



**MODEL UNITED NATIONS**

**CHAIR TRAINING MANUAL**

## **Contents**

Introduction	3
Chairing a Model UN Debate	4
Chairing the Security Council	8
Example Resolution for Training Exercise	10
Chair Training Script	12
Information for Delegates	22
<i>MUN Debates</i>	22
<i>Points</i>	24
<i>Additional Information</i>	25
<i>Points about Debate Style</i>	25
<i>Resolution Construction Procedure</i>	26
Issues to Look Out For and How to Deal with Them	28
Useful Phrases	31

If you have any further questions, please speak to JMS or ADC.

## **Introduction**

This booklet has been produced in order to train MUN chairs in the skills they need to chair debates effectively. Please read the whole booklet carefully, more than once if necessary.

However, while knowledge of procedure and protocol is of course very important, when you are chairing you should keep three points uppermost in your mind, and then you shouldn't go too far wrong.

- **Fairness**

Ensure that each delegate gets an equal opportunity to speak. Ensure that all delegates' opinions are shown the proper respect. Be sympathetic to younger and more inexperienced delegates and help them if they are hesitant or make mistakes. While the chair should never be seen to favour a particular person or point of view, you may need to help a delegate if they are struggling to defend a minority opinion.

- **Common Sense**

Remember that the point of the conference is to encourage good quality debate. Use your discretion to facilitate this, which may sometimes involve overlooking small mistakes. Exercise your judgement on decisions. If you think something is out of order, then it probably is. If you think it isn't, it probably isn't.

- **Confidence**

You are in charge. If you have made a decision, then be confident in it. Sometimes you may need to explain your decision to the floor, but this is only so that they understand the decision, not so that they can question or challenge it. Don't be hesitant or timid or unsure. Even if you are not certain of the correct protocol, if you have followed the principles of fairness and common sense then your decision will almost certainly be a good one.

You will nearly always be chairing in teams of two or three. In this case, one chair should be listening to the debate in order to keep it flowing, take points of information, and make a judgement on points of order. The other chair(s) will be dealing with any notes that come to the chair, monitoring timing in order to ask delegates to draw their remarks to a close if they go on too long, and dealing with any other issues that might otherwise distract the attention of the lead chair. You should rotate the roles of the different chairs through the day so that all members of the team have the opportunity to act as lead chair for some of the debate.

# **CHAIRING A MODEL UN DEBATE**

## **Introduction**

In this item on Chairing we start by looking at the qualities of a good chair. This is followed by a section in which the task of chairing is looked at, and suggestions are made for various situations.

## **Good Chairing**

A good chair should have a firm grasp of how MUN works and, in particular:

- Have an excellent understanding of the debating rules.
- Have a good understanding of how a resolution is written so that he/she can advise a delegate.
- Have a rough idea of the position of various countries.
- Have an understanding of the issues to be debated.

Please read and be familiar with “The Delegate Preparation Guide” and the “ReiMUN Conference Guide” and also research the topics on your committee.

During the debate a good Chair will:

- Ensure a fair opportunity for every delegate to speak and encourage less experienced delegates to take part.
- Be aware of what is going on at all times (not be distracted by notes etc).
- Keep the debate flowing.
- Control the debate without being over-authoritarian, using good humour when possible, but always being prepared to explain what is happening to the less experienced delegate.
- Keep an accurate record of what has taken place during the debate.

## **Chairing in Practice**

There is no set formula that a Chair can use, as each debate will depend on the topic and the resolution, but most of all on the personalities of the delegates taking part. In the same way that a referee has to respond to an unfolding situation, the Chair needs to enforce the rules fairly, stay on top of events, but let the “game” flow. Chairing involves applying the rules of the debate and the principles of the United Nations, having a clear idea about what is to be accomplished and to using common sense.

Certain behaviour is completely out of order (one delegate insulting another, insulting another country, showing lack of respect towards other delegates or the Chair).

Sometimes an inexperienced delegate will say things that are not really in order; in this case explain the situation sympathetically. Sometimes experienced delegates get carried away or indulge in unreasonable behaviour.

There may be grey areas and this is where knowledge, experience and common sense come in to play. The key question to ask yourself is – is the delegate being diplomatic?

Delegates are entitled to express their own opinion or the position of their country, but this must be done carefully and diplomatically. It must not be insulting to other delegates or against the principles of the United Nations or against the country's own policy.

For example an Israeli delegate stating “in the interests of the security of our state it is necessary to exert strong control over certain groups that are attempting to bring down our government” would be in order. However, if it was delivered as “we believe in killing Palestinians,” it would not be acceptable and the Chair should rule the delegate out of order.

Responses by the Chair in such cases might be that “Such attitudes are completely against the principles of the UN of which Iraq is a member.” Another ruling could be that “Israel has ratified the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights and the therefore the delegate is at variance with the stated policy of his/her country.”

Sanctions that the Chair may impose would be to ask the delegate to apologise to another delegate, or apologise to the committee. For clear and deliberate breaches of diplomatic behaviour such as advocating killing, use of torture, declaring war, the Chair should intervene before any other delegate objects and usual decision would be to order the delegate to yield the floor and sit down.

Remember that delegates are instructed that it is their duty to

- respect the decision of the Chair at all times;
- yield the floor when required to do so by the Chair;
- be courteous at all times;
- avoid the use of insulting or abusive language.

A Chair should be seen to be fair, to be reasonable, to know as much as the best delegate and to be in control. It is possible for the Chair to decide not to follow usual procedure, but this should be justified, not just imposed. Useful phrases might be –

“In the interests of balanced debate >>>>“

or “In view of the time available >>>>“

followed by

“>>>>the Chair will not take points at this time”,

“>>>> the Chair has decided that all points are out of order at this time”

or “>>>> the Chair will not entertain>>>>“.

Sometimes delegates with moderate experience try to show off by using parliamentary motions.

You could permit the motion, but many of the delegates at ReiMUN will not understand what it is all about. If you decide to grant it, you will need to explain the

outcome and each stage of the procedure. Perhaps the best way to tackle this at ReiMUN is to refuse to grant it.

