



LOK SABHA

RACMUN 2026

LOK SABHA

Agenda - “Reservation Policy: Reform, Expansion, or Status Quo”

Disclaimer - The agenda for this committee involves discussion on complex social and policy issues. Participants are expected to engage in respectful, academic, and policy-oriented debate at all times. Any remarks that are personal, derogatory, or targeted towards individuals or communities will not be tolerated. All statements made during the committee are strictly in the capacity of assigned portfolios and do not reflect personal views. The decisions of the Executive Board and Organizing Committee regarding conduct and procedure shall be final.

PART 1

MODEL LOK SABHA: STRUCTURE, ROLES, AND WHO IS WHO

Model Lok Sabha is a simulation of the Indian Parliament’s Lower House, where delegates represent real political parties and act according to their ideological positions, parliamentary strength, and public stance. Unlike MUN, this committee is not based on diplomacy between nations but on domestic policy-making, political negotiation, ideological clashes, and legislative responsibility. Since the agenda is a National Review on the Caste-Based System, debate will revolve around constitutional values, social justice, affirmative action, equality, representation, historical disadvantage, policy implementation, and social cohesion. Delegates are expected to speak as Indian lawmakers, not as neutral observers.

The House is presided over by the Speaker, who ensures order, enforces rules, recognizes speakers, and maintains neutrality. The Speaker does not participate in debate. Assisting the Speaker is the Deputy Speaker, who supports procedural flow and may preside in certain sessions. Together, they form the presiding authority of the House.

The Executive Board (EB) functions as the procedural and evaluative body. They interpret rules, approve motions, manage debate flow, and assess delegate performance for awards. The EB does not take political sides and does not influence outcomes.

Delegates are divided into two broad sides: the Treasury Benches and the Opposition Benches.

The Treasury Benches consist of the ruling party or coalition currently in power at the Centre. Members on this side are expected to defend existing policies, justify government actions, respond to criticism, and propose reforms without undermining their own administration. Ministers sit on the Treasury Benches.

The Opposition Benches include all parties not part of the ruling government. Their role is to question, critique, expose flaws, propose alternatives, and hold the government accountable. Opposition members are not required to oppose everything, but they must challenge policies logically and politically.

Some delegates may represent regional or smaller parties. These members often play a crucial role in negotiations, amendments, and voting, as they can shift balance during resolutions. Their stance may vary depending on regional interests, ideological alignment, or political advantage.

Certain delegates will hold ministerial portfolios, such as Minister of Social Justice and Empowerment, Minister of Law and Justice, Minister of Education, or Minister of Home Affairs. Ministers are expected to speak with authority, present data, defend legislation, and respond directly to allegations raised by the Opposition.

Other delegates will be Members of Parliament without ministerial portfolios. Their role is equally important. They raise issues, support or oppose resolutions, ask questions, participate in caucuses, and contribute to bloc formation.

The flow of power in the House is determined by numbers. The ruling side generally has numerical advantage, but resolutions, amendments, and outcomes can still change through negotiation, alliances, and persuasive debate. Therefore, collaboration and strategic communication are essential.

Debate in Lok Sabha is more direct and political than in MUN. Delegates are expected to use constitutional references, government schemes, committee reports, census data, and real socio-political examples. Emotional arguments are allowed, but they must be grounded in logic and parliamentary language.

Respect for decorum is mandatory. Personal attacks, unparliamentary language, or direct accusations without basis are not permitted. All remarks must be addressed through the Chair and framed institutionally.

This structure ensures that every delegate, regardless of party size or portfolio, has space to contribute meaningfully if they understand their role clearly.

PART 2

BACKGROUND STUDY FOR THE AGENDA

“Reservation Policy: Reform, Expansion, or Status Quo”

The agenda “Reservation Policy: Reform, Expansion, or Status Quo” is not a generic social issue. It is a constitutional, political, administrative, and social policy question. Background study for this agenda is not about memorising facts; it is about understanding why reservation exists, how it operates, where it succeeds, where it fails, and what different political parties want to do with it.

Delegates are expected to approach this agenda as lawmakers reviewing a national policy framework, not as activists or commentators.

First, it is important to understand what counts as a valid source and what does not. Wikipedia is not considered a valid source for background research in this committee. It may help you understand basic terminology privately, but anything derived from Wikipedia should not be cited or relied upon in debate. If a delegate repeatedly uses information that clearly originates from Wikipedia-style summaries, it will be considered weak research.

