION I: DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS

ARTICLE 2.I.160: The Diplomatic Mission- Creation of

During the course of the Summit of the Americas proceedings, a unique special mission shall be created for each of the delegations present. Parameters of special missions may vary and can include ensuring a

specific resolution passes or fails, direct partnership with, or opposition to, a specific delegation, or other unique task. These shall be crafted by the Summit Judging Committee on the second day of competition. Missions are designed to help guide delegations toward a goal the judges wish to see or address an area of weakness the delegation is perceived to have.

ARTICLE 2.I.161: Diplomatic Missions- Dissemination of and Confidentiality

The diplomatic mission shall be given to each delegation's head delegate, in secret, either through electronic correspondence or written notice. The mission may only be provided to the head delegate, and the committee officers may not share details of any mission with any other parties.

ARTICLE 2.I.162: Diplomatic Missions- Sharing of and Participation In

Delegations judged to achieve the most success in completing their mission shall be awarded a team award for Outstanding Diplomatic Mission Performance by the Judging Committee. Delegations are not required to participate in the secret mission, and the decision not to do so shall not negatively affect other judging categories or scores. Delegations have the full right to share as much or as little of their mission with any other delegations present in the competition.

CHAPTER III: PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE PROCEDURES

SECTION A: ORDER AND ELEMENTS OF DEBATE

ARTICLE 3.A.163: Establishment of Quorum

At the initial session of each committee, the Chairperson shall call the roll of delegations accredited to the conference. This call of roll will establish the number of delegations required to achieve quorum. Two-thirds of the delegations answering this initial quorum call will be necessary to conduct committee business for the remainder of the conference.

ARTICLE 3.A.164: Subsequent Quorum Calls

At the beginning of each committee session, the Chairperson shall call the roll of delegations. The majority and super-majority shall be figured for that committee session based on the quorum present for that session. The number of delegations required to be present to conduct business does not change from the initial quorum in the First Plenary Session, but the number of delegations required to achieve majority and super-majority may change with each session. Subsequent calls for quorum during the session are treated as Points of Parliamentary Inquiry and are only used only as such. Quorum may not change during a committee session but may only be recalculated between sessions.

ARTICLE 3.A.165: Granting of Voice

Recognition during the session's quorum call shall not guarantee the privilege of voice throughout the committee session. No representatives shall address the body without the approval of the Committee Chairperson. The Chairperson shall call upon member states in the order in which they signify their desire to speak, to the best of his/her ability. The Chairperson shall call a delegate to order if remarks made by that delegate are not relevant to the subject under consideration, the motion is made at an inappropriate time, or if the speaker has exceeded the allotted speaking time afforded by the *Modus Operandi*.

ARTICLE 3.A.166: Loss of Voice

Should a delegate leave the table during the debate of a resolution, or if that delegate returns late from a recess or unmoderated caucus session, that delegation loses both voice and vote for the remainder of the debate on the resolution at hand. A motion to recognize the delegate upon his/her return to the table

would be in order and would return the privilege of voice to the delegate. However, the delegate may not, under any circumstances, receive voting privileges for any resolution for which he/she has not been present 100% of the time. Voice and vote are automatically returned to a delegate after vote on a resolution has been completed and before consideration of the next resolution, provided the delegate has been recognized and is seated for the next resolution on the agenda.

ARTICLE 3.A.167: Suppression of Voice

Should a delegate repeatedly act unruly, undiplomatic, or disruptive in committee, the Chairperson may entertain a request to revoke speaking privileges. A request may be made by the Chairperson directly or may be made by a delegate in a note passed privately to the Chairperson. At this time, the Chairperson has the right to ask the committee for a vote of suppression. This is not debatable. Suppressing the voice of a delegate requires a second and a 2/3 super-majority and remains in effect for the duration of the session only. The delegate recovers the privilege of voice for subsequent sessions once the current session is adjourned. The delegate retains the right to vote; suppression of voice does not remove the right to vote.

ARTICLE 3.A.168: Yielding of Voice

If speaking time remains at the conclusion of a speech, the delegate may yield the balance of his/her time in the following ways:

1. To the Chairperson—The delegate thus forgoes any remaining time.
2. To Questions—The delegate is open to Points of Information. This is only applicable at the close of a proponent speech.
3. To Another Delegate—Remaining speaking time is granted to another delegate, who must speak on the same subject.
4. To a Motion—A delegate may conclude a speech by making a motion. This concludes the delegate's speaking privileges, but the committee must consider the motion. The motion to introduce an amendment is an exception to this rule—amendments must be yielded to at the beginning of a speech, and not at the end. These options apply only to substantive speeches. A delegate may only yield to the Chairperson during a procedural speech.

ARTICLE 3.A.169: The *Modus Operandi*—Definition

The *Modus Operandi* shall serve as the framework of debate and effectively sets time limits on speeches. The *Modus Operandi* must have four parts and may include an optional fifth component. All motions to set the *Modus Operandi* must contain:

1. A time limit for all substantive speeches,
2. A time limit for all procedural speeches,
3. A maximum number of speakers for the Pro/Con speakers' list,
4. A maximum number of questions for the Question/Answer periods,
5. An optional component setting a time limit for all proponent speeches. Should this option not be utilized, proponent speeches shall fall under the time limit constraints of substantive speeches.

ARTICLE 3.A.170: Setting the *Modus Operandi*

The initial *Modus Operandi* shall be set during the Inaugural Plenary Session or the Opening Committee Session. This *Modus Operandi* shall become the default for all committee sessions. Setting the *Modus Operandi* shall require a 2/3 super-majority. Committees shall have the option to amend the *Modus Operandi* after it has been set, and this shall also require a 2/3 supermajority.

ARTICLE 3.A.171: The Agenda—Definition

The agenda shall be the approved order of business, including the order in which resolutions may be

presented. The resolutions may be ordered in any way that neither changes the Order of Precedence nor places Late Packet Resolutions above Debate Packet Resolutions in chronological order. The agenda shall require a majority vote to be set in committee, and a 2/3 super-majority to be amended. Each committee shall set its own agenda independently.

ARTICLE 3.A.172: The General Speakers' List

Delegates may request time to give general remarks during the Inaugural Plenary Session or Opening Committee Session before debate on resolutions begins. These remarks are to be presented in the Order of Precedence and shall be termed the "General Speakers' List". The General Speakers' List is optional and may be omitted from the proceedings should the President of the Assembly determine there is not sufficient time to include it. Speeches given on the General Speakers' List must be general in nature and may not address specific issues or resolutions slated for later debate.

ARTICLE 3.A.173: The Order of Debate

Debate on each proposed resolution shall consist of the following procedures, in chronological order:

1. Presentation of the Proposed Resolution by the Chairperson or Committee Rapporteur by reading of the resolves aloud,
2. Proponent speech presented by the author(s) of the proposed resolution or a proxy,
3. Question/Answer period, during which Points of Information may be directed toward the proponent, through the Chairperson,
4. Pro/Con Speakers' List, during which supporters and opponents of the draft resolution may present their remarks. Pro and Con speeches are alternated, with the first pro speech going first,
5. Presentation, debate, and vote on draft amendments, if necessary,
6. Voting on the proposed resolution,
7. Provision of time for the explanation of votes.

ARTICLE 3.A.174: Presentation of Resolutions

A resolution is formally presented to the committee first through the reading of the resolution title and operative clauses by the Committee Rapporteur or, in his/her absence, the Committee Chairperson. After the reading, the Chairperson may entertain a second to the motion to present by another delegation, and then shall be followed by the proponent speech of the resolution's sponsor. The proponent speech should pertain directly to the resolution being considered. The Chairperson may automatically recognize the sponsor of the resolution to speak after the reading of the title and operative clauses in order to save time.

ARTICLE 3.A.175: Question and Answer Period

Immediately following the speech by the proponent, the Chairperson will recognize delegates to pose Points of Information to the proponent concerning the resolution. All questions must pertain specifically to the proposed resolution, and all questions must be in the form of a question. All questions and answers must be conducted through the presiding Chairperson and not directly between delegates, or they will be ruled out of order.

ARTICLE 3.A.176: Pro/Con Speakers' List

A Pro/Con Speakers' List consisting of a maximum number of speakers (determined by the *Modus Operandi*) will be opened for discussion of the resolution being considered. The delegates on the speaker's list will be recognized to speak in an order determined by the Chairperson. The order must begin with a pro speech and alternate between pro and con from this point forward, and there must be an equal number of pro and con speeches, less than or equal to the number set in the *Modus Operandi*.

ARTICLE 3.A.177: Parliamentary Short Form

Appended to the Rules of Procedure is a parliamentary short form including all of the primary motions and points. This short form is ordered by precedence of motion and shall be considered as part of the Rules of Procedure.

ARTICLE 3.A.178: Exceptions to the General Rules of Procedure

Special exceptions to the Rules of Procedure may be granted in special debate circumstances (such as the construction of a Joint Declaration, during the General Committee debates on funding, or during Crisis Scenario debates). These exceptions must be granted from either the Office of the Program Director or the Executive Committee and must be disseminated to all members of the committee before the exceptions may go into effect.

SECTION B: PROCEDURAL POINTS**ARTICLE 3.B.179: Points of Order**

During the discussion of a topic, any delegate may raise a Point of Order to address immediately a procedural error. The Point of Order is an interruptible motion, meaning debate may be interrupted to make said motion. The Committee Chairperson shall promptly act upon Points of Order. While raising such points, a delegate may not go into the substance of the matter under discussion but must limit his/her remarks to those regarding the perceived procedural error only.