For example:

A delegate asks to “Move the previous Question”. If you don’t feel this is appropriate, your response could be, “The delegate has asked to move the previous question. This means finishing the debate and voting on the resolution. To implement this motion requires a seconder and then if anyone objects a two thirds majority vote. However, the Chair feels that in respect for the delegate who has done lots of work on the resolution, it should be debated fully.”

Alternatively, you could wait a few seconds after the move has been called for and say, “The motion has not been seconded, so it cannot be entertained.”

### Important Details for the Chair to Remember

#### Points

Delegates should not raise placards until the Chair asks “Are there any points on the floor” – NOT when the speaker announces that he/she is yielding to points.

Points of Order take precedence over other points and must be answered by the Chair. No point, except one of Personal Privilege, may interrupt a speaker, but it is acceptable to make a point of order during a pause in a speech.

#### Amendments

In open debate amendments can be proposed at any time as long as the Chair has recognised the speaker. In closed debate amendments should be in time against unless it is a friendly amendment (accepted by the writer of the resolution) in which case it is automatically passed without debate.

Amendments to amendments are possible.

#### Voting

Voting on a resolution will be FOR, AGAINST or ABSTAIN.

In the event of a tie, the resolution passes.

If the resolution fails, but *would have* passed if all those abstaining had voted for it, a “Division of the House” is in order. In a Division of the House delegates must vote FOR or AGAINST. If the votes do not add up to the previous total, then individual votes must be recorded delegate by delegate.

Examples

For	Against	Abstaining	Division of House?
24	34	6	No; $24 + 6$ does not come to 34
28	32	10	Yes; $28 + 10 = 38$ (it could pass)
31	29	10	No; the resolution has passed

Voting on amendments must be FOR or AGAINST (ie. no abstentions).

If an amendment to an amendment is voted FOR, the amendment also passes. If an amendment to an amendment fails, the amendment must be voted on separately.

### Debate Procedure

The following leads through how a debate should take place and is followed by examples.

#### **An Open Debate**

Start by saying

*“Will the floor come to order”*

Then announce the topic of the debate and the submitter of the resolution.

*“Today’s debate is on xxxxxxxxxxxx and the resolution has been submitted by [Germany]”*

Ask the submitter to read the operative clauses

*“[Germany] please read the operative clauses.”*

After the operative clauses have been read say

*“Thank you [Germany]. We shall have twenty minutes of open debate. [Germany], you have the floor for twenty minutes”*

After the first speaker has been speaking for about two minutes ask the speaker to yield to points.

*“[Germany], in the interests of debate, please yield to points.*

*The speaker has yielded to points.*

*Are there any points on the floor?*

*[Italy], you have been recognised. Please rise and make your point”*

Remember that a point must be phrased as a question. Try to keep points brief.

Remember that a point of order must be heard before anything else. A point of order is addressed to the Chair and you should respond to it.

Remember that the time taken to ask a question is not timed, but the time for the speaker to answer it is part of the speaker’s time on the floor.

Allow two or three points and then ask the speaker to yield the floor. The speaker may yield to the Chair (in which case you choose the next speaker) or may yield to another delegate.

*“[Germany], in the interests of debate, please yield the floor.*

*“I yield the floor to Nigeria”*

*Thank you [Germany]. [Nigeria], you have been recognised. You have the floor for thirteen minutes”*

Again allow the speaker about two minutes of debate time

Encourage as many delegates as possible to speak.

ReiMUN Conference Rules state that only two consecutive yields to other delegations are permissible.

When the end of the debate is reached, say

*“Debate time has now elapsed. We shall move directly into voting procedures”*

A Closed debate would be similar except that all those speaking in time FOR must be in favour of the resolution, although points of information may be for or against. Those speaking in time against must be speaking against the resolution, but points may be for or against. Amendments to the resolution should be in time against (unless they are ‘friendly’ amendments – see above).

### The tally sheet

In order to keep a record of the contributions each delegate has made, please use a tally sheet. These will have a list of country names and a space to record points or speeches made. Give a score of 1 for a Point of Information or Point of Order. Give a score out of 5 for a speech. The speech should be reasonable to score 5 – it does not have to be brilliant.

A rough guide to the score would be

Spoke relevantly on the topic for 1 -2 minutes	score 2
Reasonably well informed	score 1
Reasonable speaking skills (audible & clear)	score 1
Answered questions reasonably well	score 1

Most speeches would score 5. If a speech is particularly good, perhaps note it with a \*.

## **CHAIRING THE SECURITY COUNCIL**

For a resolution to pass, NINE votes in favour are required with none of the P5 members (China, France, Russia, UK and USA) voting against the resolution.

The Security Council is more informal than the General Assembly

- delegates do not need to stand to speak
- a certain amount of dialogue is permissible.

It will hold the “experts” from delegations, so it is important to see that it runs the way you want it to be run.



Ask the delegate submitting the resolution to read the operative clauses  
Invite the delegate submitting the resolution to speak about the resolution.

Invite members of the Council to respond. Determine in particular if there are certain clauses that cause difficulties. Members could be invited to comment individually in alphabetical order. Members unhappy with certain clauses could be invited to submit amendments.

The resolution could be looked at as a whole paying particular attention to the clauses that members picked out as having difficulties. Usually the resolution would be examined clause by clause. This could be done by opening the floor to comment or by inviting members to comment individually in alphabetical order.

Announce that “the resolution will be examined clause by clause” and “we will now examine clause 1”.

Either read the clause yourself or ask the submitting delegate to read it again.

Ask the submitting delegate to speak briefly on the clause.

If one of the P5 opposes a clause, ask them whether they would vote against the resolution if that clause is in it.\*

At the end of the discussion take a vote on the clause. At this stage there is NO VETO.

Continue in this way clause by clause.

If you think there will be little opposition to a clause or time is very short ask the Council if they are willing to go directly to a vote on the clause.

\*If any P5 member threatens to vote against the resolution, remind them that the veto should only be used if it directly affects their country. Try to push them to abstaining rather than vetoing the resolution.

