



Singapore MUN 2026

**Academics
Guide**

Table of Contents



Contacts	3
Delegate Conduct	4
Dress Code	4
Attendance	4
Decorum	4
Code of Conduct	5
Reporting Channel	5
Types of Infractions	6
AI & Plagiarism Policy	9
Definition of Plagiarism	10
Process of Inquiry	11
Consequences and Penalties	13
Prewriting Policy	14
Position Paper	15
Format	16
Guiding Questions	17
Position Paper Example	19
Citations & Style Guide	20
Expectations	20
Draft Resolutions	24
Preambulatory Clauses	25
Operative Clauses	28
Amendments	31
Committee-Specific Mechanisms	34
Delegate Assessment Rubrics (DAR)	35
Rubrics Breakdown	36
Awards Policy	38
General Awards Matrix	38
Discretionary Awards Policy	39
Awards Policy: Frequently Asked Questions	41
Rules of Procedure (Annex A)	43

Contacts



Contacts

Should you have any queries, please feel free to send an email to the respective **SMUN 2026 Secretariat Departments** or **Committee Chairpersons**.

Academics Directorate Email <i>(for academic-related inquiries)</i>	academics@singaporemun.org
Operations Directorate Email <i>(for conference setup-related inquiries)</i>	operations@singaporemun.org
Liaisons Directorate Email <i>(for general inquiries)</i>	liaisons@singaporemun.org

Committee Emails (for committee-specific queries):

ECOSOC	ECOSOC.smun2026@gmail.com
IMO	IMO.smun2026@gmail.com
NATO	NATO.smun2026@gmail.com
PICC	PICC.smun2026@gmail.com
UNEA	UNEA.smun2026@gmail.com
UNGA	UNGA.smun2026@gmail.com
UNSC	UNSC.smun2026@gmail.com
UN WOMEN	UNW.smun2026@gmail.com
USS	USS.smun2026@gmail.com
WHO	WHO.smun2026@gmail.com
PRESS	PRESS.smun2026@gmail.com
CRISIS	CRISIS.smun2026@gmail.com

Delegate Conduct



Delegate Conduct

Dress Code

All delegates are expected to be dressed in **Western Business Attire and appropriate footwear (i.e. dress shoes, heels or flats)**.

Any delegate caught dressed inappropriately (e.g. T-shirts, jeans, sport shoes, sandals, slippers, etc.) will be required to change, and failure to do so may result in delegates being barred from committee sessions.

Attendance

Delegates are required to attend 8 out of 10 committee sessions to **qualify** for a **Certificate of Participation** or any awards.

Delegates who need to leave committee sessions halfway for emergency purposes should approach their Committee Chairperson(s) or the Academics Team for assistance. Delegates who wish to be excused due to medical reasons are required to furnish a medical certificate upon returning to the committee session.

Decorum

Delegates should be punctual for all committee sessions to ensure that debate can start on time.

During committee sessions, delegates are also expected to remain attentive to and be wholly present during committee proceedings, unless they have received permission from their Committee Chairpersons to be excused. Absence or unresponsiveness without a valid reason will be noted by the Committee Chairpersons, and persistent unresponsiveness may cause your attendance for that session to be discounted.

Delegate Conduct



Code of Conduct

The Code of Conduct (hereinafter referred to as “Code”) is established herein at SMUN 2026 to codify the standards and expectations the Secretariat has of participants at the conference to uphold professionalism and maintain a safe and conducive learning experience to facilitate worthwhile experience for every attendee. The Secretariat reserves the sole right to interpret the Code contained herein to address any breach(es) and complaint(s) that may arise and arbitrate any disputes or conflicts so as to upkeep the conference’s professional standards and safeguard the wellbeing and safety of all participants. Insofar as specific reference is made to delegates in this Code, the Secretariat emphasises that this Code shall apply to any and all participants at the conference, be it delegates, Chairpersons, Administrative Staff or Secretariat members.

Delegates are expected to treat all conference staff and other delegates with utmost respect. Derogatory, offensive, and inappropriate remarks or acts will not be tolerated. Unruly behaviour will not be tolerated, and delegates found misbehaving may be subjected to disciplinary action(s) at the discretion of the Secretariat. Such behaviour will be classified broadly as either a minor infraction or major infraction.

Reporting Channel

To **report an incident** that breaches the Code of Conduct, you may send an anonymous report at the following link:

tinyurl.com/SMUN2026ReportingChannel

Delegate Conduct



Types of Infractions

Minor Infractions

A minor infraction is generally defined as *behaviour that disrupts the proceedings of committee and/or reduces the conduciveness and/or quality of the debate experience*. Such infractions can include, but are not limited to:

- Cross-talking during debate sessions, except during Unmoderated Caucuses,
- Disrespecting the Secretariat, Chairpersons and/or other delegates,
- Using electronic devices in a disruptive manner (such as browsing social media or playing music)

A minor infraction will be assessed by its impact on the proceedings, and depending on the severity of impact, will be handled via the following penalties, in order of escalation:

- Verbal warning from the Committee Chairpersons
- Suspension of speaking and/or any other rights from the Committee Chairpersons
- Verbal warning from the Secretariat
- Escalation of infraction to a **major infraction**, where harsher penalties will be meted out accordingly, with notice made to relevant Points-of-Contact

Major Infractions

A major infraction is generally defined as *malicious or wilful behaviour that severely disrupts the proceedings of committee and/or greatly affects the quality of the debate experience for the entire committee, a group of and/or a specific individual*.

These infractions are broadly classified into four major categories: **academic dishonesty, harassment, sexual harassment and disruptive behaviour**.

Delegate Conduct



Academic dishonesty

Delegates will be disqualified from any and all awards for SMUN 2026. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to: plagiarism, passing off AI work as your own, cheating or asking another individual (with the exception of your double delegate) to conduct research or draft documents on your behalf.

Harassment

Defined as *any act, gesture, speech or behaviour, that causes alarm or distress to another individual, or group of individuals*. Such acts can include but are not limited to:

- Aggressive gestures and speech in all mediums and forms,
- Verbal, non-verbal and/or physical abuse,
- Verbal and/or non-verbal threats and/or gestures indicating a threat,
- Remarks that harm the racial and/or religious feelings of an individual and/or group;
- Remarks of bigotry and/or of hateful or prejudicial nature towards any such individual and/or group;

Sexual harassment

Defined as *any behaviour amounting to sexual misconduct*. Such behaviours include but are not limited to:

- Flashing (i.e. indecent exposure),
- Sexual harassment in all mediums and forms,
- Outrage of modesty,
- Voyeurism;

Individuals accused of harassment or sexual harassment **may be suspended from the conference at the discretion of the Secretariat.**

Once claims of harassment (verbal, physical, sexual) are verified, it will lead to **immediate dismissal from the conference without appeal or refund, with notice**

Delegate Conduct



made to the relevant Points-of-Contact. Such cases may be referred to the relevant authorities for further criminal investigation, where necessary.

All conversations and disclosures related to the case will be **carried out in full confidentiality and anonymity**, to protect the identity of the victims and safeguard their well-being.

Disruptive Behaviour

Defined as *any cumulative behaviour of disruption with the willful intent to reduce the quality of debate experience.*

Such a major infraction will be designated following a series of minor infractions with the establishment of wilful intent. Major infractions owing to disruptive pattern(s) will lead to **verbal reprimand and suspension of rights**. Recidivism will lead to **dismissal from the conference with notice made to relevant Points-of-Contact**.

Overall, as the conference will be held on campus grounds of the National University of Singapore (NUS), delegates are also required to abide by the Students' Code of Conduct as prescribed by the University, even if they are not students of the University. More information regarding NUS Code of Conduct can be found here: <https://www.nus.edu.sg/campusconduct/>.

AI & Plagiarism Policy



AI & Plagiarism Policy

As one of Singapore's foremost conferences accommodating both local and international participants, the SMUN Secretariat condemns any individual committing or intending to commit plagiarism. This includes plagiarising one's past work, plagiarising someone else's work, or misusing AI platforms and passing off AI-generated content as one's own. The Secretariat holds a firm stance against any form of academic dishonesty, as it is contrary to the spirit of good sportsmanship, mutual respect between participants, and respect for published authors and their works.

Given that SMUN hosts participants of high calibre and experience in academic writing, as well as with the publication of this document outlining the Secretariat's position on plagiarism, a high academic standard is expected from all participants. Specifically, delegates are expected to do their due diligence when submitting all documents by ensuring no instance of plagiarism or AI misuse is present.

Delegates are forewarned that insisting one was not aware he or she had copied off a source or any other such claims of ignorance or carelessness will not be an adequate defence. A penalty proportional to the extent of plagiarism and addressing its intent will be meted out regardless.