ARTICLE 3.B.180: Points of Personal Privilege

During the discussion of a topic, any delegate may raise a Point of Personal Privilege to address an immediate physical need, such as a complaint about noise, heat, etc. The point is an interruptible motion. The Committee Chairperson shall promptly act upon Points of Personal Privilege. For delegations from institutions located outside the United States and for whom English is a second language, the Point of Personal Privilege may be requested to allow both delegates in a committee to stand. If one delegate requires the assistance of his/her alternate delegate due to a language or communication barrier, the Point of Personal Privilege may be used to allow that alternate delegate to answer questions on behalf of the presenting delegate.

ARTICLE 3.B.181: Points of Parliamentary Inquiry

During the discussion of a topic, any delegate may raise a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry to ask a question about procedure. The point is not an interruptible motion, which means the delegate raising a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry may not interrupt the speaker but must wait until points or motions are being entertained. While raising a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry, the delegate shall not discuss the substance of matters under discussion but may only inquire about issues of parliamentary order or procedure.

ARTICLE 3.B.182: Points of Information

Immediately following the proponent speech for a resolution or amendment, the Chairperson shall open the floor to Points of Information. This period is defined as the Question-and-Answer Period. At this time, any delegate may raise a Point of Information in order to ask a question about the resolution or amendment. This point is not interruptible. All Points of Information must be directed to the Chairperson, as well as all responses to the Point of Information. Delegates may not face one another during the Question-and-Answer Period. There is no time limit on questions or answers during this period.

SECTION C: MOTIONS LIMITING DEBATE**ARTICLE 3.C.183: Limiting Debate**

Any delegate may make motions intended to limit debate. In the spirit of diplomacy, all primary motions

that would result in the limitation of speakers, speaking time, or overall debate shall require a 2/3 super-majority to pass. A motion to limit the number of speakers or the speaking time shall be made through a motion to amend the *Modus Operandi*.

ARTICLE 3.C.184: Closure of Debate

Considering that a topic, resolution, or amendment has been discussed sufficiently, delegates or the Committee Chairperson may move for Closure of Debate. This motion requires a second and is debatable. Debate on closure of debate shall be limited to zero (0) speakers in favor of closure and a maximum of two (2) speakers against closure. No speakers are necessary if no delegate chooses to speak. After debate, this procedural motion shall require a 2/3 super-majority to pass. Should the motion pass, the committee shall cease debate and proceed directly into voting procedure on the specific matter under consideration.

ARTICLE 3.C.185: Motion to Previous Question

The Motion to Previous Question shall have the same parliamentary procedures as the motion for Closure of Debate. Considering that a topic, resolution, or amendment has been discussed sufficiently, delegates or the Committee Chairperson may motion to Move to Previous Question. This motion requires a second and is debatable. Debate on Moving to Previous Question shall be limited to zero (0) speakers in favor of closure and a maximum of two (2) speakers against closure. No speakers are necessary should no delegate choose to speak. After debate, this procedural motion shall require a 2/3 super-majority to pass. Should the motion pass, the committee shall first cease debate and proceed directly into voting procedure on the specific matter under consideration, and then immediately cease debate on all other matters open before the committee, voting on each open matter in turn. In the event that an amendment is open for debate, for instance, a successful motion to Close Debate shall cause the committee to cease debate and move directly to a vote on the amendment, then return to regular debate on the resolution. A successful Motion to Previous Question shall cause the committee to cease debate and move directly to vote on the amendment, then directly to vote on the resolution.

SECTION D: MOTIONS EXTENDING DEBATE AND CAUCUS

ARTICLE 3.D.186: Extending Debate

Any delegate may make motions intended to extend debate. In the spirit of diplomacy, all primary motions that would result in the addition of speakers should normally require only a simple majority to pass. Though the extension of debate and the extension of the Question-and-Answer Period do, in essence, modify the *Modus Operandi*, they shall require only a simple majority to pass, in respect of the aforementioned diplomatic spirit.

ARTICLE 3.D.187: Extending the Speakers' List

A delegate may move to extend the number of speakers on the Pro/Con Speakers' List. This motion shall only be in order after the original speakers' list has been exhausted. The motion must request the same number of speakers be added to both sides of the speaking list respectively. The motion requires a second but is not debatable. This shall be a procedural motion requiring a simple majority.

ARTICLE 3.D.188: Extending the Question-and-Answer Period

A delegate may move to extend the Question-and-Answer Period to allow for more Points of Information than the original *Modus Operandi* has set as the maximum. This motion must be made following the last question and before the first speech on the Pro/Con Speakers' List. It requires a second and is not debatable. Extension of the Question-and-Answer Period requires a simple majority but can be ruled dilatory if the Chairperson believes it is slowing debate to an excessive degree.

ARTICLE 3.D.189: Moderated Caucus

During the discussion of any topic, the Chairperson or delegate may move that the meeting be suspended for the purpose of a Moderated Caucus. A Moderated Caucus shall serve as an informal debate moderated through the Chairperson. Speakers shall not be required to stand when speaking during a Moderated Caucus, but their speaking times shall be limited. A motion to suspend the meeting for a Moderated Caucus must include the total amount of time the Moderated Caucus should last, and the number of speeches it should be divided into. Speakers automatically yield their time at the end of each speech, and the Chairperson shall grant the total number of speeches (no more and no less) allotted during the caucus time. A motion to suspend for a Moderated Caucus requires a second, is not debatable, and requires a simple majority to pass.

ARTICLE 3.D.190: Unmoderated Caucus- During Debate Sessions

During the discussion of any topic, the Chairperson or delegate may move that the meeting be suspended for the purpose of an Unmoderated Caucus. An Unmoderated Caucus shall serve as an opportunity for delegates to interact free of procedural oversight or supervision from the Chairperson. The Unmoderated Caucus is, in essence, a recess during which delegates are not held to any procedural standard and may leave the room without penalty. A motion to suspend the meeting for an Unmoderated Caucus must state the amount of time the caucus is to last. A motion to suspend for an Unmoderated Caucus requires a second, is not debatable, and requires a simple majority to pass. It shall be the Chairperson's duty to remind delegates when time will run out, and it shall be the delegates' duty to return to their seats before the caucus time is exhausted or be subject to the loss of voice and vote. The total time for unmoderated caucuses shall be limited to no more than ten (10) minutes combined per scheduled session, and no more than ten (10) minutes for any single caucus. Unmoderated time granted by the chairperson in order to review resolutions before presentation may or may not be included in this total, at the chairperson's discretion. Limits on unmoderated caucus time may be relaxed by the Program Director but must be requested by the Committee Chairperson or a student officer.

ARTICLE 3.D.191: Unmoderated Caucus- Scheduled Caucuses

During the competition, committees may alternate between official debate time and unmoderated caucus time. During these scheduled unmoderated caucuses, delegates have the option to attend or not, and speaking is done in an informal setting with no parliamentary rules in place. For conferences with remote attendees, unmoderated caucus time must be held in a room with internet connectivity and all remote participants shall be given the opportunity to participate alongside those participating in person. Scheduled unmoderated caucus time should be used by delegates to further committee business, build alliances and partnerships, and continue constructing the declaration. Scheduled caucuses will be attended by members of the Judging Committee regularly, and activity taking place during these times will be considered.

SECTION E: MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER, SUSPEND, AND ADJOURN**ARTICLE 3.E.192: Tabling a Resolution**

The Chairperson or delegate may propose Tabling the Resolution at hand. Tabling a resolution shall remove the resolution from the committee's consideration and move to the next item in the committee's agenda, with the understanding that the resolution is unresolved and may be brought back under debate at a later time. This motion requires a second and is debatable, to a maximum of two speakers for and two speakers against tabling the resolution. The motion requires a 2/3 super-majority to pass. Once a resolution has been tabled, it may not be discussed or voted on until it is removed from the table for reconsideration.

ARTICLE 3.E.193: Removing a Resolution from the Table (Motion to Reconsider)

A motion to Remove a Resolution from the Table for Reconsideration is in order at any time but may only be made by a delegate who previously voted to table the resolution in question. This motion, if successful, shall bring a tabled resolution back to the committee for immediate debate. This motion requires a second and is debatable, to a maximum of two speakers in favor and two speakers opposed. The motion requires a simple majority to pass. Exceptions to this procedure may be made during sessions of special design. Some special sessions in which a committee is determining a certain number of resolutions to pass or fail (a Budgetary Committee's final list of resolutions approved for funding, for instance), any resolution may be reconsidered whether it has previously passed or not. During these final deliberations, motions to reconsider are not debatable and can be made by any delegation. A simple majority shall still be required for a resolution to be brought back into consideration. Resolutions that have already passed are still subject to reconsideration as well during this special session.

ARTICLE 3.E.194: Adjourning the Session

During the discussion of any topic, the Chairperson or a delegate may move to Adjourn the Meeting. A motion to adjourn requires a second but is not debatable and requires a simple majority to pass. Once passed, the motion ends the committee session until the committee's next scheduled meeting.

ARTICLE 3.E.195: Withdrawal of a Motion

A delegate or Chairperson with an open motion on the floor may Withdraw the Motion before it has been put to a vote. Any delegation may reintroduce a motion that has been withdrawn. Once a motion has been voted upon, it may not be withdrawn.