## **Example Resolution for Training Exercise**

Page 1 of 2

COMMITTEE: Environmental

QUESTION OF: Global Warming

SUBMITTED BY: United Kingdom

CO-SUBMITTED BY:

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

- (1) Defining “climate change” change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to
- (2) human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in
- (3) addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods (as given in
- (4) UNFCCC),
- (5) Noting that the current carbon dioxide level is at least 25% higher than its pre-industrial
- (6) level,
- (7) Further noting that the average global temperature has increased by 0.5°C in the last hundred
- (8) years and that the 1980s and 1990s show the greatest number of warm years per decade
- (9) since records began 140 years ago,
- (10) Believing that, whereas there is no absolute proof, it can be concluded with reasonable
- (11) certainty, that global warming is linked to human activity,
- (12) Deeply concerned of the effects that continued climate change will have,
- (13) Deeply disturbed that recent research by the Hadley Centre and its partners indicate that
- (14) continued global warming will result in loss of tropical rainforest, drought and famine in
- (15) arid areas, flooding in coastal areas, threat to small island states and the spread of
- (16) diseases such as malaria,
- (17) Noting with optimism that the Hadley Centre research also indicates that prompt action will
- (18) mean that the worst effects of climate change will be avoided,
- (19) Noting with appreciation the progress made at the 1997 meeting of parties to the United
- (21) Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, UNFCCC, (held in Kyoto) in
- (22) developing the Kyoto Protocol,
- (23) 1. Congratulates those countries that have ratified the Kyoto Protocol;
- (24) 2. Further congratulates those taking part in the fifth conference of parties, COP5, to the
- (25) UNFCCC held in Bonn in November 1999 for the progress made;
- (26) 3. Calls upon all countries, that have not already done so, to sign the Kyoto Protocol as a
- (27) matter of urgency;
- (28) 4. Emphasises the comprehensive nature of the Kyoto Protocol, and in particular
- (29) (a) the legally binding targets set for reduction in greenhouse emissions by developed
- (30) countries;
- (31) (b) the clean development mechanism allowing developing countries to make progress
- (32) in terms of sustainable development;
- (33) (c) the emissions trading system encouraging developed countries to assist developing
- (34) countries develop clean energy systems;
- (35) (d) the rigorous compliance regime;
- (36) 5. Recommends that developed countries achieve the Kyoto Protocol targets by using the
- (37) following measures:
- (38) (a) carry out a review of renewable energy and set a new target to provide 10 per cent of
- (39) the electricity needs from renewable energy sources as soon as possible, but hopefully
- (40) by 2010;
- (41) (b) introduce legislation that includes powers for Government to set energy efficiency

(42) standards of performance, requiring the gas and electricity companies to encourage  
Page 2 of 2

- (43) and assist customers to use less energy;
- (44) (c) introduce an integrated transport policy as a framework for a whole range of
- (45) measures which will deliver a better quality transport system with lower CO<sub>2</sub>
- (46) emissions;
- (47) (d) introduce a new vehicle excise duty system which benefits those driving smaller,
- (48) more efficient cars, and also changes the company car tax system to remove
- (49) incentives for people to drive more and encourage people to buy more fuel efficient
- (50) cars;
- (51) (e) introduce an improved fuel poverty programme which should ensure that old people,
- (52) the disabled, children and people with health difficulties have properly insulated and
- (53) heated homes and will have the additional benefit of also saving carbon emissions;
- (54) (f) introduce a new climate change levy which will encourage businesses to use energy
- (55) more efficiently, but at the same time, recognise the legitimate concerns of energy
- (56) intensive industries and offer the prospect of a significantly lower rate of levy to
- (57) those sectors which enter into agreements to improve energy efficiency and reduce
- (58) emissions;
- (59) (g) to work with business to develop a domestic emissions trading scheme in advance of
- (60) the launch of the international system, so allowing business to reduce carbon
- (61) emissions more cost-effectively;
- (62) 6. Considering that the measures outlined in clause 5 will allow Kyoto targets to be
- (63) achieved without seriously effecting the economy;
- (64) 7. Encourages governments to develop improved, appropriate public education
- (65) programmes in order for people to be better informed about the consequences of climate
- (66) change;
- (67) 8. Decides to remain seized of this matter.

## **CHAIR TRAINING SCRIPT**

*Immediately after the Operative clauses have been read...*

GERMANY : Point of order.

The Chair should accept a point of order at this time.

Is it in order that a pre-am phrase is used in clause 6?

This is not in order – the Chair should suggest a friendly amendment to “Considers” – if not, UK please make the suggestion. The UK should then be offered the floor.

UNITED KINGDOM: We are all aware of the problems caused by global warming. The Panel on Climate Change predicts a temperature increase of between 1 and 3.5°C. This could cause a sea level rise of 15 to 95 cm, which would cause widespread flooding. A rise of 100cm would displace 70 million people. Salt water would flow into rivers contaminating fresh water supplies and effect fishing. There would be more droughts, water shortages and wildfires.

Last year in the USA there were a number of deaths caused by heat waves; this situation could only become worse.

Tropical diseases such as malaria would spread as carrying organisms move into new areas.

There is substantial evidence that this warming is already under way.

The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which opened for signing at the 1992 Earth Summit, tackled the problem of global warming and has been widely ratified. Not all countries have achieved the targets agreed.

Even if the limits set in the UNFCCC are met, it will not prevent the dangerous effects of global warming. That is why a new set of targets were agreed at the Kyoto conference.

The Kyoto Protocol sets legally binding targets for developed countries to reduce their emissions of greenhouse gases by five per cent. There are no constraints on developing countries, and in addition it provides a mechanism that encourages sustainable development. It is a vital agreement and it is important that all countries sign it. This resolution calls for that support.

The Chair should call for you to yield any time now – when it does see the end of the speech\*

This resolution also sets out practical measures that would enable developed countries to achieve the reduction in emissions that are so necessary. These proposals have already been put into effect in the United Kingdom and have met with great success in reducing greenhouse emissions. We particularly believe that private companies must be encouraged to take a full part in achieving reductions in greenhouse emissions. This can be done through a combination of cooperation and legislation.

\*This is a comprehensive and effective resolution. Please support it. I yield to points.