As reference, a document may be considered as AI work or plagiarised if:

- Plagiarism exceeds **15%**
- Percentage of AI-written work exceeds **20%**

AI & Plagiarism Policy



Definition of Plagiarism

SMUN 2026's plagiarism policy will be categorised into two main types, namely **Type I** and **Type II**.

In both types of academic dishonesty, an act of academic dishonesty is committed when it is established, with strong evidence, that a document, or any part thereof, was copied from a source, or any part thereof. This document, which has been copied from the source, was then submitted as one's own work. These sources include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Text
- 2) Audio recordings
- 3) Images
- 4) Videos
- 5) Generative AI chatbots

To avoid committing plagiarism, one must respect authorship and cite the sources. This can be done through two methods.

- A. Any and all source material ought to be **paraphrased sufficiently and integrated into one's own work to the extent that the source material is indiscernible**. If one wishes to directly quote sections of the source word-for-word, one ought to do so explicitly by placing it in quotation marks or as a separate chunk of text.
 - a. It is unacceptable for a delegate to feed text into an AI chatbot for paraphrasing purposes and submit the final product directly; delegates are to demonstrate their own academic ability to rephrase any referenced material.
- B. Sources must be referenced diligently, with all references and acknowledgements made at appropriate junctures throughout any piece of work, using the **18th Edition Chicago Manual of Style (CMOS18)** Notes-Bibliography system. More information and details on citation guidelines for SMUN 2026 can be found in the **Citations and Style Guide** below.

Even if one were to convert the source from one form to another, an act of academic dishonesty would have been committed if a reasonable person cannot conclude that the plagiarised document, or its parts, could have been originally

AI & Plagiarism Policy



produced without copying from the source material. An example would be transcribing an audio recording of an interview word-for-word into a working paper and not citing the source.

Differentiating between **Type I** and **Type II** academic dishonesty involves a difference between the types of sources plagiarised. In **Type I**, the sources are officially published physically or online. Examples of sources resulting in **Type I** plagiarism include the following, but are not limited to:

- 1) Generative AI chatbots
- 2) Academic journals
- 3) Online interviews, podcasts or videos
- 4) Newspaper articles
- 5) Published books
- 6) Digital encyclopaedias and factoids
- 7) Research papers
- 8) SMUN Study Guides

In **Type II** plagiarism, the source being copied off is that of another participant at SMUN 2026. In Type II cases, a more detailed *Process of Inquiry* (established in the next section) is required to establish the chronology of events and the intention, causality and proximity of plagiarism.

Process of Inquiry

At the baseline, Chairpersons will analyse Position Papers and Draft Resolutions submitted for plagiarism. The Academics Team will also assist to afford an additional layer of checks to ensure that no act of academic dishonesty goes undetected. As for all other documents, the Secretariat maintains a level of trust with the participating delegates that due diligence is exercised, as checking for plagiarism at an excessive frequency will be counterproductive to conference execution.

If an act of academic dishonesty is sounded off either by the Chairpersons, Academics Team, Secretariat or via other delegates through verbal complaint or the Open Reporting Mechanism (ORM), a Process of Inquiry (POI) will be initiated to investigate the allegation and determine the appropriate measures to be undertaken.

AI & Plagiarism Policy



The Process of Inquiry is as follows:

- 1) The complainant party will be contacted by the Academics Team for more details on the plagiarism.
- 2) The plagiarism will be assessed for severity and be classified as **Type I** or **Type II**.
- 3) If the Plagiarism is **Type I**,
 - a. The Academics Team will obtain a copy of the suspected document from the accused party.
 - b. The Academics Team will conduct a plagiarism check on the suspected document
 - c. Based on the findings from b., the Academics Team will decide whether an act of academic dishonesty has been committed and if it has indeed been committed, the extent of the plagiarism will be assessed.
 - d. If found guilty, a penalty proportionate to the extent of plagiarism will be made known to the accused party and meted out.
- 4) If the Plagiarism is **Type II**,
 - a. The Academics Team will obtain the source copy of both the document suspected of plagiarism and the document suspected of being plagiarised from.
 - b. The chronology of writing and editing across the two documents will be established.
 - c. Relevant parties will be contacted for testimonies and witness reports as further evidence if need be.
 - d. Based on the findings from b. and c., the Academics Team will decide whether an act of academic dishonesty has been committed and if it has indeed been committed, the extent of the plagiarism will be assessed.
 - e. If found guilty, a penalty proportionate to the extent of plagiarism will be made known to the accused party and meted out.

As **Type II** plagiarism involves undocumented and unpublished source materials, the complainant and accused are advised to be forthcoming with their evidence and accounts at the POI so that an equitable outcome can be reached.

AI & Plagiarism Policy



Consequences and Penalties

As the Secretariat firmly condemns all acts of academic dishonesty, penalties are meted out on the first instance of academic dishonesty and escalated with repeat offences. These penalties will be adjusted on a situational basis and may include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Correction of document
- 2) Complete cessation of document circulation
- 3) Verbal reprimand
- 4) Written reprimand, forwarded to relevant Points-of-Contact
- 5) Temporary or permanent restriction of right to document publication
- 6) Disqualification from some or all awards
- 7) Suspension from conference

Prewriting Policy



Prewriting Policy

At SMUN 2026, the importance of discussion and collective effort is emphasised. Solutions should only be produced after topics have been sufficiently discussed in committee. It is similarly crucial that, at the start of the conference, all delegates start from an even playing field.

As such, the SMUN Secretariat condemns the practice of “prewriting”, or the writing of substantive content before the start of the conference. This practice reduces the academic rigour of the conference, hinders productive debate, and impedes interactive discussion and collaborative work. These are critical experiences that delegates should not, through prewriting, discount for themselves and their fellow committee members.

The following list is non-exhaustive. Before the first committee session, delegates will not be permitted to write out the following:

- 1) Draft Resolutions
- 2) Working Papers
- 3) Directives

Delegates will be permitted to write out the following before the conference begins:

- 1) Position Papers (Mandatory)
- 2) Personal Research
- 3) Stance Summaries
- 4) Speeches

Position Paper



Position Paper

A Position Paper provides a clear picture of a stakeholder's stance on a particular topic and its policies and interests. It should represent the viewpoints of the country or portfolio you are representing, which are separate from your personal opinions on the issue.

Delegates are required to complete and submit **one pdf document containing their Position Papers**. Each document should contain two position papers, one for each topic.

These papers should be submitted to this [Google Form Link](#) no later than **29 May 2026 (Fri), 2359 (GMT+8)**. Requests for **extensions** must be made **at least three days** before the deadline (26 May, 2359, GMT+8) and sent to your respective committee emails.

Submission of Position Papers are a prerequisite to qualify for any and all awards during the conference.

Note: Delegates from Press and PICC should prioritise the format instructed by their Chairpersons.

Position Paper



Format

Delegates are to adhere strictly to the following format:

1. Position Papers should be titled SMUN 2026 Position Paper_(Committee Name)_(Delegation).

Example: SMUN 2026 Position Paper_UNGA_United States of America

Crisis delegates do not need to submit a Position Paper.

2. Position Papers are to be written in **English**. Sections written in any language other than English will not be taken into account.
3. The Position Paper document should not exceed **500 words per topic**, excluding Bibliography.
4. Position Papers are to be written in prose, in Times New Roman, font size 12, single line spacing in justified alignment format, with one (1) inch margins and zero (0) kerning value.
5. Any referenced sources should be inserted as footnotes¹ in-text and compiled into a Bibliography at the end of the Position Paper, following the **Chicago Manual of Style, 18th Edition (CMOS18)** Notes-Bibliography system. A summary of expectations is outlined in the **Citations and Style Guide** section of this document.
6. The Position Paper document should be submitted as a pdf document to the following Google Form link: forms.gle/VknCBtXNDtA2eR5T6.

¹ This is a footnote. On Google Docs, you may use the shortcut ctrl + shift + F (Windows) or opt + cmd + F (iOS) to create a footnote. On Word Document, you may use the shortcut Alt + Ctrl + F (Windows) or opt + cmd + F (iOS) to create a footnote.

Position Paper



Guiding Questions

The following structure is a recommendation that you may choose to follow in writing your Position Papers. The sections and questions stated below are by no means exhaustive, and you are free to make any changes to the recommended structure or create your own.

Background

This section should focus on a basic overview of the contentious aspects of the issue. It is meant to identify critical components of the issue that your country believes should be the focus of debate.

1. What are the critical problems of the issue?
2. Why are these problems important to your portfolio, the committee and the world at large?
3. What are the proximal and root causes of these problems?