Acceptable sources include:

- Official Government of India websites (Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Ministry of Law and Justice, PIB, Parliament Digital Library)
- Constitutional documents (Articles 14–17, Articles 15(4), 15(5), 16(4), 16(4A))
- Reports of constitutional bodies (Mandal Commission, Justice Rohini Commission, National Commission for Scheduled Castes, National Commission for Backward Classes)

- Judgments of the Supreme Court of India (Indra Sawhney case, M. Nagaraj case, Jarnail Singh case, EWS judgment)
- Data from Census of India and National Sample Survey (where available)
- News articles from relatively neutral or international outlets such as Al Jazeera, The Hindu, Indian Express, BBC, Scroll (editorial reading allowed but should be balanced)

Highly partisan opinion pieces, political YouTube videos, Instagram posts, and WhatsApp forwards are not acceptable sources.

Background study should be done in four layers, not randomly.

The first layer is constitutional and legal understanding. Every delegate must know why reservation exists constitutionally. This includes equality before law, substantive equality versus formal equality, and why special provisions were allowed despite Article 14. You should know which Articles permit reservation and under what conditions. This layer helps you avoid making legally incorrect arguments.

The second layer is policy structure and categories. Delegates should clearly understand the difference between SC, ST, OBC, and EWS reservations, how percentages evolved, what the 50% ceiling means, and where exceptions exist. Many debates collapse because delegates mix categories or quote incorrect percentages.

The third layer is implementation and outcomes. This includes data on representation in education, government jobs, judiciary, and administration. You are not expected to memorise numbers, but you should know broad trends: where reservation has improved access, where it has not, and where gaps remain.

The fourth layer is political positioning. Since this is Lok Sabha, not MUN, political ideology matters. Delegates must know how their assigned party has historically viewed reservation, what it has promised in manifestos, and what statements leaders have made. This is where portfolio-wise preparation becomes crucial.

Ministers should prepare differently from Opposition members.

A Minister, especially from the Treasury Benches, should focus on:

- Defending the constitutional validity of existing policies
- Highlighting government initiatives, commissions, data collection efforts
- Explaining administrative challenges rather than denying problems

– Using official data and court judgments to support arguments
Ministers should avoid radical proposals unless their party is known for such reforms. Their role is policy continuity with controlled reform.

Opposition members should focus on:

- Gaps in implementation
- Exclusion errors (creamy layer issues, regional imbalance)
- Lack of updated data (caste census debates)
- Contradictions between policy intent and ground reality

Opposition arguments are strongest when they use government data against the government itself, rather than ideological speeches.

Regional or smaller party members should focus on:

- State-specific reservation models
- Regional caste dynamics
- Federalism and state autonomy in reservation policies
- Impact of central decisions on state-level systems

They should position themselves as negotiators rather than pure attackers.

Background study should not be done as long notes. Delegates should prepare:

- A one-page issue brief
- 5–7 strong talking points
- 2 constitutional or legal references
- 1 data-based argument
- 1 political or social consequence

This preparation allows flexibility during debate.

There are some common mistakes delegates must avoid during preparation.

Do not reduce the agenda to “for reservation” or “against reservation”. The agenda is about reform, expansion, or status quo, not abolition versus support. Absolute positions without nuance will weaken credibility.

Do not use emotional anecdotes without linking them to policy or law. Personal stories may be used, but they must support a structural argument.

Do not quote random statistics without source clarity. Saying “studies show” without naming the institution or report is ineffective.

Do not assume equality means sameness. Many debates fail because delegates misunderstand constitutional equality.

Finally, delegates should understand that background study is not about proving others wrong; it is about speaking from a position that sounds informed, realistic, and parliamentary.

PART 3

PORTFOLIO-WISE STRATEGY AND BEHAVIOUR IN THE HOUSE

In a Model Lok Sabha, performance is not judged only by how much a delegate speaks, but by how appropriately they speak for their portfolio. Two delegates can make the same argument; one sounds credible because it fits their role, while the other sounds unrealistic because it does not. Understanding your portfolio is therefore as important as understanding the agenda.

Delegates must remember that this is a parliamentary review of reservation policy, not a courtroom debate or a public rally. The tone, content, and strategy must reflect institutional responsibility.

Ministers on the Treasury Benches carry the highest level of accountability. A Minister is expected to speak with authority, restraint, and data. Their primary role is to defend the government's framework while acknowledging shortcomings where politically unavoidable. Denial of all problems reduces credibility; selective admission followed by controlled reform proposals strengthens it.