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

ARGENTINA: Do you agree that this resolution provides a combination of a broad perspective and practical detail?

UNITED KINGDOM: I certainly do. That is an excellent point. The Kyoto agreement in itself provides a broad solution to this problem and clause 5 outlines exactly how developing countries can achieve this.

I yield the floor to Canada.

The Chair should find that this is in order.

CANADA: This is a strong and comprehensive resolution. One of its key points is in calling for all countries to sign the Kyoto Protocol. Another very important point is that it proposes to increase the level of popular understanding through education. Canada believes that international issues such as global warming do need to be understood by all members of the World community.

I yield to points.

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

ICELAND: Canada, you picked out clause 7 promoting education, but this clause has no specific suggestions as to how it should be done. Do you not think that this clause needs to contain more specific detail?

CANADA: No, Iceland, I do not agree. Yes, this resolution could be filled here with a long, long section of sub-clauses listing everything from internet to billboards, but as we are encouraged to make resolutions shorter, I do not consider it necessary. The meaning is clear. Let us please credit governments with the intelligence of deciding the best means for themselves. For developed countries this would no doubt include television and the internet, whereas in Africa education programs directed through village elders are far more effective.

I yield the floor to Mali.

The Chair should find that this is in order.

MALI: Mali encourages developing countries to sign the Kyoto Protocol as this is a way of achieving sustainable development and that is of course one of our main aims.

I yield to points

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

INDIA: Does the delegate from Mali not think that this resolution does little apart from advising everyone to sign the Kyoto Protocol with a few quickly thought of suggestions thrown in?

MALI: I disagree. Even if it were the case, however, I feel it would still be worthwhile reminding certain nations that it would be a good idea to sign the Protocol since it is such a strong agreement.  
I yield the floor to Japan.

The Chair should find that this is NOT in order since there have already been two yields. The floor should return to the Chair.

If the Chair allows the yield – INDIA – Point of Order – Is it in order to have three yields?

The Chair should now select the next speaker.

USA: I have an amendment. Add a new clause 7 and then renumber the current clause 7 and 8. The new clause should read “Calls upon developing countries to cap their emissions at 10% higher than they are at present.”

There seems little point in the developed countries cutting back their emissions if there is no commitment at all for the developing countries. Whereas we accept that developing countries need to be allowed to develop, there should be limitations on how much that should be allowed to damage the environment. Let us remember that it has been agreed that we need sustainable development. This amendment allows room for development, but puts limits on just how much damage should result from it. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak for the amendment with a minute remaining.  
In the absence of anyone else to speak for it, time against will begin.

CHINA(Against): Of the accumulated greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, 74% has come from the industrialised countries, and 28% from Guess who? Yes, it's the United States. Yes 74% of pollutants are produced by 20% of the world's population. The main priority of developing countries is to improve the dreadful living standards that their people endure. We have actually had all these arguments at the Earth summit, and it was agreed not to restrict developing countries. If countries like the USA want to stop emissions rising they can help us develop clean technology – we look forward to their funding. Let us not go back to these old arguments. Vote against this amendment. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak against the amendment with a minute remaining.  
In the absence of anyone else to speak against it, voting on the amendment will take place.

## VOTING

FOR	AGAINST
12	78

The floor should now return to the United States since the amendment failed.

USA: I am disappointed that delegates did not wish to make this a much stronger resolution by incorporating my amendment. I yield the floor to the Chair.

CHAD: This is a stupid resolution. There are many factors linked with environmental considerations that are of greater importance.

The Chair should stop Chad and ask the delegate to rephrase their statement. If this does not happen – UK – please make a Point of Order. The Chair should also make a note of this, as individual awards are not given to delegates using non-diplomatic language.

This resolution is weak because it is limited in its consideration. One of our main concerns is desertification. It is linked to some extent to global warming, but this resolution does nothing for about it. Our people are being affected now by the process of desertification and it needs an answer now. 135 million people are directly affected by desertification.

I yield to points

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

SUDAN: Does the speaker not agree that problems of starvation should take priority over haggling about CO2 trade-offs?

CHAD: Exactly. Emissions trading is simply an excuse that means industrialised countries can carry on churning out just as much CO2 as they did before.

BELGIUM: Does the speaker not realise that desertification is due to misuse of soil rather than global warming?

CHAD: Don't you listen? I said it is linked to some extent.

BELGIUM: Point of order.

Is it in order to suggest that I was not listening?

The Chair should decide that this is not in order. The Chair might ask to delegate to leave the floor since this is the second time insulting language has been used, or at least warn that that he/she will lose the floor if it happens again.

If Chad has lost the floor go straight to where Sudan takes the floor below.

\*

\*

FRANCE: Point of Order.

Is it in order for Chad to suggest that there is some link between global warming and desertification when there is in fact none?

SUDAN: Point of Order.

Is it in order for France to claim there is no link between global warming and desertification, when spread of desert means loss of vegetation resulting in higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub>?

The Chair should point out that Chad suggested that global warming to some extent causes desertification, which is untrue, and therefore Chad should withdraw that remark.

CHAD: My main point is that there should be greater priority given to the more immediate problems. I thank Sudan for the point of order. If desertification leads to greater CO<sub>2</sub> levels and therefore increased global warming, why is it not mentioned in this resolution?

I yield the floor to Sudan.

The Chair should find that this is in order

\*

\*

SUDAN: Sudan agrees in principle with the points made by Chad. But let us look at the Kyoto agreement. The industrialised countries have come up with wonderful agreement that if they assist us to build an environmentally friendly plant, they subtract that from their own emissions. Ridiculous! How can you have reduced your emissions if you have not?

I yield to points

If a point of order is made about the term 'ridiculous', it should not be upheld because Sudan is referring to a situation rather than insulting a particular person or the work of a particular delegate.  
Yielding to Points is in order.

BELGIUM: Surely the emissions trading system encourages sustainable development and is therefore helpful to developing countries. Do you not agree?

SUDAN: I would rather see the development take place and the developed countries reducing the amount polluting gas they turn out.