Stakeholder's Position

In this section, you should be identifying your country or portfolio's stance on the issue. These can vary significantly depending on the strategic interests, as well as the cultural and political viewpoint of the country or portfolio you are representing.

1. According to your country/portfolio, should this issue be solved, mitigated or left alone?
2. What are your country/portfolio's own policies on the issue? Has your country/portfolio taken any action?
3. What are the pros and cons of solving, mitigating or leaving the issue alone?
4. Is your country/portfolio being influenced by other external entities (e.g. other nations/regional organisations) into adopting specific stances/policies?

Position Paper



Possible Solutions

In this section, the focus should be on possible policies or measures that can be adopted by your committee in order to further advance your country/portfolio's objectives.

1. What solution would best advance your country/portfolio's interests?
2. Which part of the issue is your solution trying to solve?
3. Does your committee possess the mandate to carry out your proposal?
4. What is the cost of your solution? Can the committee/larger overarching body (e.g. United Nations) bear the cost? How will the solution be funded?
5. Would other countries/portfolios disagree with your solution? Why or why not?
6. Has your solution been implemented by the United Nations/regional and international governmental organisations/non-state entities and organisations/other countries/portfolios before? What are some benefits and limitations of the solution already in place?

Position Paper Example



Position Paper Example

Council: International Seabed Authority
Delegation: Federated States of Micronesia
Topic 1: Regulation of Deep Sea Mining

The Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) recognises the importance of regulating deep-sea mining to ensure the sustainable use of marine resources while protecting the fragile ecosystems of the ocean floor. As a nation comprising numerous islands, the FSM is acutely aware of the potential impacts of seabed mining on marine biodiversity and the livelihoods of coastal communities. In 2022, together with other island states such as Palau, Fiji, and Samoa, FSM joined an alliance in collaboration with the Deep Sea Conservation Coalition and the World Wildlife Fund, with a goal to put a moratorium on deep sea exploration until more research is conducted regarding impacts of deep sea mining.² Ultimately, FSM advocates for the development of a comprehensive regulatory framework that accounts for environmental consideration.

Historically, the FSM has supported initiatives aimed at protecting the marine environment...

The FSM calls for the establishment of clear guidelines in the areas of...

In conclusion, FSM is committed to advocating for...

Bibliography

1. Ryall, Julian. "Micronesia Joins Alliance to Stop Deep-Sea Mining – DW – 07/20/2022." dw.com, July 21, 2022. <https://www.dw.com/en/micronesia-joins-growing-pacific-alliance-to-stop-deep-sea-mining/a-62540242>.
2. Singh, Pradeep A., Aline Jaeckel, and Jeff A. Ardron. "A Pause or Moratorium for Deep Seabed Mining in the Area? The Legal Basis, Potential Pathways, and Possible Policy Implications." *Ocean Development & International Law* 56, no. 1 (January 2, 2025): 18–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00908320.2024.2439877>.

² Ryall, Julian. 2022. "Micronesia Joins Alliance to Stop Deep-Sea Mining." Dw.com. Deutsche Welle. July 20, 2022. <https://www.dw.com/en/micronesia-joins-growing-pacific-alliance-to-stop-deep-sea-mining/a-62540242>.

Citations & Style Guide



Citations & Style Guide

Diligent citing and referencing is necessary to protect any individual from involuntarily plagiarising. This section will describe definitively the standards and practices expected of all participants in citing and attributing their sources.

SMUN 2026 will adopt the **Chicago Manual of Style, 18th Edition Notes-Bibliography** (CMOS18-NB) system for academic citations and manuscript typesetting.

Expectations

To fully understand the requirements of CMOS18-NB, participants are recommended to read the guide provided by Purdue Online Writing Lab at the following [link](#). Furthermore, a comprehensive sample of CMOS18-NB citations and bibliography are provided by the same Lab at this [link](#).

However, we understand that there may be certain limitations with respect to the spectrum of writing applications used by participants, as well as the need to prevent pedantic correction. Therefore, participants are expected to maintain consistency in style when submitting documents.

Citations & Style Guide



The expectations are as below:

1. Maintain consistency in **headings and subheadings**. A system is recommended below:
 - a. **Level 1 Heading**
 - b. **Level 2 Heading**
 - c. **Level 3 Heading**
 - d. *Level 4 Heading*
 - e. Level 5 Heading – Body Text

To elaborate on the Level 5 heading, it is presented as a **run-in at the start of the body paragraph** rather than starting on a separate line.

2. All sources referenced in one's work **must be cited** as per the CMOS18-NB guidelines. Citations can be generated either via **Citation Machine** or **Google Scholar**. These sources include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Academic journals
 - b. Periodicals
 - c. Online or hardcopy books
 - d. Web sources
 - e. Audiovisual material
 - f. Legal and public materials
 - g. Interviews and other forms of declassified personal communication
3. In CMOS18-NB, the titles of referenced books and periodicals, or in general **large works**, appearing in the main body of one's work must be formatted in **italics with the first letter of every word capitalised**. The titles of chapters and articles, or in general **smaller works or works contained in a larger work**, appearing in the main body of one's work must be formatted **enclosed in double quotation marks with the first letter of every word capitalised**.
4. In CMOS18-NB, if one chooses to lift a section (i.e. extract content with no change or paraphrasing from the original source), the section lifted must be

Citations & Style Guide



enclosed within double quotation marks, with a mention of the original source in the same line. If the section lifted is **five lines or more**, the section lifted must **begin on a new line and indented from the main body**; the section lifted becomes a **block quotation**.

5. In CMOS18-NB, the cited source shall appear as a **footnote**, with the note number appearing as a **superscript** at the **end of the sentence or clause** in which content was cited from, **after punctuation marks**. The citation itself will manifest fully in the footnote of the same page, with the note-number **full-sized** and followed by a period.
6. In CMOS18-NB, if the same source is cited multiple times throughout the work, the usage of *ibid* or any other similar shorthand in the footnotes is **not advised**. Instead, participants should restate the name of the author and work, along with the specific page number, from which it was cited from. This means to say, citations of the same work **following the first occurrence** shall omit all other information, except for **name of work, name of author, and page number**.
7. In CMOS18-NB, the whole corpus of sources used in one's work shall be **compiled into a single bibliography** at the end of the document. The bibliography will start on a **new page** and have the heading "**Bibliography**" - bolded and centralised. Citations must be listed in **alphabetical order of the first author's name**. The citations must also be formatted with **hanging indents**.
8. In CMOS18-NB, all images, figures and tables referenced must be placed in the work **as soon as possible** after they are mentioned, which is generally **after the paragraph in which they are referenced**. For images, figures and tables, number the attachment (e.g. Table 1, Figure 2, Image 3, etc.) and provide a **short write-up** on what the attachment is in the caption, followed by a credit line (e.g. Photo by ... , Data adapted from ...).

Citations & Style Guide



9. For Creative Commons images, follow the Creative Commons attribution guidelines and **double-check the Creative Commons License** before using the said work. For attributions, the image caption should end with a short credit line similar to that in 8. Full Creative Commons attributions will appear at the end of the work under another section titled “**Multimedia Attributions and Credits**”.



Draft Resolutions



Draft Resolutions

Draft Resolutions are proposals submitted by one or more Member States for consideration and adoption by the committee. These documents often contain the various measures and ideas discussed by the committee. Due to the number of specialised non-UN committees at SMUN 2026, not all committees will submit draft resolutions in this format. You may refer to Study Guide annexes or Special Rules of Procedure documents provided by your Committee Chairpersons for reference. The following example is taken from the World Health Organisation (WHO) Resolution A/RES/64/265 (General Assembly resolution 64/265, 2010).

Draft Resolutions are structured as a single sentence, starting with the name of the committee. The Sponsors, Signatories, Committee Topic, and Draft Resolution Number (to be added by your Chairpersons) are stated at the top of every Draft Resolution.

Example

Sponsors: The United States of America, Japan, and the French Republic
Signatories: Canada, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, and The Swiss Federation
Committee Topic: Prevention and Control of Non-Communicable Diseases
Draft Resolution Number: 1

The General Assembly,

Draft Resolutions



Preambulatory Clauses

The Sponsors, Signatories, and Committee Topics are followed by the Preambulatory Clauses. This section states the reasons for the committee being convened, as well as highlights past international actions that have been taken regarding the issue.

Each clause starts with an *italicised* past participle, known as the preambulatory phrase, and ends with a comma.