SECTION F: HIERARCHY OF MOTIONS AND SUPERCESSION RULES**ARTICLE 3.F.196: Defining Procedural and Substantive Speeches and Motions**

Procedural speeches and motions shall be defined as those involving only the procedures or processes of the committee's debate. Substantive speeches and motions shall be defined as those directly pertaining to the content of a resolution or amendment. Speeches may not involve issues of both procedure and substance and may be called to order if addressed incorrectly.

ARTICLE 3.F.197: Hierarchy of Motions

In the event that several motions are presented at once, priority shall be given in the following order, with the first motion to be considered listed first and other motions following in descending order of importance:

1. Suspension of the session
2. Adjournment of the session
3. Tabling the Item at Hand
4. Previous Question
5. Closure of debate on the topic under consideration
6. All other motions

SECTION G: AMENDMENT PROCEDURES**ARTICLE 3.G.198: Submission of an Amendment**

At the beginning of any negative speech during the Pro/Con Speakers' List period, the speaking delegate may yield to the resolution of an amendment. A valid proposed amendment must have been passed to the

Chairperson and approved before the yielding takes place. An amendment constitutes an addition to, or deletion from a proposed resolution or amendment, or a change to portions of the resolution.

ARTICLE 3.G.199: Multiple Amendments

Should the Chairperson receive multiple amendments that he/she deems capable of merging, the Chairperson shall move for an Unmoderated Caucus in order to work with delegations to streamline and consolidate amendments. All effort should be made in minimizing redundant and frivolous amendments by the Chairperson. When several draft amendments to a resolution are approved for presentation, the consideration and vote of each draft amendment shall be taken in the order in which they were proposed. Multiple amendments shall not be concurrently considered in committee; no substantive votes can be considered concurrently—each must be voted on individually.

ARTICLE 3.G.200: Requirements of Amendments

An amendment that would totally replace the original resolution or that is not directly related to it shall not be considered an amendment, and therefore shall not be accepted by the presiding Chairperson. Amendments must also bear the signatures of the proposing delegate and one additional delegate. These signatures are not binding and may not include the proponent of the resolution being amended.

ARTICLE 3.G.201: Cosigning of Amendments

Amendments may not be proposed by any delegate on the positive (“pro”) speaker’s list. However, delegates who are cosignatories on the original resolution and/or delegates on the positive speaker’s list (other than the proponent) may cosign an amendment.

ARTICLE 3.G.202: Approval of Amendments

Amendments must be approved for form and substance by the Chairperson before they may be presented to the committee. Approval of amendments lies solely within the discretion of the Chairperson. The Chairperson may reject amendment resolutions either verbally or by ignoring the amendment resolution and not granting it the opportunity to be presented. The Chairperson may rule the amendment dilatory and reject its resolution if the amendment:

1. Lacks two signatures,
2. Includes the signature of the proponent of the resolution being amended,
3. Closely approximates an amendment that has previously been decided upon by the committee,
4. Strikes out or inserts words that would leave no rational or logical proposition before the committee or could be considered frivolous, absurd, or redundant.

ARTICLE 3.G.203: Results of Amendment Voting

All amendments, like resolutions, require a simple majority to be adopted. Should the proposed amendment pass, the amended resolution shall stand as amended for the remainder of its debate, and all signatories to the original resolution shall be released from their binding agreement to vote for the resolution. In the event that a draft amendment does not pass, the proponent of the amendment shall be granted the speaking time on the negative speakers list he/she would have received had an amendment not been presented. When the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the exclusion of another amendment waiting to be presented, the latter shall not be put to consideration or a vote.

SECTION H: VOTING PROCEDURES

ARTICLE 3.H.204: Voting Options

There shall be two sets of voting options, according to the type of motion being voted upon. For procedural motions, delegates shall have the option of voting either “yes” or “no”. For substantive

options, delegates shall have the option of voting “yes,” “no,” or “abstain,” and may also request “with rights,” as outlined in Article 5.47.

ARTICLE 3.H.205: Types of Votes

There shall be three types of votes in general usage during the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas: Placard Votes, Roll Call Votes, and Secret Ballot Votes. All elections and award nominations must be conducted as Secret Ballot Votes. All other votes shall default to Placard Votes unless a motion for Roll Call Voting is recognized.

ARTICLE 3.H.206: Voting with Rights

Delegates may vote “yes” or “no” and add the option “with rights” to that vote during a roll call vote. Voting “yes with rights” or “no with rights” indicates the delegate wishes to use speaking time to explain his/her vote. During debate/voting on a Joint Declaration, a delegate may also vote “yes with rights” to attach a reservation to the bottom of a Joint Declaration.

ARTICLE 3.H.207: Placard Voting

The default voting procedure for all non-election votes shall be the Placard Vote. Delegates must vote “yes” or “no” on procedural matters by raising placards when called for by the Chairperson. On substantive matters, the Chairperson shall ask for “those in favor,” “those opposed,” and “abstentions.” All delegates must vote with “yes,” “no,” or “abstain” when called for by the Chairperson. All delegations shall be required to vote.

ARTICLE 3.H.208: Roll Call Voting

On all votes, a delegate has the option to motion for a Roll Call Vote. This motion, which must be made before voting begins, does not require a second. The motion for a Roll Call Vote is not debatable and shall be automatically granted by the Chairperson. Using the Order of Precedence, the Chairperson shall call for votes of delegates. At this point, delegates shall answer “yes,” “no,” “no with rights,” “abstain,” or “pass”. After the entire roster has been read through once, any delegates that previously passed will be called upon again. Passing delegates shall then be required to answer “yes,” or “no” only. At this time, the Chairperson may call for “changes in votes”. After the changes are recorded, the Chairperson shall announce the outcome of the vote. Any delegates that have voted “yes with rights,” “no with rights,” or “abstain” are to be recognized to explain their votes.

ARTICLE 3.H.209: Secret Ballot Voting

All elections and nominations for awards must be conducted by Secret Ballot Voting. In the Secret Ballot, there shall be only one ballot per participating institution, regardless of how many delegations the institution has registered. For awards within committees, each delegation shall be given one vote. For elections of the Secretariat, each participating institution shall be given one vote. Only approved ballot forms may be used to submit a vote. No authority within the committee room shall be allowed to count votes. Instead, all ballots shall be passed to an approved, objective third party (such as a Rapporteur or page), who then shall carry ballots to the designated location for counting and recording.

ARTICLE 3.H.210: Voting Eligibility

During debate on resolutions and during voting for individual awards within committees (but not for elections), each member state shall possess one vote. Delegates may only cast votes on behalf of the delegation they are representing. A delegation is considered eligible to vote if it is present during the most recent call for quorum and has not left the room during any portion of the debate on the resolution. If the delegation leaves the table during any portion of debate on that resolution, it loses voice and vote on that resolution and may not receive voice until it is recognized by the Chairperson. It cannot receive voting privileges until the next resolution is presented.

ARTICLE 3.H.211: Voting on Resolutions

After all aspects of debate are closed, the resolution being considered must be put to a vote immediately. Multiple resolutions shall not be concurrently considered in committee. Like amendments, a simple majority is required to approve a resolution. In the case of a tie vote, the measure does not pass.

ARTICLE 3.H.212: Explanation of Vote

After the voting has ended on any substantive matter (other than those by secret ballot), any voting delegate may request the floor to give a brief explanation of his/her vote. Delegates voting “abstain,” “yes with rights,” or “no with rights” are required to explain their votes, while all other explanations shall be optional. The Chairperson has the right to limit the time of the explanation. “Yes with rights” votes may have their explanation written and attached to the bottom of the passed resolution or joint declaration as a “reservation”.

ARTICLE 3.H.213: Abstentions

During a substantive vote, delegates shall possess the option of abstention. An abstention may only be used by a delegation that has been placed in a diplomatic conflict of interest (for instance, if voting on a resolution would violate an existing trade agreement or military agreement, even if the delegation supports the idea of the resolution). Delegations abstaining shall be asked to explain their vote after the conclusion of voting procedure. The Chairperson shall call the delegate to order if the explanation is deemed improper or invalid, and then request the delegate to enter a “yes” or “no” vote for the record.

ARTICLE 3.H.214: Division of the Question

After debate is closed, and before voting procedure begins, a delegate may move that single resolves, or combinations of resolves within any substantive resolution be voted on separately. The motion must specify the method of division and is not amendable. This motion requires a second but shall not be debatable. If a simple majority approves the motion for Division of the Question, the committee will vote upon the divided clauses separately. Then the resulting resolution, which will consist of those operative clauses approved by a majority vote, shall be put to a final vote. When all parts of a resolution or amendment have been rejected, such a resolution or amendment shall be considered as rejected in whole. If all individual sections of a resolution have been approved, however, the entire resolution must still be voted upon as a single unit after the parts have all been considered. Only operative clauses of the resolution may be divided. In the case of a Joint Declaration that must pass by consensus, Division of the Question is automatically the default voting procedure.

ARTICLE 3.H.215: Diving the Assembly

If the final vote tally does not equal the total number of eligible voters, or if there was any sort of disruption during voting procedure, the Chairperson or any voting delegate may move to Dive the Assembly. A motion to Dive the Assembly is automatically granted, and requires no second nor is it debatable. Diving the Assembly forces a re-vote, in which a second vote is taken with identical parameters to the first, in order to reach a reliable conclusion.

ARTICLE 3.H.216: Reconsideration of Vote

A motion to reconsider a resolution which has already been accepted or rejected will be in order only when made by a delegate that voted with the prevailing side during the original vote on a resolution. Reconsideration requires a second and is debatable, requiring two for and two against, and requires a 2/3 super-majority. A reconsidered resolution immediately moves to the front of the agenda and shall be reconsidered by the committee immediately.