I yield the floor to Sri Lanka

The Chair should find that this is in order

SRI LANKA: The Kyoto Protocol sounds wonderful doesn't it? But let's consider it more carefully. There is the emissions trading system. How does it work in detail?



Well, of course, that has not been finalised yet. The present programme hopes to put the operational mechanisms in place at the sixth meeting of the parties, COP-6 as it is called, to the UNFCCC that is not due to take place until November 2000.

To Sri Lanka it does not make sense to sign the Protocol until the detail has been worked out. Therefore I propose an amendment. I propose that clause 3 should read “Calls upon all countries that have not already done so to consider signing after the sixth meeting of the parties to the UNFCCC”

The Kyoto Protocol recommends reductions in emissions for developed countries. Specific reductions for specific countries have been agreed, but what happens if the country does not achieve its targets? We don’t know!

Forests are a key factor for reducing the level of CO<sub>2</sub> in the air. How will the presence of large forest areas in a country be accounted for by this system? We don’t know!

I think we need a breathing space to wait and see how the system develops. I hope therefore that you will accept this amendment. I yield to points.

CANADA: Does the speaker not realise that it is perfectly in order to sign a Convention before detail has been sorted out?

SRI LANKA: I think that it is important to know exactly how the Protocol will work in practice before it is signed. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak for the amendment with a minute remaining.  
In the absence of anyone else to speak for it, time against will begin.

UNITED KINGDOM(Against): The signing of a Convention or Protocol means that the country agrees with the principles contained within it. It is not a commitment to do anything – the commitment comes with ratification. Are countries here really against the principles of protecting the environment? Are countries here really in favour of unrestrained emissions. I don’t think so. Please agree with principle of Kyoto and throw out this amendment. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak against the amendment with a minute remaining.  
In the absence of anyone else to speak against it, voting on the amendment will take place.

#### VOTING

FOR	AGAINST
42	48

The floor should now return to Sri Lanka since the amendment failed.

SRI LANKA: Sri Lanka is disappointed that the General Assembly felt unable to uphold an amendment that would have made the resolution more acceptable to a number of countries. I yield the floor to the Chair.

ARGENTINA: I have an amendment. Add a new clause 7 and then renumber the current clause 7 and 8. The new clause should read “Urges all countries to work towards fulfilling the obligations of the Kyoto Protocol”

Let us remember that even if countries sign the Kyoto Protocol, it will not come into effect until all the measures are in place and it has the correct number of ratifications. Some countries still have not met their commitments to the Earth Summit agreements. This amendment strengthens the resolution because the topic is global warming not just the Kyoto Protocol. The Earth Summit had greater support than the Kyoto Protocol does at present, and this amendment by Argentina urges action on global warming alongside the Kyoto agreements. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak for the amendment with a minute remaining.  
In the absence of anyone else to speak for it, time against will begin.

NORWAY: I have an amendment to the amendment. The new clause 7 should continue “--- and in particular for each country to make the main part of its reduction through domestic energy, industry and transport sectors rather than through emission trading.”

Whereas Norway supports the principle of industrialised countries helping developing countries develop clean energy systems, we feel that it would be an abuse of the trading system if countries do not attempt to reduce their own emissions. This amendment makes this principle clear and addresses the concerns expressed by Chad and Sudan earlier on the debate. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak against the amendment to the amendment with a minute remaining.  
In the absence of anyone else to speak against it, voting on the amendment to the amendment will take place.  
The Chair should explain that the first vote will be on the amendment to the amendment, and that if this passes, the amendment also passes.  
If the first vote goes against, there will then be a vote on the amendment itself.

## VOTING

FOR	AGAINST
57	33

The amendment to the amendment and the amendment pass. The floor should now go to the Chair.

ICELAND: Call to Move the Previous Question

ARGENTINA: Seconded

ZIMBABWE: Objection

Moving the Previous Question is a call to go straight to a vote on the resolution. It must have a seconder. Since there is an objection it must go to a vote.

#### VOTING

FOR	AGAINST
48	42

The Chair should find that this motion fails because it did not achieve the two thirds majority required.

ZIMBABWE: Zimbabwe would like to ask –what does this resolution do for developing countries? Now we all know what the Kyoto Protocol may or may not do, but what does this resolution do?

We have a nice long section on how the lucky, wealthy industrialised countries can achieve their commitments if they decide to bother, but what does it do for Zimbabwe? What does it do for Cameroon or Chad or Ethiopia or The Gambia or India or....., I could go on and on. It does nothing.

We have in this resolution the consideration that we always get from these rich countries – none. I urge you to vote against a flawed resolution or at least abstain.

I yield to points.

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

USA : The Kyoto Protocol provides for developing countries for achieve sustainable development. Surely that is something Zimbabwe would appreciate?

ZIMBABWE: If as a result of Kyoto we are assisted by the United States to further our development of course we would appreciate that. Let's see what happens. My point is that this resolution itself does nothing for us.

I yield to points.

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

CHAD: Does Zimbabwe agree that when investment in developing countries does actually happen, that it rarely comes to African countries where the real need is?

ZIMBABWE: Yes. Thank you, Chad. At last we have someone who understands the situation. I hope we do see benefits from Kyoto, but I suspect it will go to the Tigers again so that the industrialised countries can make quick profit yet again. This resolution does nothing about our development.

I yield to points.

The Chair should find that this is in order and ask for points.

UNITED KINGDOM: *(Your main point is to put to Zimbabwe that it should be trying to \*amend the resolution, but see how many points you can squeeze in)* The point of this resolution is that it calls for countries to support the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol could be of immense value to developing countries. For example, you need to be able to supply your people with energy. The Kyoto Protocol encourages the industrialised countries to help with this through the emissions trading system. It could improve your production base by providing the mechanism whereby industrialised countries are encouraged to build these for you.

\*Why don't you make an amendment rather than be destructive of the resolution?

ZIMBABWE: I can assure you that I would make an amendment if there was sufficient in it to make that worthwhile, but I do not think there is.

I yield the floor to India.

The Chair should find that this is in order.

INDIA: I have an amendment. Clause 3 should replace "sign" with "ratify".