Draft Resolutions



Example

Sponsors: The United States of America, Japan, and the French Republic

Signatories: Canada, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, and The Swiss Federation

Committee Topic: Prevention and Control of Non-Communicable Diseases

The General Assembly,

Recalling the United Nations Millennium Declaration and the 2005 World Summit Outcome, as well as the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields, in particular the health related development goals set out therein,

Recalling also all its resolutions related to global public health, including those related to global health and foreign policy, *Recalling* further its resolution 61/225 of 20 December 2006 in which it decided to designate and observe 14 November as World Diabetes Day,

Reaffirming the ministerial declaration of the 2009 high-level segment of the Economic and Social Committee, on the theme “Implementing the internationally agreed goals and commitments in regard to global public health”,

Noting with appreciation all relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the World Health Assembly on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases, and underlining the importance for Member States to continue addressing key risk factors for non-communicable diseases through the implementation of the 2008–2013 Action Plan for the Global Strategy for the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases, the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, the Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, and the evidence-based strategies and interventions to reduce the public health problems caused by the harmful use of alcohol,

Draft Resolutions



In general, Preambulatory Clauses are ordered based on its content. Any references to the United Nations Charter must be stated first. The first mention of the document must be referenced as “the Charter of the United Nations”, after which any further references may simply be stated as “the Charter”.

After the Charter, any references to past resolutions or decisions must be stated. The format for such references are as follows:

“Recalling Security Committee Resolution 338 (1973) of 22 October 1973,”

Any further references to the same resolution would only require the resolution number and year (e.g. Resolution 338 (1973)).

A non-exhaustive list of preambulatory phrases can be found in Annex A.

Draft Resolutions



Operative Clauses

Operative Clauses are the actions and/or recommendations proposed in the resolution, often after extensive negotiations by the committee.

Operative Clauses are always numbered. These clauses start with an underlined verb, known as the operative phrase, and end with a semicolon. The last clause is the only exception as it ends with a period.

A non-exhaustive list of operative phrases can be found in Annex B.

Draft Resolutions



Example

Sponsors: The United States of America, Japan, and the French Republic

Signatories: Canada, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, and The Swiss Federation

Committee Topic: Prevention and Control of Non-Communicable Diseases

The General Assembly,

Recalling the United Nations Millennium Declaration and the 2005 World Summit Outcome, as well as the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields, in particular the health related development goals set out therein,

Recalling also all its resolutions related to global public health, including those related to global health and foreign policy, Recalling further its resolution 61/225 of 20 December 2006 in which it decided to designate and observe 14 November as World Diabetes Day,

Reaffirming the ministerial declaration of the 2009 high-level segment of the Economic and Social Committee, on the theme “Implementing the internationally agreed goals and commitments in regard to global public health”,

Noting with appreciation all relevant resolutions and decisions adopted by the World Health Assembly on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases, and underlining the importance for Member States to continue addressing key risk factors for non-communicable diseases through the implementation of the 2008–2013 Action Plan for the Global Strategy for the Prevention and Control of Non-communicable Diseases, the World Health Organization Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, the Global Strategy on Diet, Physical Activity and Health, and the evidence-based strategies and interventions to reduce the public health problems caused by the harmful use of alcohol,

Draft Resolutions



1. Decides to convene a high-level meeting of the General Assembly in September 2011, with the participation of Heads of State and Government, on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases;
2. Also decides to hold consultations on the scope, modalities, format and organisation of the high-level meeting of the General Assembly on the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases, with a view to concluding consultations, preferably before the end of 2010;
3. Encourages Member States to include in their discussions at the high-level plenary meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the review of the Millennium Development Goals, to be held in September 2010, the rising incidence and the socio-economic impact of the high prevalence of non-communicable diseases worldwide;
4. Requests the Secretary-General to submit a report to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session, in collaboration with Member States, the World Health Organization and the relevant funds, programmes and specialised agencies of the United Nations system, on the global status of non-communicable diseases, with a particular focus on the developmental challenges faced by developing countries.

Where necessary, operative clauses can be categorised into **articles**, which are to be labelled succinctly. These labels are to be bolded, written in centre alignment format, and numbered using Roman numerals. For instance, operative clauses specifying actions to be undertaken to provide humanitarian support would follow after “Article I: Humanitarian Aid”, while those specifying actions to be undertaken in terms of peacekeeping would follow after “Article II: Peacekeeping”.

Draft Resolutions



Amendments

Amendments are proposed changes to parts of the Draft Resolution. For procedural matters, you may refer to the SMUN 2026 Rules of Procedures. When submitting amendments, please clearly denote whether the amendment is to Add Clause, Edit Clause or Delete Clause. The format for an amendment is as follows:

Original Clause: *Requests* that the following procedure is to be included;

Submitter: The United States of America

Signatories: The French Republic, Swiss Federation, Italy

Draft Resolution Number: 1

Add Clause A after Clause No. B

A. Requests that the following additional measure is to be included;

Edit Clause C

C. Requests Reminds that ~~the following procedure is to be included~~ **existing protocols based on RES/XXX/XXX are to be adhered to;**

Delete Clause D

D. Requests that the following procedure is to be included;

Draft Resolutions



Annex A: List of Preambulatory Phrases

List of Preambulatory Phrases		
Affirming	Expecting	Noting with deep concern
Alarmed by	Expressing its appreciation	Noting with regret
Approving	Expressing its satisfaction	Noting with satisfaction
Aware of	Fulfilling	Noting further
Bearing in mind	Fully alarmed	Noting with approval
Believing	Fully believing	Observing
Confident	Further deploring	Reaffirming
Contemplating	Further recalling	Realising
Convinced	Guided by	Recalling
Declaring	Having adopted	Recognising
Deeply concerned	Having considered	Referring
Deeply conscious	Having devoted attention	Seeking
Deeply convinced	Having examined	Taking into account
Deeply disturbed	Having heard	Taking into consideration
Deeply regretting	Having received	Taking note
Desiring	Having studied	Viewing with appreciation
Emphasising	Keeping in mind	Welcoming

Draft Resolutions



Annex B: List of Operative Phrases

Accepts	Draws the attention	Proclaims
Affirms	Emphasises	Reaffirms
Approves	Further invites	Recommends
Authorises	Encourages	Regrets
Calls	Expresses its appreciation	Reminds
Calls upon	Expresses its hope	Requests
Condemns	Further invites	Solemnly affirms
Confirms	Further proclaims	Strongly condemns
Congratulates	Further reminds	Supports
Considers	Further recommends	Takes note of
Declares accordingly	Further requests	Transmits
Deplores	Further resolves	Trusts
Designates	Notes	

Committee-Specific Mechanisms



Committee-Specific Mechanisms

At SMUN 2026, all mechanisms and Special Rules of Procedures will be appended to the respective committee's Study Guides directly or sent as a separate document by your Committee Chairpersons for relevance and coherence. Only mechanisms or procedures outlined in the committee's Study Guides or Special Rules of Procedure may override the procedural rules in the general SMUN 2026 Rules of Procedure.

In the event of dispute, the Committee Head Chairperson will have the final authority on what procedures are to be undertaken.

Delegate Assessment Rubrics (DAR)



Delegate Assessment Rubrics (DAR)

The Delegate Assessment Rubrics (DAR) will outline how delegates' performances will be assessed by the SMUN 2026 Academics Team and Chairpersons. The aim of the DAR is to provide a standardised evaluation procedure to encourage consistency and transparency in the justification of awards and feedback to respective delegates. As a university-level conference, SMUN will continue to uphold a high standard through a thorough and robust assessment matrix in order to induce greater academic rigour and encourage holistic development in delegates.

In line with conventional expectations of Model United Nations, the DAR will broadly assess delegates on:

1. **Stance**
2. **Content; evaluated through argumentation and solutions**
3. **Presence; evaluated through influence**

Delegates are to note that this list is not exhaustive and only serves to provide the foundations for Chairpersons to assess delegates. Additional components of assessment may be added depending on the specifications of the committee, and delegates will be informed of such additional significant components by the Committee Chairpersons prior to the commencement of the first committee session.

Delegate Assessment Rubrics (DAR)



Rubrics Breakdown

Stance

This category should be a reflection of the delegate’s understanding of their allocation, defined through words and actions that a delegate uses and expressed in council with speeches, voting, forming/joining blocs et cetera. The accuracy of a delegate’s stance should be judged by how closely it aligns with past actions of the country, whether they act in their national interest, and whether their ideological alignment is also grounded in reality — the latter determined by who they do and do not cooperate with in council.

Content

This category measures a delegate’s preparedness in tackling complex topics — a demonstration of how much critical research and analysis they have done on the issues at hand. It will be evaluated at SMUN 2026 through: (i) Argumentation and (ii) Solutions.

(i) Argumentation

Argumentation refers to the reasoning and lines of analysis that delegates use in the justification of their stance and solutions. While one can determine the stance of a country and hence act in that expected manner, argumentation requires the delegate to be able to justify their positions. Justification must be carried out with logical reasoning, grounded in reality and well-substantiated.