For this agenda, a Minister of Social Justice and Empowerment or a related portfolio should focus on explaining the constitutional basis of reservation, the rationale behind current percentages, and the steps taken by the government to ensure fair implementation. Ministers should rely heavily on official reports, commission findings, and Supreme Court judgments. Emotional language should be avoided unless responding to direct political attacks.

Ministers should not propose extreme reforms unless such reforms are aligned with their party's public stance. A Minister who suddenly supports abolition or radical expansion without political backing appears unrealistic. Ministers gain respect by explaining why certain reforms are difficult, not by pretending all reforms are easy. Opposition leaders and MPs have a different responsibility. Their role is to scrutinize, question, and expose gaps in the policy and its execution. Strong opposition performance comes from precision, not noise. Merely stating that

“reservation has failed” is weak; identifying where it has failed, for whom, and why is strong.

Opposition members should focus on issues such as outdated data, exclusion of deserving groups, misuse of the creamy layer concept, uneven implementation across states, and lack of transparency in policy review. Using government data, parliamentary replies, or court observations against the ruling party is far more effective than ideological speeches.

Opposition MPs should avoid proposing solutions that contradict their own party’s historical position unless they clearly frame it as a policy evolution. Consistency is key. A good opposition speech leaves the government defending details, not attacking ideology.

Regional and smaller party MPs play a strategic role in Lok Sabha proceedings. Their power does not come from numbers but from relevance. These delegates should position themselves as representatives of regional realities and federal concerns. Reservation policies often operate differently at the state level, and this is where regional parties gain strength.

Such delegates should highlight how central policies interact with state reservation systems, how regional caste dynamics differ from national narratives, and how one-size-fits-all solutions may create imbalance. They should avoid purely national rhetoric and instead speak from a state-specific perspective. This makes them valuable in negotiations and amendments.

Neutral or independent MPs, if present, should act as bridge-builders. Their speeches should aim to summarize competing positions, highlight consensus points, and propose middle-ground reforms. They often gain importance during bloc formation because both sides see them as negotiable.

A key strategic element in Lok Sabha is numbers management. Delegates must understand that winning arguments does not always mean winning votes. Ministers aim to protect numbers; opposition aims to break them. Regional parties aim to trade support for concessions. Every speech should be made with awareness of who is listening and why.

Unmoderated caucuses are where most portfolio-based strategy is executed.

Ministers should use this time to consolidate their benches, clarify messaging, and pre-empt opposition amendments. Opposition members should use it to identify cracks, pull regional parties, and coordinate questioning. Regional MPs should use it to extract relevance and policy recognition.

Another critical aspect is issue ownership. Each delegate should claim one specific angle of the agenda and repeatedly return to it. For example, one MP may focus entirely on data transparency, another on judicial oversight, another on social impact. This makes speeches coherent and recognizable.

Delegates should avoid speaking on everything. Breadth without depth weakens impact. EB members notice delegates who develop one line of argument consistently across the session.

Portfolio credibility is also reflected in language. Ministers should use administrative and legal vocabulary. Opposition MPs should use accountability-driven language. Regional MPs should use federal and representational language. Mixing tones reduces effectiveness.

Finally, delegates must remember that Lok Sabha performance is judged holistically. Speaking out of turn, ignoring parliamentary decorum, or behaving like a protestor rather than a lawmaker damages evaluation, regardless of content quality.

Understanding and playing your portfolio correctly ensures that even delegates with fewer speaking opportunities remain influential throughout the committee.

PART 4

FLOW OF THE HOUSE AND HOW PROCEEDINGS MOVE

A Model Lok Sabha committee follows a structured flow. Understanding this flow is essential because different stages require different kinds of participation.

Delegates who perform well are those who adjust their strategy according to the stage of the House, rather than repeating the same speech style throughout.

The session begins with the opening of the House. The Speaker calls the House to order, roll call is conducted if required, and basic procedural announcements are made. At this stage, delegates are expected to settle into their roles, understand seating arrangements, and observe the tone set by the Chair. No substantive debate happens here.

Once the House is in order, the agenda is introduced. Since the agenda is pre-decided as “Reservation Policy: Reform, Expansion, or Status Quo,” there is no agenda-setting debate. The Speaker formally announces the topic and opens the floor for discussion.