The Kyoto Protocol requires 55 ratifications, including those developed countries responsible for 55% of the 1990 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, before it can enter into force. There seems to be little point in signing it if it is not allowed to do anything, and it cannot do anything until countries ratify it. The amendment seems a logical correction. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should then ask if anyone else wishes to speak for the amendment with a minute remaining.

In the absence of anyone else to speak for it, time against will begin.

CANADA(Against): As I am sure India is aware, the process of ratification requires changing national law. For a highly industrialised country, such as Canada, which has undertaken cut its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by well over the 5% requirement, this is a considerable task. We, and other developed countries are working towards this, however, and we hope to be able to ratify the Protocol in the near future. It cannot be done at once, and it is more important to encourage countries to agree to the principles, so I ask countries to reject the amendment. I yield the floor to the United Kingdom.

The Chair should find that this is in order with about one minute remaining.

UNITED KINGDOM(Against): This is strange. India is calling for the Kyoto Protocol to be ratified when it has not even signed the agreement. Is this a change of heart? I think not. Industrialised countries are working towards ratification as Canada pointed out, but they are not in a position to do so at present. If ratification is called for, it will make it impossible for the industrialised countries to support the resolution. This is a badly disguised wrecking amendment. Please vote against it. I yield the floor to the Chair.

The Chair should find this in order. Time will have almost run out on the amendment, so voting should take place

#### VOTING

FOR	AGAINST
36	65

The floor should now return to India since the amendment failed.

INDIA: It is a pity that the General Assembly voted against an amendment which would have helped strengthen the resolution and would have perhaps have made it almost acceptable.

#### TIME HAS NOW ELAPSED

The Chair should now call for voting procedures on the resolution. The Chair should remind delegates that they may abstain in voting on the resolution.

#### VOTING

FOR	AGAINST	ABSTENTIONS
43	40	7

CHAD: Division of the House.

The Chair should decide against a Division of the House because this would only be considered if the resolution had failed.

## **Information for Delegates**

*The information on pages 22-26 is taken from the Delegates' Handbook and contains information for delegates on the format and style of debate. Chairs should be familiar with this material.*

## **MUN Debates**

Debates begin officially with the person who submits a resolution reading out the 'operative clauses'.

In **closed debate** the chair will then announce the time allowed FOR and AGAINST this resolution: - "The Chair proposes ten minutes for and ten minutes against the resolution."

In **open debate** the chair will announce the overall time allowed: - "The Chair proposes twenty minutes of open debate."

The delegate submitting the resolution then begins.

The speaker may invite questions at any time while he/she has the floor saying, "I yield to points of information". The chair will then select a delegate wishing to ask a question.

For example

*Speaker: I yield to Points of Information.*

*Chair: The speaker has yielded to points. France, you have been recognised. Please rise and state your point.*

A "Point of Information" must be put to the speaker who has the floor, and must be a question.

The time taken to ask the question is not included in the debate time, but the time for the answer is taken into account. Points of information may be for or against the resolution. It is usual for a speaker to yield to points at some stage while holding the floor.

When a speaker has finished he/she may

- (1) allow the chair to choose the next speaker- "I yield the floor to the chair"
- (2) hand on to another speaker as previously arranged - "I yield the floor to Italy"

It is usual for the Chair to restrict yielding to other delegates, perhaps allowing only one or two such yields at a time.

### Closed Debate

Closed debate starts with time FOR the resolution. In this time only delegates supporting the resolution may speak, although points of information may be FOR or AGAINST. When time FOR the resolution has elapsed, then time AGAINST begins. This takes place in exactly the same way as time FOR, with speakers explaining their opposition to a resolution and picking out weaknesses in it, and submitting to points when they choose. Again, the points of information may be FOR (with delegates challenging the speaker on his views), or AGAINST (with delegates supporting the speaker in his opposition to the resolution).

When the speaker has finished, he/she may yield the floor to the Chair or to another delegate.

Any amendment which has not been accepted by the submitter must be proposed during time

AGAINST as an “Unfriendly amendment”, and, when and if the Chair decides, will be debated. To propose an amendment, a delegate should submit it in writing to the Chair, and then wait to be recognised. The time allocated to consider an amendment is usually two minutes FOR and two minutes AGAINST. At the end of this time, the amendment is voted on, with delegates voting FOR or AGAINST; there are no ABSTENTIONS on an amendment.

### Open Debate

In open debate delegates are encouraged to be “as positive as possible about a resolution”, and it is suggested that delegates propose amendments rather than simply oppose a resolution. Amendments may be considered at any time during open debate provided that a written copy of the amendment has been submitted to the Chair and that the Chair has recognised the delegate wishing to propose the amendment.

*Note for Chairs:*

*ReiMUN conferences usually use Open Debate format. However, the style of debate is at the individual Chair’s discretion.*

## Points

**A Point of Personal Privilege** refers to the well being of a delegate. It may not refer to the resolution. It may only interrupt a speaker if the speech is inaudible. This is the only point that may interrupt a speaker.

**A Point of Information** is a question and must be made as a question. It can only be made when the speaker has yielded to points. It can be made to the speaker or to the Chair.

**A Point of Order** is a question about procedure. It has to be addressed to the Chair. It can be made during a pause in a speech.

**A Point of Parliamentary Enquiry** is a question to the Chair about the rules of procedure.

**Orders of the Day** is a call to return to the main topic of the debate.

**Permission to Approach the Chair** is a request to discuss a problem with the Chair privately.

**Explain Vote** is a request, after a vote, by a delegate to explain the way he or she voted. Usually one for each FOR, AGAINST and ABSTAINED would be given half a minute.

## Parliamentary Procedure

**Move to Extend Debate Time** is a request to have further time FOR and AGAINST a resolution. It should have a seconder. If anyone objects, it is put to a vote (without debate), a simple majority being required.

**Move to Table** is used to propose a stop to consideration of a resolution if that resolution clearly has little support and would be a waste of time to debate fully. It should have a seconder. If anyone objects, it is put to a vote (without debate), a simple majority being required.

**Move the Previous Question** is a call to end debate time and to vote on the resolution. It should have a seconder. If anyone objects, it is put to a vote (without debate), a two-thirds majority being required.