ARTICLE 3.H.217: Conduct during Voting

Once the Chairperson has announced that the committee is in voting procedure, no delegate may interrupt

the proceeding, except with a Point of Order regarding actual voting procedure, or a motion for a Roll Call Vote. Voting procedure is not completed until the Chairperson announces the outcome of the vote.

SECTION I: PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE CONFLICT RESOLUTION

ARTICLE 3.I.218: Right of Reply

The Chairperson, at his/her discretion, may accord the Right of Reply to any delegation if a speech delivered by another delegation contains extraordinary comments that bear directly and negatively on the national or personal dignity of another delegate. The right of reply request must be delivered to the Chairperson in writing and contain the reason for the request, along with a brief summary of the statement of reply. Only the offended delegation may request the Right of Reply. The Chairperson may limit the time allotted for the reply at his/her discretion. This is not a motion but a granting of extra speaking time by the Chairperson, and shall not be subject to debate, vote, or appeal.

ARTICLE 3.I.219: Removal of the Chairperson

In the event the Committee Chairperson is deemed insufficient in the maintenance of the rules and the insurance of parliamentary order within the committee, he/she may be officially removed by the Secretary General. This removal is at the discretion of the Secretary General but may be appealed by the committee using the same procedure as appealing the decision of the chair. Upon approval, the Secretary General may name himself/herself as the Emergency Chairperson or may appoint the Parliamentarian or the committee's Rapporteur. Only the Rapporteur may become eligible for awards when chairing as a replacement if this rule is invoked and causes in the Chairperson's removal. The removed Chairperson may return to his/her delegation as a Public Information Officer or an assistant, but not a delegate.

ARTICLE 3.I.220: Procedural Conflict Hierarchy

Should a delegate feel that the Rules of Procedure have been breached or that the Chairperson has acted in an inappropriate or undiplomatic fashion, the delegate shall follow a procedure of appeals, listed below in chronological order:

1. Appealing the Decision of the Chair or Secretary-General (done during regular committee business in the form of a motion),
2. Request for a Ruling by the Parliamentarian (first by requesting an unmoderated caucus, second by immediately notifying the chair, during the caucus, of the request),
3. Appeal to the Secretary General and Executive Committee (by requesting an appeal directly to the Parliamentarian. If there is no acting Parliamentarian, this step immediately follows Appealing the Decision of the Chair). If the appeal is against the Secretary-General, the appeal process moves from Parliamentarian to Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 3.I.221: Appealing the Decision of the Chair

On occasion, the Chairperson may make a unilateral decision concerning a matter. It is the right of any delegate in the speaking position to appeal that decision. The motion to Appeal the Decision of the Chair is not interruptible, but must immediately follow the decision in question, and must be seconded. After the second, the appellate shall be allowed to present reasons for the appeal to the committee. Following this, the Chairperson shall be allowed equal time to explain the reasons for his/her decision. Following the appeal, the question shall be phrased, "Shall the decision of the Chair be overruled?" and a vote shall be taken. A "no" vote supports the Chairperson. Overturning of the Chairperson's decision shall require a 2/3 super-majority vote.

ARTICLE 3.I.222: Deferment to the Parliamentarian

If the conflict over parliamentary procedure is not resolved through the appeal of the chair, the Chairperson or appellate delegate shall have the right to request an Unmoderated Caucus for the Purposes of Consulting the Parliamentarian. This shall be automatically granted. During this caucus, the Parliamentarian shall hear both interpretations and consult the Rules of Procedure. The Parliamentarian's judgment on the matter shall be the final authority for the committee session, and no further time shall be allotted to resolving the dispute.

ARTICLE 3.I.223 Final Appeal

After the adjournment of a session and the Parliamentarian makes a ruling, or in the event that there is no acting Parliamentarian available, the Chairperson or delegate possesses the right to appeal a decision to the Secretary General. The Secretary General, with the guidance and counsel of the Secretariat and the Executive Committee, shall have the final authority over interpretation of the rules. If this final decision overturns the Parliamentarian's original interpretation of the rules and would affect voting on a resolution, the committee shall reconsider the resolution or motion under review immediately during the next committee session.

CHAPTER IV: IACHR MOOT COURT COMPETITION

SECTION A: IACHR MOOT COURT COMPETITION STRUCTURE

ARTICLE 4.A.224: IACHR Moot Court Competition- Definition

The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) Moot Court Competition is a moot court competition based on the proceedings of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. In the competition, participants are provided with a hypothetical case and are judged on their written and oral arguments, presented from both sides of the case. IACHR Moot Court is open to all educational levels, but may be judged separately at the undergraduate, graduate, and law school level, depending upon the teams registering.

ARTICLE 4.A.225: IACHR Moot Court Competition- Purpose

The IACHR Moot Court Competition is designed to advance and promote human rights legal education. It is based on the Inter-American System for the Protection of Human Rights, the legal obligations contemplated in the American Convention on Human Rights and the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man, and is an adaptation of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) Moot Court competitions already in effect, particularly that governed by American University in Washington, D.C.

ARTICLE 4.A.226: Participation in the Competition

The Moot Court Competition accepts teams of two (2) students each, with each team representing an educational institution. Registration fees are assessed per student, with a minimum of two (2) students from any institution required for participation, and a maximum number determined by the ESMOAS Executive Committee, based on availability. Each team must have exactly two (2) student participants.

ARTICLE 4.A.227: Team Composition

Teams may be comprised of undergraduate, graduate, or law school students, though the team shall be judged on the highest level of education represented on the team. For instance, if a team is comprised of an undergraduate student and a law school student, the team shall be included with other law school teams for the purposes of judging. Students must be currently enrolled at the same institution to form a team. Substitutions made after the initial registration period are not allowed, unless in extreme circumstances and with the approval of the ESMOAS Executive Program Director and/or Executive Committee.

ARTICLE 4.A.228: Faculty Advisors for IACHR

A Faculty Advisor may be assigned by the participating institution to oversee all teams representing the institution in the competition. This advisor may also serve as the advisor for the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas or may be separate. Faculty Advisors are allowed to attend ESMOAS proceedings, but attendance is not mandatory. They may not interrupt proceedings for any reason, though they are free to coach and consult with their team(s) between rounds.

ARTICLE 4.A.229: Language of the Competition

English shall be the official language of the competition and must be used exclusively in written and oral arguments, with the exception of short phrases meant for emphasis. Should excessive use of languages other than English occur, the IACHR Judging Committee may call participants out of order and penalize their scores.

ARTICLE 4.A.230: Approved Materials

The use of laptop computers, cell phones, two-way communication devices, or other devices with Internet access by any seated team member (team member not actively arguing the case) during IACHR Moot

Court proceedings is strictly forbidden. Active presenters (state and petitioner) may utilize their devices both for communication and for consultation during the proceedings. Members of the Judging Committee and approved observers retain the right to use these devices. Use of these devices during competition shall result in penalization or, in extreme cases, dismissal, as determined by the IACHR Judging Committee and the Executive Program Director.

ARTICLE 4.A.231: Team Members

Each team shall be responsible for preparing written and oral arguments on both sides of the case provided. One team member shall be the representative of the victims, known as the “petitioner,” while the other team member shall be the representative of the “state”. Each team will be given the opportunity to present twice—once for each side, and its overall scores will be determined based on the combination of the scores of the two members.

ARTICLE 4.A.232: Speaking Privileges

Though each team consists of two (2) members, both sitting at the table, usually one member is the expert on the Petitioners case, and the other is the expert on the State case, so only one member will usually argue per round. However, it is acceptable for the second member to give the rebuttal speech if the team chooses to do so.

ARTICLE 4.A.233: Single-Person Teams

In the event a team member must drop out of the competition and no replacement can be found, the Executive Program Director may grant an individual the ability to present his/her side of the case only. This shall be done in an *ex parte* hearing as part of the Preliminary Oral Rounds. The team will be scored only on the written work and oral arguments completed, meaning a maximum of 50% of the total possible score for the team can be achieved. The individual legal counsel may then opt to participate in the Tournament Round as a lower seed or complete their competition at this time. He/she shall be deemed eligible for all individual awards (for written work or oral presentation). Single-person *ex parte* teams are also eligible for team awards if they participate in the oral hearing rounds (prelim and tournament), but are graded on the same 100 point scale as complete teams. No score adjustments are made to accommodate a single person team for team tournament awards.

ARTICLE 4.A.234: Double-Representation Team

In the event a team member must drop out of the competition and no replacement can be found, the Executive Program Director may grant an individual the ability to present both sides of the argument and submit legal memorials for both petitioner and state. If this ability is granted, the single individual will then perform and be scored just as a regularly composed IACHR legal team would be.

ARTICLE 4.A.235: IACHR Moot Court Bailiffs

The position of Bailiff shall be made available to volunteers from any participating institution or the host institution. Bailiffs shall be responsible for preparing the room, providing materials to the Judging Committee (including score sheets), submitting completed score sheets to the Program Director, and timing speeches. Bailiffs shall be responsible for meeting with the Program Director and staff during scheduled meetings with Chairpersons and Rapporteurs and shall be recognized at the close of proceedings for their service. A bailiff is preferred, but proceedings do not require a bailiff to be conducted.

ARTICLE 4.A.236: Bailiff Confidentiality

Bailiffs are required not to disclose confidential information about the proceedings, bench briefings, or scores during the competition. If a bailiff is found to be sharing this information with any participants

other than the Judging Committee or Program Director, the baili ff shall be dismissed from the competition and may be barred from future competition.