(ii) Solutions

Solutions are judged on their quality rather than their quantity. Good solutions must be feasible, taking into account the mandate of the council, the real-world situation, and the likelihood of the council to agree to such a solution. Ideally they also build upon previous solutions and hence indicate engagement with the historical context of the council. Innovative and creative solutions are appreciated, but only as far as they fulfil the above mentioned.

Delegate Assessment Rubrics (DAR)



Influence

A delegate's influence over the council will be observed by levels of support enjoyed in council. Rather than judging how skilled a delegate is at certain lobbying techniques, SMUN will evaluate the outcomes of your diplomacy rather than how it is carried out. The evaluation will account for varying ways a delegate's influence can be gauged, e.g.: bloc leadership, the support of other delegates for motions and resolutions, mentions in speeches, yields, etc..

Conduct

Veto factor leading to awards disqualifications. Refer to the *Code of Conduct* section.

Awards Policy



Awards Policy

General Awards Matrix

SMUN 2026 will be giving out a maximum of four (4) distinct types of awards per committee, unless otherwise stated in a committee's Special Rules of Procedure.

- 1) Best Delegate (BD)
- 2) Outstanding Delegate (OD)
- 3) Honourable Mention (HM)
- 4) Best Position Paper

Verbal Commendations may also be given out during the award ceremony at the discretion of the Committee Chairpersons.

All awards will be decided by Committee Chairpersons, with the advice of the Academics Team, where necessary. Decisions made by Committee Chairpersons **are final** and delegates will not be afforded any appeals or disputes on the awardees. The SMUN 2026 Secretariat reserves the sole right to rescind any and all awards awarded to any delegate if they are found to have breached the *Code of Conduct* during the duration of the conference.

Awards Policy



Discretionary Awards Policy

The Discretionary Awards Policy, including the Discretionary Best Delegate policy (DBD) is a policy that enables Committee Chairpersons to **not award 1 of 3 paper awards (BD, OD, HM)**. This does not apply to the Best Position Paper award.

The policy is in line with SMUN's objectives of maintaining high academic standards in the circuit and recognising delegate performance only when it is objectively impressive.

The policy allows Chairpersons to withhold any 1 of 3 paper awards. This may occur in the event the committee Chairpersons find the award contenders of their committee to be wholly undeserving of the award due to various possible thematic performance deficits that may include, but are not limited to:

- (a) Significant breakage of stance;
- (b) Significant isolation and ostracisation from traditional allies and blocs;
- (c) Significant erosion of state interests and objectives throughout proceedings, and especially in the committee outcome.

At the same time, fairness will be accorded to incoming participants at SMUN 2026 through the following means:

1. **Accountability**

Prior to the conference, the respective Committee Chairpersons would have done extensive research on the committee, topic and attending members. As such, they would have had a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of each attending member's objectives and endgames. This will be cross-referenced with the participant's conference performance and evaluated with respect to baseline and disqualifying indicators.

Awards Policy



2. Consultation

Chairpersons do not have the power to unilaterally withhold the awarding of a Best Delegate award. The decision to do so will be in consultation with the relevant Academics Directors, together with the Deputy Secretary-General (Academics). This ensures the decision is deliberated upon from as many perspectives as possible, such that the decision, if so arrived at, will be prudent and grounded. This serves as a check and balance against an otherwise unfounded call to not award a Best Delegate award.

3. Transparency

[Only applicable to DBD] If a decision to not award a Best Delegate is eventually arrived at, the Committee Chairpersons will present this decision during the awards ceremony. Thereafter, the committee's Head Chairperson will draft a formal email to the committee **within five (5) working days of the conference's conclusion** to elaborate and justify how the decision was arrived at. Delegates with further queries may send in an email to their respective committee emails.

Awards Policy: FAQ



Awards Policy: Frequently Asked Questions

1. What is the purpose of the DAR?

The DAR is meant to provide a consistent and transparent assessment method to improve the academic quality of Model United Nations in Singapore. By publishing the DAR, delegates will be encouraged to strive toward achievable goals while receiving a constructive appraisal of their performance. In other words, the DAR is designed to reflect the all-rounded characteristics that SMUN envisions an ideal delegate should possess.

2. How does the DAR affect awards consideration?

Chairpersons are expected to utilise the DAR in support of their knowledge, experience, and judgement, in order to provide accurate performance appraisal and identify deserving award winners. Award winners are expected to be the same delegates who attain relatively higher grading bands, although there is no requirement for awards decisions to be restricted to the top performers based on the DAR. Chairpersons are given the prerogative to present a Best Delegate award, as long as a minimum standard is assessed to have been met.

3. What scoring or tabulation method does the DAR adopt?

The DAR does not rely solely on scoring or tabulation methods as it is not a point system; instead, it allows Chairpersons to band delegates according to each individual's performance in the committee. The judgement of a single attribute will not bias that of any other attributes, and each criterion is considered independently. Each assessment category is not weighted equally; Chairpersons may prioritise different categories according to their respective committee mandate and Special Rules of Procedure, where applicable. Please consult your Committee Chairpersons for further clarification if necessary.

4. Are Chairpersons allowed to consider assessment standards not included in the DAR?

Awards Policy: FAQ



Chairpersons are encouraged to contextualise the DAR to meet their requirements as far as possible, according to their respective committee mandate and Special Rules of Procedure, where applicable. The respective Committee Chairpersons will brief the delegates prior to the commencement of the first committee session on any changes or deviations to the standard DAR outlined in this section.

While the DAR is designed to be holistic, it is not intended to be exhaustive; awards decisions will be well-justified with reference to the DAR, or in consideration of other mitigating or aggravating factors that are not listed. Delegates should note that the DAR is not a point system, that fulfilment of a particular criterion does not automatically confer awards, and that all awards decisions are finalised by the judgement of the Committee Chairpersons.

5. How will Chairpersons provide feedback in reference to the DAR?

If delegates request for detailed feedback, Chairpersons are encouraged to explain in the context of their committee and/or in relation to other delegates. Delegates should note that the DAR is not a point system, that fulfilment of a particular grading band does not automatically confer awards, and that all awards decisions are finalised by the judgement of the Committee Chairpersons.

Delegates should also only approach the Chairpersons for individual feedback **after the conference**. This is to mitigate any potential conflicts of interest and ensure fairness and impartiality in the awards decision.



Singapore MUN 2026

**Rules of
Procedure
(ROP)**

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Section I: General Rules	2
Section II: Representation, Voting Rights, and Quorum	4
Section III: Roll Call, Agenda Setting, and Opening Speeches	6
Section IV: General Speakers' List	9
Section V: Points	11
Section VI: Motions	12
Section VII: Working Papers	17
Section VIII: Draft Resolutions	18
Section IX: Amendments	22
Section X: Direct Voting Procedure on Draft Resolutions	25
Section XI: Conclusion of Debate	29
Section XII: Order of Precedence	30

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section I: General Rules

Rule 1.1

The following document shall be adopted as the official Rules of Procedure for Singapore Model United Nations (henceforth referred to as “SMUN”) 2026.

Rule 1.2

Each rule within this document is self-reliant unless otherwise modified by the committee Chairpersons (also referred to as the “Dais”), with the approval of the Academics Directorate. These modifications will supersede any rules stated in this document. If a situation that has not been addressed by the Rules of Procedure and/or Special Rules of Procedure arises, the committee Chairpersons, under the guidance of the Academics Directorate, will have the final authority to decide on the procedure to follow.

Rule 1.3

No other rules external to this document stipulating SMUN’s Rules of Procedure shall apply, unless otherwise stated in **Rule 1.2**.

Rule 1.4

English will be the only official working language of the conference.

Rule 1.5

Delegates are to abide by the Delegates’ Code of Conduct, as stipulated in the **Academics Guide**. Any breach(es) of the Code of Conduct may result in disciplinary action(s) at the discretion of the SMUN 2026 Secretariat; which can include: a formal letter of warning issued to the delegate and their respective affiliated institution(s), dishonourable dismissal from the conference without appeal or refund, and if necessary, escalation to the relevant authorities for further investigation.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section II: Representation, Voting Rights, and Quorum

Rule 2.1

Each member state in a committee will be represented by a single delegate. Observer entities will also be represented by a single delegate.

The double-delegate committees for SMUN 2026 are: the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), the Paris International Conference on Cambodia (PICC), and the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). These councils will be exceptions to this rule, in which each member state or observer entity will be represented by a delegation consisting of **two (2)** delegates. Each double-delegation will have **one (1)** vote on procedural and substantive matters.

Rule 2.2

Observer entities have the same rights and privileges as member states, except that they may not participate in voting on substantive matters or sponsor Draft Resolutions and Amendments.