**Move to adjourn** is a proposal to finish proceedings. It should have a seconder. If anyone objects, it is put to a vote (without debate) a simple majority being required.

**Refer the Question** is a proposal to send a resolution to be considered by another committee. It should have a seconder. If anyone objects it is debated (3 minutes



FOR and 3 minutes AGAINST) and is then put to a vote, a simple majority being required.

### **Duties of Delegates**

**All delegates must:**

- (1) respect the decision of the Chair at all times;**
- (2) obtain the floor before speaking;**
- (3) stand when speaking;**
- (4) yield the floor when required to do so by the Chair;**
- (5) be courteous at all times;**
- (6) avoid the use of insulting or abusive language.**

### **Additional Information**

Delegates at an MUN conference are taking the role of diplomats, and so it is important for them to behave in a diplomatic manner, showing politeness and courtesy at all times, even when they strongly disagree with another delegate.

Diplomacy is particularly important when considering resolutions. A resolution represents a great deal of work by a student and should be respected as such. Any delegate referring to a resolution or part of a resolution in a derogatory way will be ruled out of order, and delegates making comments such as “This resolution is useless” will be reprimanded, and may well lose possession of the floor.

It is assumed that if a resolution proposes financing a project through the United Nations, that it will be funded by the UN. This means that a resolution containing such a proposal may not be criticised during debate on the basis of its financial implications.

The General Assembly is a body that is not able to enforce its decisions; its authority lies in the weight of opinion behind its decisions. Resolutions to be debated in the General Assembly or one of its committees may not “demand”, but may “recommend,” “urge” or “request”. Delegates should therefore avoid criticising a resolution for being weak because it only uses phrases such as these.

### **Points about Debate Style**

*When speaking, remember:*

- Make sure you are speaking about the particular resolution under discussion, and not just the general issue.
- Talk in the third person – “Sweden believes that...” not “I think that...”
- Address your speech to the Chair, not to other delegates.
- At the end of your speech, say, “I open myself to points of information” (so that people can ask you questions). After questions are finished, say either “I

yield the floor to the Chair” (if you want the Chair to choose the next speaker) or “I yield the floor to [another country]” if you want to choose the next speaker (eg. one of your co-submitters).

*When making points of information, remember:*

- Stand up in your place to make your point, and stay standing until the person has answered.
- It must be a question and must be about what the person has just said.
- Ask the question to the Chair not to the delegate (eg. not “Do you think...?” but “Does the delegate of Syria believe that...?”)
- If you feel they haven’t answered your question, or want to respond to their answer, you may ask for a **right of reply** so that you can make a second point of information. *You must ask the Chair for permission.* Speaking without the Chair’s permission is called **dialogue** and is not permitted on the floor at any time.

## **Resolution Construction Procedure**

*Chairs’ Note:*

*Topic 1 at the main ReiMUN conference in the autumn follows the resolution construction procedure rather than normal debate procedure. The Chair’s role in this process is particularly important, so it is essential that you are completely confident in what is involved. If you have any questions, please speak to ADC well in advance of the conference.*

This is the format of debate that will be used for Topic 1, and may not be familiar to many delegates. It is relatively informal style of debate, and involves constructing resolutions on the day with fellow delegates rather than by yourself in advance. Although you will be given guidance on the day, it is essential that you research relevant topics and prepare speeches in advance if you are to get the most out of this mode of debate. The procedure is as follows.

- Opening speeches
- Formal Caucusing
- Informal Caucusing
- Lobbying
- Submission of Resolutions
- Debate
- Voting

### **Opening Speeches**

These will take place in committee. Each delegate will make a compulsory speech for no longer than one minute on the issue at hand, setting out their nation’s position and suggesting solutions to relevant problems. The order of speakers will be drawn from

a hat. There is no right of reply at this stage. **This speech should be prepared before ReiMUN.**

#### Formal Caucusing (30 mins)

This formal caucusing stage is your opportunity to respond to other opening speeches.

Try to develop ideas and reach consensus, perhaps by directing questions to other delegates. If you wish to speak then raise your placard. You will be placed on a speakers' list, and come your turn you will be allocated one minute to make your point. Up to two points of information will be entertained on each speech.

Once a delegate has spoken, they may be placed on the end of the list if they wish to speak again. If a country directly mentions another, committee chairs may, at their discretion, allow a 30-second direct response.

#### Informal Caucusing (30 mins)

In this stage, informal discussion takes place between delegates working together in groups of their choosing. Resolutions are constructed during this phase. The aim is to produce resolutions with as many co-submitters as possible. You should ensure that any resolution you sign reflects your country's policy. Do not sign multiple resolutions which conflict with one another. Resolutions must be written in the formal style.

#### Lobbying and Submission of Resolutions (15 mins)

There will be 15 minutes during which delegates may lobby informally to gain support for their resolutions. At the end of this period the resolutions will be submitted to the committee chairs. Three resolutions will be accepted by the chair for discussion in formal debate. Resolutions with a greater number of co-submitters are more likely to be considered for debate.

#### Debate and Voting (45 mins)

The three resolutions selected by the chairs will be read and the proposers will be asked to explain the merits of the resolutions. There will then follow standard open debate during which points may be raised on any of the three resolutions. Amendments may be submitted to resolutions at the chairs' discretion, but the presumption is that amendments will not be used in this debate.

The resolutions will be voted on. Delegates may vote for as many of the resolutions as they wish (but should avoid voting for contradictory resolutions).

## **Issues to Look Out For and How to Deal with Them**

*The following pages list some of the most common issues that you will have to deal with. There are no fixed rules; the advice here is for guidance, but you should use your common sense and discretion to make a judgement on individual situations. Remember that the purpose of the day is to practise the skills of good debate in the style of the UN; however, also remember that many delegates are inexperienced and that correcting every single mistake can become tedious and unconstructive.*

### **Resolutions**

Incorrect initiating phrases - *Preamble clauses should begin with verbs ending with -ing or -ed. Operative clauses should begin with verbs in the present tense.*

- Ignore problems with the preamble, as this is not the subject of debate. If it can be done quickly, suggest a friendly amendment to operative clauses. If such amendments will be too time-consuming, ignore the issue and proceed with debate on the resolution.