SECTION B: STRUCTURE OF HEARINGS AND ROUNDS

ARTICLE 4.B.237: Oral Argument Round Scheduling

The first oral arguments to be judged in the IACHR competition shall be the Preliminary Oral Rounds. The Preliminary Oral Rounds may be held during the first day of in-person competition or may be held online via video conference up to one week prior to the in-person meetings. Hearing times and matchups will be drawn at random after memorials have been submitted and shall be made public at least one week before the first oral round is to take place. Teams will have one entry in Judging Panel A's drawing, and one entry in Judging Panel B's. For instance, State University Petitioning Side will be placed in the drawing for Judging Panel A's sessions, and State University State Side will be placed in the drawing for Judging Panel B's sessions. This ensures each team will be judged by two different panels. Times will be adjusted so no team is giving both presentations simultaneously.

ARTICLE 4.B.238: Preliminary Oral Round Structure

The two Preliminary Oral Argument rounds for each team shall be held either online or in person, prior to the Tournament Rounds. All effort should be made to schedule the Preliminary Rounds at least one week before the opening of the Tournament Rounds, as the preliminaries are designed to provide constructive feedback to help teams improve their arguments before beginning the Tournament.

At the close of these two rounds, the IACHR Judging Committee members will provide more in-depth feedback and suggestions—partially critique and scoring, and partially coaching. The average score from each Preliminary Oral Round (calculated by averaging the scores of all judges on the bench), along with the average scores for each memorial (again, averaged across those judges who reviewed the work), will be weighed equally to give a final team average score (25% each of the above listed components). This score will be used to determine seeding for the IACHR Tournament Round, which shall be held in person during the IACHR Moot Court Competition. These rounds shall be judged by a panel of no fewer than two and no more than five judges per hearing.

ARTICLE 4.B.239: Tournament Round Procedure

The Tournament Round shall be, when feasible, a double-elimination bracket-style competition in which teams are seeded according to their total scores from the Preliminary Rounds and paired in tournament brackets (top score vs. lowest score, 2nd highest score vs. 2nd lowest score, etc).

In the first round of the tournament teams with the lower seed (better ranking) in the matchup may choose which side of the case they will argue. After a team chooses its side for the first time, it must choose the opposite side at the first available opportunity. Until a team has argued from both sides, either by choice or as the result of another team's choice, it must choose the opposite side from its first hearing whenever possible. Once it has argued at least once on each side, the team that is seeded lower (better ranking) may choose whatever side it wishes for the remainder of the tournament when qualified to do so.

In each subsequent tournament round, the maximum number of judges on the bench increases, as does the pressure they apply and the aggression of their questions. Tournament rounds are judged independently by the judges on the bench, who submit a general rubric/score sheet at the close of the round before deliberations begin. After the scores have been submitted, judges may deliberate and reach a consensus on the winner of the matchup. The winner is determined on the basis of which team did a better job of arguing the case, not necessarily what side would "win" in a real-life setting. Teams shall be judged on the quality of their research, argument, persuasion, flexibility and adaptability, and use of judges'

feedback to improve from round-to-round. The team decided to be the winner by vote of the bench judges shall then advance to the next round.

Tournament rounds are closed rounds; other participants are not allowed to observe the rounds (non-competitors and other guests may observe any portion of the competition). All feedback sessions at the end of each round, however, remain open to all observers, including other competing teams.

ARTICLE 4.B.240: Tournament Final Round

The IACHR Final Round shall be treated the same as tournament rounds, in which the top seeded team is given the choice of Petitioner or State. The Final Round is a Plenary Session, open to all conference participants (unlike the other rounds). All members of the IACHR Judging Committee shall participate in judging for this round. Despite the Tournament Round being a double-elimination setup, the two teams who meet in the final round face each other only once, in a winner-take-all match (in other words, if Team A has lost once and the Team B has not lost at all up to that point, Team B does not have to defeat Team A twice to win, only once.

ARTICLE 4.B.241: Pre-Round Sharing of Memorials

The memorials of opposing teams shall be made available for review online before the Preliminary Oral Round portion of the competition begins, and teams will be notified of their opponent approximately one week prior to the opening of the Preliminary Oral Rounds.

ARTICLE 4.B.242: Oral Argument Time Length

Each Oral Argument Session shall consist of forty (40) minutes of pleadings, with each side being allotted twenty (20) minutes. This time shall include the pleadings from both teams, as well as rebuttal and surrebuttal. Each team may divide its time however it wishes between its initial pleading and its rebuttal time (for instance, Petitioner Side may spend fifteen (15) minutes in the initial pleading and five (5) minutes for rebuttal). The time for rebuttal or surrebuttal must be reserved at the beginning of the initial argument. During the arguments and/or after oral arguments are made, the Judging Committee may ask questions of the presenter or, at the close of arguments, may ask questions of either team for an additional ten (10) minutes, and will provide up to an additional ten (10) minutes of feedback after the round is scored, using the parameters set forth later in the Rules of Procedure). Thus, the total time for an Oral Argument Round is one (1) hour.

ARTICLE 4.B.243: Oral Argument Order of Procedure

The order of the pleadings in each round of Oral Arguments shall be:

1. Petitioners Pleading
2. State Pleading
3. Petitioners Rebuttal
4. State Surrebuttal

ARTICLE 4.B.244: Rebuttal and Surrebuttal

Each team shall be allowed to reserve time for rebuttal and surrebuttal. However, if the Petitioner Side does not choose to give rebuttal, the State may not give surrebuttal.

ARTICLE 4.B.245: Judging Feedback

At the close of surrebuttal, all participants shall be asked to leave the courtroom, beginning the Judging Deliberation Period. Judging deliberations may be attended and observed by any faculty advisor, but participants are not allowed to observe any of the judging deliberations. After score sheets have been completed and submitted by each judge, the bench shall confer and determine, by vote, the winner of the

round (in the Tournament Rounds), or shall discuss their feedback (in the Preliminary Rounds, since score sheets will be averaged to determine these outcomes).

After a deliberation of no more than ten (10) minutes, all participants are allowed to return to the courtroom for judging feedback of no more than ten (10) minutes total. This feedback session is open to all conference participants.

After the Preliminary Oral Rounds, judges are given more freedom to share advice and tips, whereas the Tournament Round feedback shall generally be more direct, simply explaining why (or why not) a team will move forward. Judges' feedback is limited to a total not to exceed ten (10) minutes. After judges provide feedback, team members are allowed to ask the panel questions as time permits, as long as it does not pertain to the substance of the case. Team members and advisors may briefly confer before deciding what they wish to ask the panel.

ARTICLE 4.B.246: General Feedback Sessions

After the conclusion of the Preliminary Oral Rounds and either immediately before or after the Final Round of the Tournament Rounds, the Judging Committee, if time permits, shall provide a brief question and answer session open to all participants in which they will provide general feedback and answer questions about their views of the competition and presentations. Specific strategies and arguments will not be addressed; this is designed to be a general session to provide all delegates equal insight into the judging process and the interpretations the judges are applying to the arguments and to scoring.

SECTION C: RULES OF COURTROOM PROCEDURE

ARTICLE 4.C.247: Scope of Pleadings

The scope of the oral pleadings for each team is not limited to the scope of written memorials but can include any arguments deemed pertinent to the case at hand. However, the scope of rebuttals are limited to the State's initial oral pleading, and the scope of surrebuttals are limited to the scope of the Petitioner's rebuttal.

ARTICLE 4.C.248: Observation of Oral Argument Rounds

Preliminary Oral Rounds are open- anyone from any institution (competing or observing) may observe the proceedings of any preliminary round, except for the judging deliberation portion of each hearing. All participating teams are not only allowed, but encouraged, to attend all judges' feedback sessions, either those particular to the hearing or scheduled general feedback sessions open to all participants.

During the Tournament Round, all hearings are closed to any participant other than those directly participating in the hearing, except for the Judges' Feedback Session at the end of each round, which is open to all registered participants. Faculty sponsors may observe the Judging Committee's deliberations, but retain neither voice nor vote in these proceedings. A team's faculty advisor, assistant, or Public Information Officer may photograph or record an oral argument only with the expressed consent of the Program Office, and with the approval of the opposing Faculty Advisor. The bailiff and judging panel possess the authority to ask any individual to leave the proceedings.

ARTICLE 4.C.249: Physical Presentation Materials

No multimedia, electronic, or physical items (charts, graphs, maps, etc.) may be presented to the Judges' Bench during the Oral Argument Rounds. In addition, no electronic device (such as a cell phone or projector) or program (such as Power Point, Prezi, Keynote, etc.) may be used as part of the oral presentation.

ARTICLE 4.C.250: Reservation of Rebuttal Time

Reserving time for rebuttal or surrebuttal must be done at the beginning of an oral argument. Failure to do so shall result in forfeiture of the rebuttal time and a zero score for that section of the judging evaluation.

ARTICLE 4.C.251: Scoring of the Preliminary Oral Argument Rounds

Judging of the Oral Argument Rounds shall be based on the organization of presentations, quality and clarity of legal arguments, and the ability to respond to opponents' arguments and questions from the Judging Committee. Judges shall complete score sheets at the conclusion of each round prior to deliberating with each other. Score sheets are to be submitted to the bailiff before any feedback or deliberations may occur. Each session will be scored by a panel of at least two (2) judges. Each judge may score an orator on a scale of one (1) to one hundred (100) points, one hundred (100) being the highest possible score.