Rule 2.3

A **Simple Majority** is a majority greater than **one-half ($>1/2$)** of the number of delegates present. When the number of delegates present is even, it will be **one-half plus one ($1/2 + 1$)**. When the number is odd, it will be **one-half, rounded up to the nearest whole number**.

Rule 2.4

A **Substantive Majority** is a majority of at least **two-thirds ($2/3$)** of the number of delegates present and voting, **rounded up to the nearest whole number**.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 2.5

A **Procedural Vote** is a vote to decide on committee matters involving debate procedure. Procedural Votes require a **simple majority** to pass. Abstentions are not allowed in Procedural Votes.

Rule 2.6

A **Substantive Vote** is a vote to decide on committee matters relating to Resolutions and Amendments. Substantive Votes require a **substantive majority** to pass. Abstentions are allowed in Substantive Votes, and the total vote count will exclude abstaining member states.

Rule 2.7

The quorum for all committees is set at **one-third** ($\frac{1}{3}$) of the total number of allocated members, **rounded up to the nearest whole number**, unless otherwise ruled by the Academics Directorate.

Rule 2.8

The committee shall only commence proceedings once the quorum is reached. Any committee that does not meet the quorum may only commence proceedings with the approval of the Academics Directorate.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section III: Roll Call, Agenda Setting, and Opening Speeches

Rule 3.1

At the start of each committee session, the Dais will conduct a Roll Call to take the attendance and voting status of delegates in the committee. Delegates may respond with one of the following statements:

Present — The delegate's attendance is recorded, and the delegate will have procedural voting rights for the duration of the committee session. However, they will not be entitled to vote on substantive matters or sponsor Draft Resolutions and Amendments. Observer entities may only state “Present” as their voting status.

Present and Voting — The delegate's attendance is recorded, and the delegate has voting rights for both procedural and substantive matters for the duration of the committee session. They are also allowed to sponsor Draft Resolutions and Amendments.

Rule 3.2

Once a delegate has indicated their voting status, they are not permitted to change their status during the committee session.

Rule 3.3

Delegates who have missed Roll Call are to indicate their attendance by sending a note to the Dais, stating their country or portfolio representation and their voting status.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 3.4

If the committee has more than one topic to discuss, the committee shall proceed to set the agenda for debate once the first committee session is declared open, following the procedures in **Rules 3.5-3.8**.

Rule 3.5

Delegates wishing to change the default order of the topics may raise a *Motion to Set the Agenda*. This Motion requires a **procedural vote** to pass.

Rule 3.6

Upon the passage of the *Motion to Set the Agenda*, the Dais shall recognise **two (2)** speakers speaking “For” and **two (2)** speakers speaking “Against” the default order of the topics. Each speaker will have **ninety (90)** seconds to make their speech.

Rule 3.7

At the end of all the speeches, the committee will conduct a **procedural vote** on changing the order of the topics. The order of topics which receives a simple majority will be adopted as the official order of the topics for the committee.

Rule 3.8

In any of the following situations, the agenda-setting procedure will lapse automatically, and the committee will follow the default order of topics:

- a. In the event that the *Motion to Set the Agenda* does not receive a procedural majority and is not passed, or
- b. In the event that the procedural vote on changing the order of the topics fails, or
- c. In the event that there are no speakers who wish to speak “For” or “Against” the default order of the topics.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 3.9

Following the conclusion of the agenda-setting process, the committee will proceed with opening speeches on the first topic. Every delegate is required to give an opening speech, and will be given **sixty (60)** seconds to make their opening speech. Yielding is not in order during opening speeches.



Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section IV: General Speakers' List

Rule 4.1

After Opening Speeches have concluded, the General Speakers' List (GSL) will be opened. The default speaking time on the GSL is **sixty (60)** seconds. Only the time used by the speaking delegate will count towards the speaking time.

Rule 4.2

Following the conclusion of the delegate's speech on the GSL, the delegate must yield their time using **one (1)** of the following yields:

a. Yield to Points of Information

This yield allows other delegates to ask the speaking delegate questions related to the speech.

b. Yield to Another Delegate

This yield allows the speaking delegate to pass on the remaining time on their GSL speech to another delegate. If the first yield to another delegate is refused, the speaking delegate may attempt to yield **once more** to another delegate.

c. Yield to the Dais

This yield signals a delegate's conclusion of their speech and allows the Dais to call upon the next speaker.

Rule 4.2.1

When yielding to Points of Information or to another delegate, the delegate must have a minimum of **fifteen (15)** seconds of speaking time left.

Rule 4.2.2

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Yields to the second degree, defined as an attempt to yield to any entity other than the Dais following a successful first-degree yield, will not be in order.

Rule 4.2.3

In the following scenarios, the time will automatically be yielded back to the Dais:

- a. When the speech timer elapses after a successful yield to Points of Information or to another delegate, or
- b. When there are no more Points of Information to be answered by the delegate, or
- c. When the delegate who accepted a yield from another delegate completes their speech before the speech timer elapses, or
- d. When **two (2)** delegates have refused yields from the same delegate in the same speech.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section V: Points

Rule 5.1

The following Points will be in order for SMUN 2026:

a. Point of Personal Privilege

A delegate may raise this Point if the environment causes the delegate to face difficulties in focusing on the committee proceedings. A Point of Personal Privilege on the basis of audibility is the only Point that may interrupt a speaker.

b. Point of Parliamentary Inquiry

If the delegate is uncertain about the Rules of Procedure or any procedural matter regarding the ongoing debate, the delegate may raise this Point to clarify the issue with the Dais. This Point shall only be used to clarify committee-related matters.

c. Point of Order

If the delegate believes that the Dais has deviated from or made an error with regard to the Rules of Procedure, the delegate may raise this Point to correct such deviations or errors.

d. Right to Reply

If a delegate (**A**) believes that another delegate (**B**) has insulted either **A** or the nation **A** is representing, **A** may raise a *Right to Reply* at the end of **B**'s speech. The Dais will request **A**'s reason for the *Right to Reply*, after which they will determine if the *Right to Reply* is valid. If the Dais finds **A**'s *Right to Reply* to be valid, they may compel the offending delegate **B** to publicly apologise for their remarks, and may subject **B** to further disciplinary action.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section VI: Motions

Rule 6.1

A **Motion** is a formal proposal raised by a delegate to request that the committee take certain specific actions. The Dais may choose to budget out specific timings in which delegates are invited to raise Motions.

Rule 6.2

Any delegate wishing to raise a Motion may raise their placard until they are recognised by the Dais. When recognised, the delegate is to state the Motion they are proposing clearly.

Rule 6.3

In the event that multiple delegates have raised Motions, the Motions will be voted upon according to the *Order of Precedence*.

Rule 6.4

The committee will then vote on the Motion. If the Motion passes, the committee acts on the Motion. If the Motion fails, the committee will either move to vote on the next proposed Motion, or carry on with its present undertaking if there are no other proposed Motions.

Rule 6.5

Procedural Motions are Motions that concern the procedures of debate and require a **procedural vote** to pass.

Before the commencement of a procedural vote, the Dais will ask for seconds and objections for the Motion. Any Motion with seconds and no objections will automatically pass, while any Motion with no seconds will automatically fail. If there are both seconds and objections, the committee will move to a **procedural vote** for the Motion.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 6.6

Substantive Motions are Motions that concern substantive actions of consequence which the committee desires to or is refraining from executing, namely, the passing or tabling of Draft Resolutions and Unfriendly Amendments. Substantive Motions require a **substantive vote** to pass.

Rule 6.7

If the delegate would like the committee to temporarily narrow the scope of discussion, the delegate may raise a *Motion for a Moderated Caucus*. The committee will then conduct a **procedural vote** on the Motion.

Rule 6.8.1

Moderated Caucuses operate similarly to a GSL, with a set number of speakers to speak on the topic of the Moderated Caucus for a fixed duration per speaker.

Rule 6.8.2

When raising a *Motion for a Moderated Caucus*, the delegate will have to state the intended topic of discussion, total speaking time, and the duration of speech for each speaker.

Rule 6.8.3

If a delegate wishes to extend the duration of the Moderated Caucus, they may do so by raising a *Motion to Extend Moderated Caucus*, specifying the duration of the extension. Such a Motion will then be put to a **procedural vote**. A *Motion to Extend Moderated Caucus* must be raised before the time for the Moderated Caucus elapses.

Rule 6.8.4

The total speaking time for a Moderated Caucus, excluding extensions, cannot exceed **twenty (20)** minutes. With extensions under the *Motion to Extend Moderated Caucus*, the total time of the Moderated Caucus cannot exceed **thirty (30)** minutes.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



The total speaking time should also be perfectly divisible by the individual speaking time.