Grammar or punctuation errors.

- If the error means that the resolution cannot be understood, suggest the submitter make a friendly amendment. If the meaning is clear, ignore the issue and proceed with debate.

Unclear or ambiguous statements.

- Allow debate to proceed without raising the issue yourself. If another delegate raises the issue, suggest that the delegate submit a friendly amendment.

### **Speeches**

Delegates saying “I” or “you”.

- If the delegate appears to be experienced, quickly intervene with a gentle reminder that, “Delegates should speak in the third person.” If the delegate appears to be less experienced, allow them to finish their speech, but when they have finished make a general comment to the floor to say, “Delegates are reminded that they should refer to themselves and other delegates at all times in the third person and by the name of their country.”

Delegates being rude or using undiplomatic language.

- If the offence is, in your view, serious and/or obviously out of order, intervene immediately and ask the delegate to withdraw the comment, apologise and/or (in the most serious cases) to yield the floor. If the offence is more borderline, ignore the issue unless another delegate raises a point of order. If a point of order is raised, respond appropriately.

Delegates going off-topic or speaking around the general issue rather than addressing the resolution directly.

- If the delegates is clearly completely off topic, intervene and ask them to address the issue at hand.
- If the delegate is speaking about the general issue but is not addressing the resolution, you must make a judgement about is how the best interests of good debate are served.
  - If the delegate is inexperienced, or if you feel the discussion is worth having, then say nothing.
  - If you feel that the point is leading the debate to become unfocused then you may, at the end of the delegate's speech, ask if they have a particular point to make about the resolution as a whole or one of its clauses, or ask them to indicate whether they are supporting or opposing the resolution and why. You may choose to wait to see if another delegate raises this in a point of information before you raise it yourself.
  - In the most serious cases, you may choose to interrupt the delegate before he/she has finished speaking in order to bring them back to the point, but this would be an exceptional course of action, not the norm.
- A better approach would normally be to make a general point to the floor that, "Delegates are reminded to speak about the specific points raised by the resolution and not simply about the general issue."

The speaker goes on too long.

- Gently intervene, saying, "Will the delegate please come to his closing remarks?"

### Points of Information

Delegates sitting down before their point has been answered.

- Ask the delegate to remain standing until their point has been answered.

Delegates making a speech.

- Intervene immediately and ask the delegate to raise a point about what the delegate who has the floor has said. Remind them that if they wish to make a speech of their own they should ask to take the floor at the appropriate time.

Delegates not asking a question.

- Ask the delegate to rephrase their point as a question. If they are unsure how to do this, suggest that they simply add the question "Do you not agree?" to what they have said.

Delegates asking an unclear question.

- Let this pass. However, if the delegate who has the floor asks for the question to be rephrased then pass this request on.

The delegate who has floor has clearly misunderstood the question that was asked.

- Make your own judgement as to how the best interests of debate are served. If the issue is unimportant than let the issue pass, although grant a right of reply if the delegate making the point of information requests it.
- If the delegate asking the question appears inexperienced, you may choose to help them by saying something like, “Is that what the delegate of [*Sweden*] was asking? Would he/she like a right of reply?”
- If you feel that the question that was raised was a crucial question to the progress of the debate, you may choose to rephrase the question yourself. For example, “I believe the question that the delegate of [*Sweden*] was raising was... Could the delegate of [*Malawi*] address that issue?”

The delegate raises a second point without asking for a right of reply.

- Intervene immediately with the phrase, “There shall be no dialogue on the floor.” You may choose to follow this up by asking, “Would the delegate like to request a right of reply?”

### Points of Order

Delegates raising points of information as points of order.

- Intervene immediately and say that that is not a point of order. Advise the delegate to raise that as a point of information at the appropriate time.

Delegates spuriously taking offence.

- Respond either by saying simply that you see nothing out of order in what was said, or suggest that the delegate raising the point of order has inferred more from the comments made than was actually said.

If you are not sure whether the comment was out of order.

- The easiest way to get out of this situation is normally to suggest that the comment made was in the delegate’s own opinion, and therefore in order, and then quickly move on.

### Other Points

If an unusual point is raised that you do not understand.

- This can be difficult to deal with. One approach is simply to say, “That is not in order at this time,” and move on. However, this is a risky approach if you don’t understand the point, as it may make you appear incompetent.
- Alternatively, you may ask the delegate raising the point to explain why they have raised the points. This may give you a greater insight into what is being asked, without letting on that you don’t understand, and will give you time to rule whether the request is in or out of order.
- If, after an explanation, you still do not understand, use a phrase such as, “In the interests of good debate, the Chair rules that this is not in order at this time.” Then move on.

## Useful Phrases

“Will the floor please come to order?”

- *To quieten the floor at the start of the debate.*

“The topic of today’s debate is... This resolution has been submitted by [Sweden]. Would the delegate from [Sweden] please take the floor and read the operative clauses of his/her resolution?”

- *To start the debate. Once the operative clauses have been read, continue with:*

“The delegate now has two minutes to speak in favour of his/her resolution.”

“Do you open yourself to points of information?”

- *If the delegate fails to open him/herself to points at the end of his/her speech, followed by:*

“The delegate has opened him/herself to points of information. Are there any such points from the floor?”

“[Malawi], you have been recognised. Please rise and state your point.”

- *To recognise a point of information.*

“Do you yield the floor to the Chair or to another delegate?”

- *Once points of information are finished.*

“The floor has been yielded to the Chair. Are there any delegates wishing to take the floor at this time?”

- *If the Chair has floor and wishes to call another delegate.*

“There shall be no dialogue on the floor.”

- *If a delegate speaks without the Chair’s permission.*

“There shall be no lobbying on the floor.”

- *If a delegate attempts to have the floor yielded to him/her by the delegate who currently has floor.*

“Time has elapsed on this resolution. We will now move into voting procedure.”

- *At the end of debate.*

“This resolution has passed; applause will be in order.” / “This resolution has failed; applause will not be in order.”

- *To announce the result of the vote.*