The House then moves into general debate, which functions similarly to a General Speakers List. This stage allows delegates to place their broad positions on record. Ministers outline the government's framework and intent. Opposition members raise key concerns and lines of questioning. Regional and neutral MPs signal their focus areas.

General debate speeches should be structured and restrained. This is not the stage for aggressive questioning or detailed policy breakdowns. Delegates should use this phase to establish their stance, credibility, and relevance to the agenda.

After general debate, the House transitions into moderated caucuses. Moderated caucuses are focused discussions on specific sub-issues within the agenda, such as constitutional validity, implementation gaps, data accuracy, or future reforms.

These are time-bound and speaker-controlled by the Chair.

During moderated caucuses, delegates should make sharp, specific points rather than broad speeches. This is the stage where policy detail matters. Ministers clarify positions, opposition members press for accountability, and others propose alternatives. Delegates should avoid repetition and instead build on what has already been said.

Moderated caucuses may occur multiple times, each on a different sub-topic.

Delegates should choose when to speak based on relevance rather than frequency.

Speaking once with substance is more effective than speaking multiple times without adding value.

Between or after moderated caucuses, the House may move into unmoderated caucuses. Unmoderated caucuses are informal sessions where delegates can move around, communicate freely, and negotiate. This is where drafting, bloc formation, and deal-making occur.

Unmoderated caucuses are crucial for shaping outcomes. Ministers consolidate support within the Treasury Benches and prepare responses to criticism.

Opposition members coordinate questions, amendments, and alternate drafts.

Regional parties negotiate support in exchange for inclusion of their concerns.

Delegates should use unmoderated caucuses to:

- Form or join blocs
- Draft or amend resolutions
- Secure numbers for voting
- Align messaging within their side

Standing idle during unmoderated caucuses is a missed opportunity.

After sufficient debate and drafting, the House moves toward introduction of resolutions. Draft resolutions are submitted to the Chair for approval and then introduced formally. At this stage, delegates debate the contents of the resolution rather than the agenda itself.

Following introduction, the House discusses amendments. Amendments allow delegates to modify specific parts of a resolution. Some amendments may be friendly, meaning the sponsors accept them directly. Others may be unfriendly and require debate and voting. This phase often determines the final shape of the resolution.

Once debate on resolutions and amendments concludes, a motion is raised to close debate. If accepted, the House enters voting procedure. During voting, decorum is strictly enforced. Delegates vote according to their party stance, alliances, and negotiated commitments.

Voting outcomes determine whether resolutions pass, fail, or are modified. In Lok Sabha simulations, majority usually decides, but political dynamics and alliances influence outcomes more than numbers alone.

After voting, the Speaker may allow closing statements or remarks summarizing the session. This marks the end of substantive proceedings.

Throughout the entire flow, delegates must remember that different stages reward different skills. Early stages reward clarity of position. Middle stages reward policy depth and negotiation. Final stages reward strategic coordination and discipline. Understanding this flow allows delegates to plan when to speak, when to negotiate, and when to conserve energy. Those who treat all stages the same usually lose relevance as the session progresses.

PART 5

PROCEDURE, MOTIONS, POINTS, AND PARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Procedure exists to maintain order, fairness, and efficiency in the House. Delegates are not expected to memorise rulebooks, but they are expected to understand how and when to use basic procedural tools correctly. Misuse of procedure disrupts debate and reduces credibility.

All procedural communication is directed through the Speaker. Delegates must not directly address other members while raising points or motions.

A motion is a formal proposal made by a delegate to move the House into a specific mode of discussion. Motions control the flow of debate.

The most commonly used motion is the motion for a moderated caucus. This motion is used when delegates want focused discussion on a specific sub-issue within the agenda. When raising this motion, the delegate must clearly state three things: the total duration, the individual speaking time, and the topic. For example, a moderated caucus on constitutional limits of reservation or implementation gaps in welfare schemes.

Moderated caucuses are structured. Delegates speak only when recognized by the Speaker, and each speech must stay on the announced topic. This format is best used for analytical discussion, questioning policy, or presenting concrete proposals. A motion for an unmoderated caucus is used when delegates want to negotiate informally. During unmoderated caucuses, delegates may move around, talk freely, draft resolutions, and form blocs. This is the primary space for political coordination and drafting work. When raising this motion, only the duration needs to be specified.

Unmoderated caucuses should not be used as breaks. Delegates are expected to actively negotiate, write, or coordinate. The Speaker may end an unmoderated caucus early if it becomes unproductive.