ARTICLE 4.C.252: Scoring of the Preliminary Round

The scores of both written memorials and both oral arguments will be combined to determine a participating team's score in the preliminary round (this score will be used to seed the remainder of the competition for the tournament round). Each memorial and each oral argument score shall comprise $\frac{1}{4}$ (25%) of the overall team score in the Preliminary Round. In the event of a tie, the team with the higher oral argument score shall be considered the higher score.

ARTICLE 4.C.253: Scoring of the Tournament Round and Final Round

In each subsequent round, the score for a team shall be determined 80% from the oral argument score for that round (no carryover from previous rounds will be factored in), and 20% from the written memorial scores (10% each). Tournament rounds are considered a "win/loss" situation, with a verdict rendered and the winner moving on to the next round, with no official "score" given.

SECTION D: WRITTEN COMPONENTS**ARTICLE 4.D.254: The Hypothetical Case**

The IACHR Moot Court Competition's hypothetical case shall be drafted each year by volunteers selected by the Executive Committee. This will generally include members of the IACHR Judging Committee but may extend beyond that group. The subject area of each year's hypothetical shall be determined by the Executive Committee and shall attempt to reflect issues of current concern to the Inter-American System. No faculty sponsor for any IACHR team is allowed to serve on the hypothetical case writing team, though they may be allowed to serve as part of a judging panel.

ARTICLE 4.D.255: The Client Interview Period

For at least three weeks following the release of the hypothetical case, each participating university shall schedule one interview for each side (petitioner and state), during which all students representing one side of the case may confer and ask questions of a case expert designated by the Executive Committee to be that side's "client". During this interview, the "client" will answer questions similarly to an actual client—giving more details when it helps their side, and being less forthcoming when the answers are not in his/her favor. However, the client may not purposefully mislead or provide false information during the interview. Each participating institution is allowed one interview session per side, and shall be limited to one hour of interview time per session.

Information gathered during client interviews is considered part of the hypothetical and the case's stipulated facts, though information obtained shall not be shared among all participants—whatever proprietary or beneficial information a team obtains through its interview is entirely their own, and will

not become common knowledge until the team's written memorial is shared with participants (the time from the posting of memorials until the first hearing shall be the "Discovery Period". Information obtained after the Discovery Period may be used by any team in its subsequent oral hearings, rebuttals, surrebuttals, or other statements during the Preliminary or Tournament Rounds.

ARTICLE 4.D.256: The Legal Memorials

Teams will be required to prepare two (2) legal briefs known as "memorials," one written by each team member, for the Petitioner and for the State, respectively. These documents should follow the template and instructions appended to these Rules of Procedure with regard to formatting and style.

ARTICLE 4.D.257: Memorial Constituent Parts

All memorials shall follow the template listed in these Rules of Procedure exactly or will be penalized. All memorials shall include, in this order:

1. Title Page
2. Table of Contents
3. Index of Authorities
4. Statement of Facts
5. Legal Analysis
6. Request for Relief

Failure to include all of these in the proper order or to label the sections properly shall result in a penalty during scoring.

ARTICLE 4.D.258: Memorial- Title Page

The Title Page of the Memorial should include the case name, official team number in the upper right corner, and the assigned role of Petitioner or State. There should be no colored background or watermark on the page.

ARTICLE 4.D.259: Memorial- Table of Contents

The Memorial's Table of Contents should clearly list the remaining sections and corresponding page numbers of the Memorial.

ARTICLE 4.D.260: Memorial- Index of Authorities

Each Memorial shall include an Index of Authorities, which must contain both (a) a listing of legal books and articles used in the Memorial and (b) a listing of legal cases cited in the Memorial. This index shall include a description of each authority adequate to allow the reader to identify and locate the authority in a publication. The page number upon which the authority is cited should also be included.

ARTICLE 4.D.261: Memorial- Statement of Facts

The Statement of Facts shall be a list of stipulated facts and necessary inferences from the hypothetical and any clarifications posted. The Statement of Facts may not include distorted facts, unsupported claims, opinions, argumentative statements, or legal conclusions.

ARTICLE 4.D.262: Memorial- Legal Analysis

The discussion of legal issues presented in the hypothetical must include an analysis of the preliminary admissibility issues (for instance, the exhaustion of domestic remedies) and an analysis of the issues of law according to the American Convention on Human Rights and other applicable international instruments cited in the hypothetical.

ARTICLE 4.D.263: Memorial- Request for Relief

Each Memorial must include a separate Request for Relief in its conclusion. No legal arguments shall be presented in this section.

ARTICLE 4.D.264: Memorial- Length and Formatting Requirements

The Memorial may not exceed twenty-five (25) pages in total. All pages in the document, including the Title Page, shall be included in this total. All pages must be in Times New Roman, size twelve (12) font, double-spaced, with one inch (1”) margins on all sides, and set to letter size (8.5” x 11”) paper. Character spacing should be normal (condensed or expanded text is not acceptable).

ARTICLE 4.D.265: Memorial- Citation Style and Footnoting

Footnotes must be single spaced and printed in Times New Roman size ten (10) font. Footnotes should be limited to the location of the case or report cited in the text. Footnotes may not contain substantive legal arguments.

ARTICLE 4.D.266: Memorial Submission

Both team’s memorials, along with the approved Memorial Submission Form, must be emailed by the announced due date and time, which shall be announced by the time registration for IACHR competition opens. Memorials not received by this time, or incomplete emails (missing a memorial or missing the submission form) will be considered late, and subject to penalization. Each memorial and the submission form must be submitted in a single, separate file (three files total—one for each memorial, one for the form).

ARTICLE 4.D.267: Memorial Scoring

Each memorial shall be submitted with its team number only (no authorship information will be attached) to the IACHR Judging Committee. Each memorial will be scored on a scale of one (1) to one hundred (100), with one hundred (100) being the highest possible score. Points will be allocated for the identification of issues, research, use of authorities, persuasiveness of reasoning, argumentation, and adherence to format. Scores of all judges shall be averaged to find the final score for each memorial. Top scoring individual memorials and top scoring teams (the sum of the two scores) will receive awards.

ARTICLE 4.D.268: Memorial Scoring Penalties

The following penalties shall be deducted automatically from memorials when scored:

1. Late Submission—Five (5) points if received after the due date within twenty-four (24) hours, and an additional two (2) points deducted for every twenty-four (24) hour period afterwards. Memorials submitted less than five (5) days from the opening of the competition shall not be eligible for scoring at all.
2. Length—Memorials exceeding the forty (40) page limit shall receive a ten (10) point penalty.
3. Formatting—Three (3) points each shall be deducted for incorrect font size, footnote size, footnote location, omission of team name from any page, incorrect text spacing, incorrect margins, or sections out of order. Penalties accrued shall be included in the final evaluation sent to the team after the competition by the IACHR Judging Committee and the Program Director.

ARTICLE 4.D.269: Plagiarism and Work Performed

All work completed for the IACHR Moot Court Competition, including research, writing, and oral arguments, must be completed solely by the two (2) registered team members. The team’s faculty advisor may not edit or add to the work in any way. Penalties or disqualification may be approved by the IACHR Judging Committee if this rule is violated. Faculty advisors are allowed to guide team members through

general discussion, research suggestion, consultation on oral technique, and writing organization and structure training.

ARTICLE 4.D.270: Use of Research Materials

Only memoranda, briefs, proceedings, and other documents used in international adjudications and publicly available may be used for research or argument. Items currently pending before international adjudicating bodies, including the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, or items not currently available for public view, are not considered acceptable materials for use in the IACHR Moot Court Competition.

ARTICLE 4.D.271: Composition of Judging

All written memorials shall be graded by a minimum of three (3) IACHR judges, though more may be allowed to score memorials, at the discretion of the Program Director. During Oral Argument Rounds, a panel of at least two (2) judges shall conduct the proceedings, ask questions, and score the oral arguments. Scores shall be calculated as the average of the two judges' scores. Judging panels may consist of faculty sponsors for IACHR teams, as long as a panel is not comprised entirely of judges coaching the same institution. Every effort shall be made to ensure each judging panel includes at least one professional attorney or J.D. degree holding volunteer.

ARTICLE 4.D.272: Scheduling of Judging Panels

Should there be more than one group of two (2) IACHR judges working a conference (in other words, multiple hearings running simultaneously in front of different judging panels), all effort shall be made to ensure that each team is graded by two different panels (for example, State University's "petitioner" representative's round shall be judged by Judging Panel A, while its "state" representative's round shall be judged by Judging Panel B). This rule serves to ensure fair judging and allowance for changes in scoring from panel to panel.

ARTICLE 4.D.273: The Bench Briefing

The author(s) of the hypothetical case shall provide a Bench Briefing on the legal issues addressed in the hypothetical case for the purpose of briefing IACHR Judges and providing them materials from which to ask questions. The content of this Bench Briefing is strictly confidential and shall only be made available to the IACHR Judging Committee members. Review or use of the Bench Briefing by any team members, observers, or faculty advisors shall constitute grounds for immediate dismissal of the team's score and eligibility for awards.

CHAPTER V: JUDGING AND AWARDS PROCEDURES

SECTION A: SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS VOTED AWARDS

ARTICLE 5.A.274: Award Voting Procedure

In individual committees, delegates shall have the option of voting for the most outstanding delegate in their respective committees. All voting for awards in committee shall be done by Secret Ballot Vote, with one vote per delegation, using only provided official ballots. The ballots are not to be counted by any committee staff, including chairs. This vote shall be conducted by either the Secretary General, the Parliamentarian, or both. If assistance is needed, the Committee Chairperson shall be allowed to collect ballots and count the total number of ballots, without reading them, and send them, via the committee rapporteur, to the group designated to count the ballots. The committee must remain in session until the

election is verified by the counters. In the event of a tie, a runoff election may be conducted, or the election may be left in a tie, at the discretion of the counting committee and Program Director.