Rule 6.8.5

If a delegate (**A**) has raised a *Motion for a Moderated Caucus*, and another delegate (**B**) wishes to retain the selected topic but modify the total or individual speaking time, **B** will have to raise it as a separate Motion.

Rule 6.8.6

In the event there is more than **one (1)** *Motion for a Moderated Caucus* raised at any point in time, the Moderated Caucus with a greater total duration is deemed more disruptive, followed by the Moderated Caucus that can accommodate a greater maximum number of speakers.

Rule 6.8.7

Upon the passage of a *Motion for a Moderated Caucus*, the delegate who raised the Motion may indicate to the Dais whether they would like to speak first or last in the Caucus. Thereafter, other delegates may indicate their interest in speaking on the Caucus by raising their placard once the Dais has called for speakers. Delegates are not allowed to change the speaking order on the list once recognised by the Dais.

Rule 6.8.8

If the full duration of the Caucus is not utilised after the last recognised speaker on the Moderated Caucus has spoken, the Dais may open the floor to more speakers at their discretion. This rule only applies if the delegate who raised the Moderated Caucus has either spoken as the first speaker of the Caucus or has yet to make their speech as the last speaker of the Caucus.

Rule 6.8.9

A delegate may not speak more than once in the same Moderated Caucus.

Rule 6.9.1

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



If the delegate would like the committee to discuss various issues in a more informal manner, the delegate may raise a *Motion for an Unmoderated Caucus*. When raising this Motion, the delegate will have to state the total time of the Unmoderated Caucus. No topic is required to be stated for an Unmoderated Caucus. The committee will then conduct a **procedural vote** on the Motion.

Rule 6.9.2

Assuming the Motion passes, formal committee proceedings will be temporarily suspended during the Unmoderated Caucus, allowing delegates to freely move around and speak to other delegates.

Rule 6.9.3

If a delegate (A) has raised a *Motion for an Unmoderated Caucus*, and the delegate (B) wishes to modify the total Caucus time, B will have to raise it as a separate Motion to the Dais.

Rule 6.9.4

If a delegate wishes to extend the duration of the Unmoderated Caucus, they may do so by raising a *Motion to Extend Unmoderated Caucus*, specifying the duration of the extension. Such a Motion will then be put to a **procedural vote**. A *Motion to Extend Unmoderated Caucus* must be raised before the time for the Unmoderated Caucus elapses.

Rule 6.9.5

The total time of the Unmoderated Caucus, excluding extensions, cannot exceed **twenty (20)** minutes. With extensions under the *Motion to Extend Unmoderated Caucus*, the total time of the Unmoderated Caucus cannot exceed **thirty (30)** minutes.

Rule 6.9.6

Upon the conclusion of the Unmoderated Caucus, the delegate who raised the Motion will be recognised by the Dais and must give a speech of no longer than

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



sixty (60) seconds, summarising what the committee has discussed during the Unmoderated Caucus.

Rule 6.10

If delegates wish to change the speaking time on the GSL, a *Motion to Amend the Speaking Time on the General Speakers' List* may be raised, which will require a **procedural vote** to pass.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section VII: Working Papers

Rule 7.1

Working Papers are documents drafted by delegates in order to highlight or propose certain ideas to the committee.

Rule 7.2

Working Papers have no standardised format, but must be presented in the form of a Portable Document Format (.pdf) file, or a Microsoft Word (.docx) document. Delegates may submit a Working Paper for approval by sending it directly to the committee email.

Rule 7.3

Working papers must be properly cited where necessary, using the Chicago Manual of Style (18th Edition), Notes-Bibliography (NB) system.

Rule 7.4

Working Papers do not require Signatories, but must mention the member state(s) (co-)submitting them.

Rule 7.5

Delegates are not permitted to reference the Working Paper in formal debate before it has been approved by the Dais.

Rule 7.6

The Dais reserves the right to reject any Working Paper for cause.

Rule 7.7

Delegates may request the Dais to screen any approved Working Paper during GSL speeches and Moderated Caucus speeches, subject to the approval of the Dais.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section VIII: Draft Resolutions

Rule 8.1

A **Draft Resolution** (henceforth referred to as “Resolution”) is a written solution to the problems discussed within the committee, and is to be written in the form of a single, continuous sentence.

Rule 8.2

Sponsors are delegates who are the main writers and supporters of the Draft Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment.

Rule 8.3

Signatories are delegates who are interested in seeing a Draft Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment being introduced to formal debate, and generally support the Draft Resolution, but may not necessarily support the entire Resolution.

Rule 8.4

A Resolution consists of two sections — preambulatory clauses and operative clauses.

- a. **Preambulatory clauses** describe the issue being discussed, acknowledge and reference past actions taken, explain the purpose of the Resolution, and offer support for the operative clauses that follow. Each clause begins with an *italicised verb* in continuous tense and ends with a comma.
- b. **Operative clauses** state the appropriate discussed actions, ideally in detail, to be undertaken by the committee. Each clause begins with an underlined active verb in the present tense, and ends with a semicolon (;) except for the last clause, which ends with a full stop (.).

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 8.5

Each Resolution shall have a minimum of **two (2)** Sponsors, and a maximum of **five (5)** Sponsors or **twenty per cent (20%)** of the members present in committee, whichever is lower.

Rule 8.6

A minimum of at least **twenty per cent (20%)** of the members present in committee, **rounded up to the nearest whole number**, must be either a Sponsor or Signatory for the Resolution to be introduced.

Rule 8.7

Draft Resolutions must be presented in the form of a Microsoft Word (.docx) document only. Delegates may submit a Draft Resolution for approval by sending it directly to the committee email.

Rule 8.8

Delegates are not permitted to reference any Resolution(s) in their speeches before they have been officially introduced.

Rule 8.9

The Dais reserves the right to reject any Draft Resolution for cause.

Rule 8.10.1

Once the Dais has vetted and approved the Resolution, a Sponsor may proceed to introduce their Resolution by raising a *Motion to Introduce Draft Resolution*. The committee will then conduct a **procedural vote** on the Motion.

Rule 8.10.2

Upon passing the *Motion to Introduce Draft Resolution*, the committee will be given **five (5)** minutes to read the Resolution. The Dais may amend the amount of reading time given at their discretion.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 8.10.3

After the reading time has elapsed, the committee will enter a **ten (10)** minute Question and Answer (Q&A) session with all Sponsors of the Resolution, following the format of *Points of Information*, where delegates will raise their placards and await to be recognised by the Dais before rising to ask a question. Each question may only be answered by one Sponsor.

Rule 8.10.4

After the time for the Q&A session has elapsed, the committee will re-enter Open Debate.

Rule 8.11

All Resolutions introduced to council through a *Motion to Introduce Draft Resolution* may be referenced during formal debate.

Rule 8.12

If at least **one-half** ($\frac{1}{2}$) of the Operative Clauses in the Resolution are substantially modified or removed, or the number of Sponsors falls below the minimum number required, the Resolution will automatically be tabled.

Rule 8.13

If a delegate would like to withdraw any Resolution from being discussed in Open Debate, the delegate may raise a *Motion to Table Draft Resolution*. The Dais may, at their discretion, recognise the delegate who is raising this motion to justify their actions to the committee through a formal speech of no longer than **sixty (60)** seconds. Following this, the committee will then conduct a **procedural vote** on the passage of the Motion.

Rule 8.14

In a *Motion to Table Draft Resolution*, the committee will conduct a **substantive vote** on whether to table the Draft Resolution in question. Should this vote be successful,

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



the Resolution will be tabled. Should this vote be unsuccessful, the committee will move back to its present undertaking.

Rule 8.15

A tabled Resolution must be submitted as a new Resolution should delegates wish to discuss it once more, following the procedures outlined in this document. However, a **simple majority** of the clauses must be amended for the new Resolution to be valid.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section IX: Amendments

Rule 9.1

If a delegate would like to make modifications to the Resolution, the delegate may do so by introducing either a *Friendly Amendment* or an *Unfriendly Amendment*.

Rule 9.2

Similar to a Draft Resolution, a delegate is not permitted to reference any Amendments in the delegate's speeches if it has not been introduced to formal debate.

Rule 9.3

The Dais reserves the right to reject any Amendment for cause.

Rule 9.4

Friendly Amendments are Amendments that are submitted and agreed upon by **all** Sponsors. These Amendments do not require any formal voting procedures to be passed and executed.

Rule 9.5.1

The delegate submitting the Friendly Amendment is to obtain the consent of **all** Sponsors of the Resolution upon drafting a Friendly Amendment to said Resolution.