A motion to introduce a resolution is raised when a draft resolution is ready to be presented to the House. The resolution must already be approved by the Chair before introduction. Once introduced, debate shifts from the agenda to the content of the resolution.

A motion to close debate is used when delegates believe sufficient discussion has occurred and the House should move to voting. This motion is serious and should not be raised prematurely. If raised too early, it may be rejected by the Speaker or voted down by the House.

Points are used to address procedural or personal issues, not to make arguments.

A Point of Personal Privilege is used when a delegate faces discomfort that affects participation, such as inability to hear or physical issues. This point may interrupt a speaker only if the issue is directly related to audibility.

A Point of Order is used when a delegate believes the rules are being violated. This point cannot be used to disagree with content. It must be raised immediately after the procedural error occurs.

A Point of Parliamentary Inquiry is used when a delegate is unsure about procedure and seeks clarification from the Speaker. This point is encouraged for beginners and does not negatively affect evaluation if used appropriately. Points must be brief and respectful. Repeated misuse of points to interrupt debate reflects poorly on a delegate.

Parliamentary language is critical in Lok Sabha. Delegates must avoid direct accusations, personal remarks, or inflammatory language. Statements must be framed institutionally. For example, instead of accusing another member of dishonesty, a delegate may state that the argument lacks supporting data or contradicts official records.

Delegates should refer to others by their portfolio or party, not by name. All remarks should be addressed to the Speaker, not directly to another delegate. Strong parliamentary language is calm, precise, and firm. Raising one's voice does not increase impact. Logical consistency and factual backing do.

Interruptions, shouting across the floor, or casual expressions reduce seriousness and may invite warnings from the Chair.

Procedural discipline is noticed by the Executive Board. Delegates who understand when to use motions, points, and silence appear more competent than those who speak constantly without procedural awareness.

Mastery of procedure allows delegates to control the pace of debate rather than react to it.

PART 6

RESOLUTIONS, BLOCS, NEGOTIATION, AND THE NUMBERS GAME

In a Model Lok Sabha, outcomes are not decided only by speeches. They are decided by resolutions, alliances, and numbers. Understanding how these work is essential to influencing the final direction of the House.

A resolution is a formal proposal that outlines the House's recommendations, conclusions, or policy directions on the agenda. In this committee, resolutions are not symbolic documents; they represent the political will of the House on how reservation policy should be reviewed, reformed, expanded, or maintained.

Resolutions usually emerge after substantial debate and negotiation. They should not be rushed. A weak or poorly drafted resolution, even if passed, reflects low quality participation.

A standard Lok Sabha resolution contains:

- A brief context or intent (what issue is being addressed)
- Clear policy positions or recommendations
- Specific areas of reform, review, or continuation
- Implementation mechanisms or review processes
- Accountability or reporting suggestions

Resolutions should avoid vague language. Statements such as “ensure equality” or “improve implementation” must be backed by clear policy direction, such as review mechanisms, data collection, or institutional responsibility.

Bloc formation is the process through which delegates align themselves with others who share similar positions. In Lok Sabha, blocs usually form along party lines first, but they often evolve based on negotiation, concessions, and strategic interests.

The Treasury Benches generally aim to present a unified resolution defending the government’s framework while allowing controlled reforms. Ministers typically lead this process. Their goal is to protect numbers and avoid fragmentation.

The Opposition may form a unified bloc or multiple sub-blocs depending on ideological alignment. Their strategy often involves drafting alternative resolutions or proposing amendments that expose weaknesses in the government’s draft.

Regional and smaller parties often act as swing blocs. Their support can determine whether a resolution passes smoothly, passes with amendments, or faces strong opposition. These delegates should negotiate for inclusion of region-specific concerns, review committees, or safeguards.

Negotiation happens primarily during unmoderated caucuses. Effective negotiation is not about loud persuasion but about clarity and trade-offs. Delegates should clearly state:

- What they support
- What they oppose
- What they need in return for support

Promises made during negotiation should be realistic and reflected in the resolution text. Empty assurances damage credibility.

Amendments are a key negotiation tool. Delegates may propose amendments to:

- Add safeguards
- Modify language
- Introduce review mechanisms

– Remove politically sensitive phrasing

Friendly amendments are accepted by sponsors without voting. Unfriendly amendments require debate and voting. Strategic use of amendments allows delegates to influence outcomes even without controlling the main resolution. The numbers game is central to Lok Sabha. Delegates must always be aware of how many members are on their side and how many votes are needed to pass a resolution. This awareness should guide:

- Whether to push for voting
- Whether to delay debate
- Whether to negotiate further

Winning a vote without negotiation often creates political backlash. Losing a vote without strategy reflects poor planning.