ARTICLE 5.A.275: Awards Granted by Committee Delegates

Awards shall be given to the top delegates in each committee (including the General Committee). These awards shall be voted upon by delegates within each committee, using the procedures outlined in the Rules of Procedure. The Outstanding Delegate in Committee award shall be granted to the top receiver of votes in each of the committees, while the Distinguished Delegate in Committee awards shall be given to each committee's runner-up. When sixteen (16) delegations or more are participating, a third place Recognized Delegate in Committee award for each committee will also be made available. Delegates must have had a resolution approved for form and substance in order to be considered for these awards. In the event of a tie, the Program Director has the discretion to break the tie or to present awards to both delegates.

SECTION B: SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS WRITTEN AWARDS

ARTICLE 5.B.276: Awards for Research and Writing

The Research and Writing Review Committee shall be responsible for presenting awards for individual written work (resolutions, granted by the Resolution Vetting Subcommittee), and awards for team written work (position papers, granted by the Position Paper Review Subcommittee). These awards shall be given at the Outstanding (1st place), Distinguished (2nd place), and Recognized (3rd place) levels for individual written work, and Outstanding (1st place), Distinguished (2nd place) and Recognized (when 16 or more delegations are participating, for 3rd place) for team position papers, and shall be based solely upon the committee's assessment of writing and research quality. Verbal and physical performance at the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas shall not be considered when awarding written work.

ARTICLE 5.B.277: Written Work Eligibility

Only written items submitted before the deadline and approved for the agenda may be considered eligible for awards.

SECTION C: SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS JUDGED AWARDS

ARTICLE 5.C.278: Awards for Ambassadors

Awards for overall performance by a delegate shall be given by the Summit Judging Committee. The Outstanding Ambassador award shall be given by the Judging Committee during the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas and shall be presented to the delegate deemed by the judges to be the most effective team leader, resolution writer, and overall delegate amongst all conference attendees. The Distinguished Ambassador award shall be given to the runner-up for the Outstanding Ambassador award. When sixteen (16) or more delegations are participating, a third place Recognized Ambassador Award may also be given. Delegates must have submitted an approved resolution for debate to be eligible for this award. Though preference shall be given to those serving as Head Delegates, the Ambassador awards are available to all participating delegates.

ARTICLE 5.C.279: Award for Chairperson & Rapporteur

There shall be an award made available for the Outstanding Committee Chairperson and Outstanding Committee Rapporteur. The Judging Committee retains the right to grant the award to a team of chair/rapporteur, or to split the award. This award will take into consideration the performance of the chairperson and/or rapporteur as a team in their respective committees, as well as the contribution of the committee as a whole. These awards shall be decided upon by the Judging Committee.

ARTICLE 5.C.280: Awards for Delegations

There shall be at least three awards available for delegations' overall team performance in debate. The Outstanding Delegation award shall be determined by the Judging Committee, which shall consider the individual performance and success of delegates in committees, awards garnered by the team overall, and the general efficacy of delegations in presenting and defending a cohesive, coherent agenda throughout the ESMOAS Summit of the Americas proceedings. The Distinguished Delegation award shall also be given to the runner-up in the award considerations and, when more than sixteen (16) teams are present, the Recognized Delegation Award shall be given to the third-place team. The Ileana Cid Award for Outstanding International Delegation shall be given, using the same criteria, to the most effective delegation hailing from a university outside the United States. When more than six delegations from outside the United States are participating, the ESMOAS Program may also grant a Distinguished International Delegation Award to the second-place international team.

ARTICLE 5.C.281: Awards for Committees

The ESMOAS Judging Committee possesses the right to grant an award for Outstanding Committee. The Outstanding Committee award is given to all participants in the committee deemed to have the best quality of debate and execution at the conference. This is an optional award that may or may not be granted upon approval of the Judging Committee.

ARTICLE 5.C.282: Awards for Special Sessions

The ESMOAS Summit Judging Committee shall give awards at the Outstanding, Distinguished, and Recognized levels for Head of State Crisis Address, and shall provide Outstanding and Distinguished level awards for team performance in the Diplomatic Missions.

SECTION D: SUMMIT OF THE AMERICAS DIRECTOR'S AWARDS**ARTICLE 5.D.283: Awards Granted by the Program Director**

There shall be two awards for specific conduct that may be granted by the Program Director at his/her discretion. The first award, for Parliamentary Procedure Mastery, shall be open to any delegate or officer at the ESMOAS Conference. The award is given to the individual who exhibits the best mastery of parliamentary procedure and using that procedure to further the work of his/her country or committee. The second award, the Stegall Award for Outstanding Diplomacy, shall be given to the participant who best exhibits the principles and values of the organization and acts as a leader of his/her peers through diplomacy.

SECTION E: IACHR MOOT COURT PERFORMANCE AWARDS**ARTICLE 5.E.284: Written Memorial Awards**

The IACHR Judging Committee shall confer awards to the individuals scoring best and second-best (Outstanding and Distinguished) on their memorial. Additionally, the committee has the option also to confer awards to the teams (pairs) scoring the best and second-best for both memorials combined. The Team Combined Writing and Research Award shall be considered equal in status to the Outstanding Orator award. In the event there are more than ten teams registered, a third place (Recognized) award for state and petitioner memorials will be made available. These awards, respectively, shall be the Outstanding/Recognized Written Memorial and the Outstanding/Distinguished Team Legal Pleadings awards.

ARTICLE 5.E.285: Individual Performance Awards

The IACHR Judging Committee shall confer awards to individuals with the highest and second highest

(Outstanding and Distinguished) Oral Argument Score, taken from the average of all arguments they presented, for all oral arguments presented. These awards, respectively, shall be the Outstanding/Distinguished Orator Awards. When more than ten (10) teams are registered, a third place (Recognized) Orator Award will be given. The IACHR Judging Committee may, at its discretion, also grant an *Amicus Curiae* award for special recognition for a specific individual performance of note.

ARTICLE 5.E.286: Team Performance Awards

The IACHR Judging Committee shall confer overall team awards to the two teams reaching the Final Round. The final scores from this round will determine the Outstanding and Distinguished Legal Team award, which will be announced, with the other awards, at the ESMOAS Conference Awards Gala. When more than twelve (12) teams are participating, an additional tournament round between the losing semifinalist teams shall determine third place, and the winning team will receive the Recognized Legal Team Award.

ARTICLE 5.E.287: Awards Levels

The Office of the Program Director and Executive Committee may offer delegation and/or individual awards for participants at different educational levels (for instance, Outstanding/Distinguished Legal Team or Orator or Written Memorial awards for Junior College, University, and Graduate School levels). This decision shall be based upon review of the institutions registered at the IACHR Moot Court Competition each year.

ARTICLE 5.E.288: Provision of Evaluations

The IACHR Judging Committee, acting through its Chairperson and the Executive Program Director, shall provide official score sheets and feedback forms to the participating teams within approximately two (2) weeks after the close of the competition. A single official score sheet shall be provided, which shall reflect the average scores of each of the judges, as well as a compilation of all notes and suggestions provided by all members of the Judging Committee.

CHAPTER VI: ESMOAS PROGRAM OFFICE DUTIES

SECTION A: PROGRAM OFFICE DUTIES & RESPONSIBILITIES

ARTICLE 6.A.1: Responsibilities of the Program Office

In partnership with the host institutions for each year and with the participating institutions in each conference, the ESMOAS Program Office pledges to provide certain services, enumerated below:

1. **Exterior Recruitment:** Recruitment of new participating institutions via phone, email, or personal campus visit. The program office agrees to maintain a database of points-of-contact at all institutions within a reasonable distance and agrees to disseminate marketing or informational items to prospective universities on behalf of the organization.
2. **Interior Recruitment:** The recruitment of volunteers, including organizational staff, judges, veters, and other event staff. This recruitment shall be focused on the building of a strong alumni network. This alumni network will provide recent ESMOAS program graduates with the opportunity to return in various volunteer capacities. The Program Office will attempt to recruit at least one (1) member of the Research and Writing Review Committee for every assigned committee agenda topic; one (1) member of the ESMOAS Summit Judging Committee for every three (3) delegations registered, and at least two (2) members of the IACHR Judging Committee for every eight (8) IACHR delegations registered, along with sufficient numbers of other volunteers.
3. **Regular Correspondence:** Information, changes, and upcoming events will be disseminated among ESMOAS participating universities year-round by the Program Office, through an e-mail account maintained by the organization.
4. **Website and Technological Maintenance:** The design, maintenance, and financial hosting of the ESMOAS website, through which most information shall be funneled, is the responsibility of the Program Office, as is the maintenance and execution of all social media or ancillary Internet-based programs associated with the ESMOAS Program or Conferences.
5. **Student Training:** The provision of student and graduate student volunteer leaders for teaching sessions at the annual Parliamentary Procedures Workshop.
6. **Design Services:** The design of graphics, logos, and printed materials, including conference programs and certificates, is the responsibility of the Program Office and its Executive Program Director.
7. **Arrangements for guest speaker(s) and dignitaries, as needed.**
8. **On-site oversight and supervision of conference and its participants.**