Rule 9.5.2

The delegate is to send a copy of their Friendly Amendment to the committee email for vetting by the Dais, with all Sponsors of the Resolution carbon copied ("CC") in the email.

Rule 9.5.3

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Once the Dais has vetted and approved the delegate's Friendly Amendment, the Dais will announce and automatically execute the stipulated Amendments on the Resolution without requiring the committee to vote.

Rule 9.6

Unfriendly Amendments are Amendments which do not have the full consent of **all** Sponsors of the Resolution. Unfriendly Amendments may be raised by any member of the committee.

Rule 9.7

Unfriendly Amendments must be voted upon and require a **substantive majority** to be passed and executed.

Rule 9.8

Unfriendly Amendments may have a minimum of **one (1)** Sponsor, and a maximum of **five (5)** Sponsors or **twenty per cent (20%)** of the members present in committee, whichever is lower.

Rule 9.9

A minimum of at least **ten per cent (10%)** of the members present in committee, **rounded up to the nearest whole number**, must be either a Sponsor or Signatory for the Unfriendly Amendment to be introduced.

Rule 9.10

The delegate is to send a copy of their Unfriendly Amendment to the committee email for vetting by the Dais, with all Sponsors of the Unfriendly Amendment carbon copied ("CC") in the email.

Rule 9.11.1

Once the Dais has vetted and approved the Unfriendly Amendment, the delegate may raise a *Motion to Introduce Unfriendly Amendment*. The committee will then conduct a **procedural vote** on the Motion.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 9.11.2

Upon passing this Motion, the committee moves into Closed Debate on the Unfriendly Amendment. The format for Closed Debate will follow the format for Closed Debate in Direct Voting Procedure on Draft Resolutions. However, the Dais reserves the right to amend the speaking time or number of speakers for Closed Debate on Unfriendly Amendments.

Rule 9.11.3

Upon the conclusion of Closed Debate on the Unfriendly Amendment, the committee will automatically move into Direct Voting Procedure on the Unfriendly Amendment and conduct a **substantive vote** on the Unfriendly Amendment.

Rule 9.11.4

If the substantive vote is successful, the stipulated Amendments proposed in the Unfriendly Amendment will be executed on the Resolution.

Rule 9.11.5

In the event an Unfriendly Amendment fails a substantive vote, a delegate may raise a *Motion to Divide the Question*, following the procedure for such Motions. If an Unfriendly Amendment fails substantive voting **twice**, it will be automatically tabled.

Rule 9.11.6

A delegate who has sponsored a Draft Resolution is allowed to withdraw from being a Sponsor should any passed Unfriendly Amendments go against the stance of the delegate's stakeholder. They may do so by sending a note to the Dais.

Rule 9.11.7

The Dais may, at their discretion, recognise the delegate who is withdrawing as a Sponsor to a Resolution to justify their actions to the committee through a formal speech of no longer than **sixty (60)** seconds.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section X: Direct Voting Procedure on Draft Resolutions

Rule 10.1

At any point in time during Open Debate, a delegate may raise the *Motion to Close Debate and Move into Direct Voting Procedure on Draft Resolution (DVP)*. This Motion requires a **procedural vote** to pass.

Rule 10.2

Once passed, all Resolutions presently introduced to the committee will be consecutively put to a vote. The order of voting will be based on the initial order of introduction, unless modified by a *Motion to Reorder Draft Resolutions*.

Rule 10.3

Immediately after the committee has moved into Direct Voting Procedure, Delegates may raise a *Motion to Reorder Draft Resolutions*. This Motion may only be raised once at the start of each Direct Voting Procedure, and if there are multiple Resolutions on the floor. If passed, this Motion will change the order of the Resolutions being voted on. A *Motion to Reorder Draft Resolutions* requires a **procedural vote** to pass. Only one *Motion to Reorder Draft Resolutions* may pass in each Direct Voting Procedure.

Rule 10.4

During Direct Voting Procedure, the doors to the committee venue shall be sealed, and delegates will not be allowed to enter or leave the committee room. Delegates not present in the committee venue will be considered absent for the purposes of the substantive vote.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 10.5

Before voting on each Resolution, the committee will move into Closed Debate on the specific Resolution that will be voted upon next, where the Dais shall recognise **two (2)** delegates speaking “For” and **two (2)** delegates speaking “Against” the Resolution in question. Each speaker in the Closed Debate will be allotted **ninety (90)** seconds for their speech.

Rule 10.6

Once Closed Debate on the Resolution has elapsed, the committee will vote on the Resolution in question.

Rule 10.7

All Resolutions require a **substantive majority** to pass.

Rule 10.8

Abstentions during substantive voting will be in order. In the event of abstentions, the committee attendance will be adjusted to remove the abstaining delegates to determine the new substantive majority.

Rule 10.9

The following Motions may be raised when the committee has entered Direct Voting Procedure, and all require a **procedural vote** to pass. These Motions shall only apply to the current Resolution being discussed. The Motions may only be raised before voting on the incumbent Resolution, or immediately following a failed substantive vote on a Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment, and may be enforced simultaneously:

a. Motion to Divide the Question

The *Motion to Divide the Question* forces a substantive vote to be conducted on individual components of the Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment in question, as opposed to the Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment as a whole. The process of such a Motion is described below.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



A delegate raising this Motion must specify how the Question should be divided (i.e., Divide by Article or Divide by Clause). If passed, individual components of the Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment require a **substantive majority** to be retained, and any components failing to reach that threshold will be struck off. All the retained components will then be compiled as a new Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment, and the new Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment will immediately go through substantive voting, requiring a **substantive majority** to pass.

b. Motion for a Roll Call Vote

A *Motion for a Roll Call Vote* requires delegates to individually cast their vote for the Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment in question, in the alphabetical order of their country names.

There will be two rounds of voting. In the first round, delegates may vote “For”, “Against”, “Abstain”, or “Pass”. A delegate who has voted “Pass” would be taken to have not participated in the first round of voting and will be required to vote in the second round. In the second round, delegates who have voted “Pass” in the first round will now vote “For”, “Against”, or “Abstain” on the Resolution or Unfriendly Amendment. The total number of votes cast for “For”, “Against” and “Abstain” are tallied from both rounds of voting.

Rule 10.10

Once a Resolution is passed, all discussions on the current topic will be concluded. Any Resolution which has not yet been voted on will be automatically tabled.

Rule 10.11

If a Resolution has failed substantive voting **twice**, it shall be automatically tabled. The committee will then continue with Closed Debate and substantive voting on the next Resolution, if there are multiple Resolutions on the floor. If no Resolutions are

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



passed at the end of the Direct Voting Procedure, the committee will revert to the General Speakers' List.

Rule 10.12

A delegate may also raise a *Motion to Table the Question*, subject to chair's discretion, and requiring a **substantive majority** to pass. If passed, the committee will immediately conclude all discussions on the current topic. The *Motion to Table the Question* may be raised at any point during committee discussions on the topic, except when DVP is in progress.

Rule 10.13

If there is a second topic, the committee will move on to the second topic, beginning with opening speeches, following the passage of a Resolution for the first topic or a successful *Motion to Table the Question*.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section XI: Conclusion of Debate

Rule 11.1

The following Motions may be raised at the end of committee sessions to conclude debate.

a. Motion to Suspend Debate

A *Motion to Suspend Debate* may be raised when the committee is temporarily pausing the debate for administrative reasons, such as a lunch break.

b. Motion to Adjourn Debate

A *Motion to Adjourn Debate* may be raised when the committee is permanently ending debate during the last committee session of the conference.

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Section XII: Order of Precedence

Rule 12.1

The following Points and Motions are listed in order from most disruptive to least disruptive:

- a. Point of Personal Privilege
- b. Point of Order
- c. Point of Parliamentary Inquiry
- d. Right to Reply
- e. Motion to Adjourn Debate
- f. Motion to Suspend Debate
- g. Motion for an Unmoderated Caucus
- h. Motion for a Moderated Caucus
- i. Motion to Extend Moderated/Unmoderated Caucus
- j. Motion to Introduce Draft Resolution
- k. Motion to Introduce Unfriendly Amendment
- l. Motion to Table Draft Resolution
- m. Motion to Close Debate and Move into Direct Voting Procedure on Draft Resolution
- n. Motion to Table the Question
- o. Motion to Amend the Speaking Time on the General Speakers' List
- p. Motion to Set the Agenda

Rules of Procedure (ROP)



Rule 12.2

When the committee is in voting procedure on a Draft Resolution, the following Motions are deemed most to least superseding:

- a. Motion to Reorder Draft Resolutions
- b. Motion to Divide the Question by Clause
- c. Motion to Divide the Question by Article
- d. Motion for a Roll Call Vote