Delegates should remember that abstentions are political statements. Choosing not to support either side can shift the balance and signal dissatisfaction or strategic neutrality.

A common mistake is assuming that the side with more members automatically wins. In practice, fragmented benches, internal disagreement, or poor coordination can weaken numerical advantage. Conversely, a smaller but disciplined bloc can influence outcomes significantly.

Effective delegates are those who:

- Participate in drafting, not just speeches
- Build alliances across ideological lines
- Understand when to compromise and when to hold ground
- Align their public speeches with private negotiations

Executive Board members closely observe negotiation behaviour, drafting contribution, and bloc leadership. These factors weigh heavily in evaluations, often more than the number of speeches delivered.

Ultimately, resolutions and blocs reflect political maturity. Delegates who treat this phase seriously shape the final outcome of the committee.

PART 7

AWARDS, EVALUATION, AND HOW DELEGATES ARE ASSESSED

Awards in a Model Lok Sabha are not based on popularity, volume of speaking, or aggression. They are based on overall parliamentary performance. Delegates are

evaluated continuously throughout the session by the Executive Board, not only during final speeches.

Evaluation focuses on five broad areas: understanding of the agenda, role-play accuracy, quality of participation, collaboration and negotiation, and procedural discipline.

The Best Delegate award is given to the delegate who demonstrates the strongest overall performance across the entire committee. This includes consistent role alignment with their portfolio, strong understanding of reservation policy, effective participation in debate, meaningful contribution to resolutions, and strategic negotiation. Best Delegate is not necessarily the loudest or most confrontational speaker. It is usually someone who influences outcomes both publicly and privately.

A Best Delegate typically:

- Speaks with clarity and relevance
- Maintains consistency with party ideology
- Contributes directly to drafting or shaping resolutions
- Engages in negotiation during unmoderated caucuses
- Respects procedure and parliamentary decorum

The Best Speaker award is focused specifically on oratory and content delivery. This award goes to the delegate who delivers the most impactful speeches in the House. Impact does not mean shouting or dramatic language. It means structured arguments, strong references, confident delivery, and the ability to command attention while remaining parliamentary.

A Best Speaker usually:

- Delivers fewer but high-quality speeches
- Uses constitutional, legal, or data-based references effectively
- Responds directly to arguments raised by others
- Maintains composure and control while speaking

Best Speaker does not require drafting leadership or negotiation dominance. It is speech-focused.

The Special Mention award is given to delegates who perform strongly but may not dominate every aspect of the committee. These delegates often show depth in a

specific area, such as research, amendments, negotiation, or regional representation. They may not speak frequently, but when they do, they add value.

Special Mention recipients often:

- Raise sharp questions
- Propose effective amendments
- Represent smaller parties or difficult portfolios well
- Show strong understanding but limited opportunities

The Verbal Mention is given to delegates who show clear effort, improvement, or disciplined participation. This award recognizes delegates who may be new to such committees but demonstrate seriousness, procedural correctness, and growing confidence.

Verbal Mentions are often awarded to delegates who:

- Follow procedure carefully
- Speak when relevant
- Participate actively in caucuses
- Support drafting or bloc coordination

There are some common misconceptions about awards.

Speaking the most does not guarantee an award. Repetition, irrelevant speeches, or procedural misuse reduce impact.

Aggression is not rewarded. Personal attacks, emotional outbursts, or unparliamentary language are viewed negatively, even if they draw attention.

Drafting and negotiation matter significantly. Delegates who influence the resolution text, manage alliances, or shape voting outcomes are highly valued.

Consistency matters. A strong opening speech followed by weak participation later reduces chances. EB looks for sustained performance.

Delegates are also assessed on discipline and maturity. Interruptions, misuse of points, ignoring the Chair, or dominating without listening affect evaluation.

Portfolio alignment is critical. A Minister behaving like an activist or an Opposition MP defending government policy without reasoning loses credibility.

The Executive Board does not compare beginners to experienced delegates directly. Performance is evaluated in context of role, responsibility, and opportunity.

Ultimately, awards reflect who contributed meaningfully to the committee's work and helped move the House toward a coherent outcome.