SECTION VII: PARLIAMENTARY SHORT FORM

Parliamentary Points			
Motion	Purpose	Article	Interrupt?
Point of Order	To address a possible procedural error	5.18	YES
Point of Personal Privilege	To address immediate physical needs (heat, noise, etc.)	5.19	YES
Point of Parliamentary Inquiry	To ask a procedural question to the Committee Chairperson	5.20	NO
Point of Information	To ask a question about a proponent speech to the speaker, through the chair	5.21	NO

Motions of Committee Business				
Motion	Debate?	Majority	Article	Notes
Introduce Resolution	No	N/A	5.15	
Set/Amend Modus Operandi	No	2/3	5.11	
Set Agenda	No	Simple	5.12	For the first setting of the agenda
Amend Agenda	No	2/3	5.12	For all changes to the initial agenda
Divide the Question	No	Simple	5.55	
Dive the Assembly	No	N/A	5.56	
Reconsider a Vote	Yes	2/3	5.57	Must be made by prevailing side in previous vote; speakers 2+/2-
Roll Call Vote	No	N/A	5.49	
Appeal Chair's Decision	Yes	2/3	6.2	Delegate making motion and chair get only two speaking times

Procedural Motions (in order of precedence)					
Motion	Second?	Debate?	Majority	Article	Notes
Suspend Meeting for Caucus/Recess	Yes	No	Simple	5.28/29	Used for all caucus types
Adjourn Meeting	Yes	No	Simple	5.32	
Table Resolution	Yes	Yes	2/3	5.30	Speakers 2+/2-
Previous Question	Yes	Yes	2/3	5.24	Speakers 0+/2- closure
Close Debate	Yes	Yes	2/3	5.23	Speakers 0+/2- closure
Extend Speakers List	Yes	No	Simple	5.26	
Extend Q&A Period	Yes	No	Simple	5.27	May only be made immediately after Q/A period concludes
Reconsider Tabled Resolution	Yes	Yes	Simple	5.31	Must be made by delegate originally voting to table
Suppression of Voice	Yes	No	2/3	5.8	May only be made by the Committee Chairperson

Templates Attached to Rules of Procedure:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| 1. Resolution Template | Page 59-60 |
| 2. Joint Declaration Template | Page 61-62 |
| 3. Position Paper Template | Page 63-64 |
| 4. IACHR Memorial Template | Page 65 |

2023-2024

GA/RES. (_____) (XXVI-O/22)
Secretariat for Multidimensional Security (SMS)
Republic of Colombia

**Exactly as written*
**Name of your committee*
**Long form of country name*

TITLE OF RESOLUTION IN ALL CAPS & BOLD

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

BEARING IN MIND that one of the main functions of the Organization of American States (OAS) is to seek the solution of political, juridical, and economic problems that may arise among states, as indicated in Article 2;

CONSIDERING FURTHER the increased seizures of illicit chemicals and cocaine in the Tri-Border Area and the attractiveness of this area to drug traffickers and organized crime;

RECOGNIZING the need for increased training opportunities and equipment for law enforcement along the Tri-Border Area;

NOTING WITH SATISFACTION the efforts and achievements made by the Secretariat of Programming for the Prevention of Drug Addiction and Drug Trafficking (SEDRONAR) in the seizure of illegal drugs and precursor chemicals;

RECALLING the resolution AG/RES. 2198 (XXXVI-O/06) which recommends that states “continue to strengthen their national controls over chemical precursors that can be used to produce illicit drugs and, in this effort, make full use of the pre-export notification (PEN) mechanism”; and

REAFFIRMING the observations and recommendations on the annual report of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission AG/RES. 2343 (XXXVII O/07) which resolved to “to invite member states to cooperate with governments that have requested training and technical assistance related to interdiction of drug trafficking, especially by sea, and money laundering; and to encourage the implementation of policies and programs in narcotics demand reduction according to the hemispheric guidelines adopted by the OAS on the basis of CICAD’s work. . .To continue to provide training and other technical assistance to promote the capacity of law enforcement, customs, and other officials of member states responsible for controlling drugs, the diversion of chemical precursors, and related contraband,”

RESOLVES:

1. To continue the cooperation between SEDRONAR and the governments of the Tri-Border-Area in the fight against drug trafficking. To make a conscious effort to reduce the cultivation of marijuana and to continue to seize and close clandestine cocaine laboratories.

2. To increase security along the Tri-Border Area in cooperation with SENDRONAR, the Federal Police, Customs, the National Air Police, and the Coast Guard as well as with provincial police forces and the U.S. Department of State’s International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL).

3. To cooperate with INL and CICAD to seek an investment fund to increase training and equipment to fight drug trafficking and increase counter narcotics programs.
 - a. That this investment fund be open to investment from all interested parties.
 - b. That this fund be administered through CICAD.
 - c. That an annual budget report for the fund be submitted for approval by CICAD to the Committee for Administrative and Budgetary Affairs, which will then forward the report to the General Assembly at its annual meeting.

4. To request funding from voluntary donations by member states, observer states, and registered non-governmental organizations.

Approved for Form and Substance: _____
(Signature of Secretary General)

Cosignatories:

1.	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____

Signature of Delegate Country of Delegate

DECLARATION OF WACO 2022
 NAME OF COMMITTEE
 EUGENE SCASSA MOCK ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES
 XXVI GENERAL ASSEMBLY, NOVEMBER 2022

PREAMBLE

1. We, the delegates representing the member states of the Organization of American States (OAS), gathered in Waco, Texas on November 5, 2022, present this declaration on behalf of the ***** Committee to the ESMOAS General Assembly for consideration and approval.
2. We recognize the OAS Charter, our foundational document, which states that “-----“, text text text text text.
3. We reaffirm our commitment to the priorities set forth in this joint declaration, and pledge to...something like this.
4. We further commit to reassemble in November 2023, during the XXVII General Assembly of the ESMOAS, to reassess the decisions put forth in this declaration.

We, the committee, propose:

1. Passed Resolution.
 - a. Subpoint a.
 - b. Subpoint b.
 - c. Subpoint c.
2. Passed Resolution.
 - a. Subpoint a.
 - b. Subpoint b.
 - c. Subpoint c.
3. And so forth...

SIGNATURES

Republic of Uruguay**Position Paper for the 2022 ESMOAS Summit of the Americas****I. GENERAL STATEMENT**

Body of the General Statement, which is a summary of the major points and positions of the country, including its achievements in meeting the challenges of this year's topics. This statement should also clearly set out the themes that the country will pursue in the conference. It must be single spaced, indented, and in 12-point Times New Roman font, as shown here.

II. PARTICULAR STATEMENTS**A. General Committee (GC)**

Body paragraph on the country's stance and history regarding the assigned agenda topic for the General Committee. Include what your intended resolution(s) would do and how it would address the topic, along with statements about what other items or suggestions you will be supporting or not supporting at this meeting, and why.

B. Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI) – “Title of Topic”

Body paragraph on the country's stance and history regarding the assigned agenda topic for the SEDI Committee. Include what your intended resolution(s) would do and how it would address the topic, along with statements about what other items or suggestions you will be supporting or not supporting at this meeting, and why.

C. Secretariat for Multidimensional Security (SMS) – “Title of Topic”

Body paragraph on the country's stance and history regarding the assigned agenda topic for the SMS Committee. Include what your intended resolution(s) would do and how it would address the topic, along with statements about what other items or suggestions you will be supporting or not supporting at this meeting, and why.

D. Committee on Juridical and Political Affairs (CJPA) – “Title of Topic”

Body paragraph on the country's stance and history regarding the assigned agenda topic for the SPA Committee. Include what your intended resolution(s) would do and how it would address the topic, along with statements about what other items or suggestions you will be supporting or not supporting at this meeting, and why.

III. CONCLUSION

A brief synopsis of your intentions at this year's conference. Essentially, what you want the judges to see you doing.

IV. APPENDIX

This is a list of each agenda topic Head Delegates will propose in GC at Summit. All further explanations of these topics should be saved for Proponent Speeches.

Executive Secretariat for Integral Development (SEDI) – “Connecting Energy Innovation and Security to Sustainable Development”

Secretariat for Multidimensional Security (SMS) – “Improving Water and Food Security and Accessibility in the Hemisphere”

Committee on Juridical and Political Affairs (CJPA) – “Utilizing Education to Strengthen Democratic Participation”

The second page (and subsequent pages) should be headed this way:

The Republic of Uruguay
Position Paper, Page Two

Style Notes:

- Font: Times New Roman, size 12
- Paragraphs are single-spaced
- Page margins are 1 inch around the page (considered the “Normal” layout in Microsoft Word)
- “member states” will not be capitalized.
- “hemisphere” will not be capitalized.
- Spell out the name of the organization or committee first, then use abbreviations. Example: “General Committee (GC)”
- Spell out “Organization of American States” first, followed by (OAS). From this point on, you can just use “OAS”. For example: “The Organization of American States (OAS) was founded on the principles of...”
- Use the official name of the country. Example, “The United Mexican States”
- **DO NOT INCLUDE THE NAME OF YOUR UNIVERSITY ANYWHERE**
- Citation style may be in Chicago or APA style (parenthetical, endnotes, or footnotes), as long as the style is consistent throughout.

IACHR Written Memorial Instructions

A full sample memorial can be found at www.esmoas.org under the IACHR Moot Court section.

Memorials must include a:

- Title Page
- Table of Contents
- Index of Authorities
- Statement of Facts
- Legal Analysis
- Arguments on the Merits
- Request for Relief

2023-2024