



Equity Policy

Equity Committee

Aryan, Rajnish

Clash Form

[≥](#)

Complaints Form

[≥](#)

Table of Contents

1. Preface	3
1.1 Purpose	3
1.2 Background and Principles	3
2. Scope	4
2.1 Who Does This Policy Apply to?	4
2.2 When Does This Policy Apply?	4
2.3 What Is Inequitable Behaviour?	4
3. Prohibition of Discriminatory Conduct	4
3.1 Definitions of Prohibited Behaviour	4
3.2 Protected Attributes	6
3.3 Political Messaging and Free Speech	6
4. Conduct and Matters Regarding Debates	7
4.1 General Conduct	7
Use of Graphic Language	7
Harmful Generalisation	8
Harmful Generalisation about Political Affiliations or Beliefs	8
Personal Attacks	8
Reclaimed Language	8
Slurs	9
4.2 Cheating and the Use of Internet	9
4.3 Gender Pronoun Policy	9
4.5 Iron-Person Teams	10
4.6 Opting Out of Preliminary Rounds on Equity Grounds	11
4.7 Disruptions	11
4.8 Double Adjudication	11
4.9 Interactions with Minors	12
4.10 Regarding Leaking and Clashes	12
4.11 Prohibition on Intoxication on Venue	13
5. Clashes	13
5.1 On “Financial Obligations”	14
5.2 Clashes Against Members of the Equity Team	15
6. Sexual Interactions and Positive Consent	15
7. Accessibility	16
7.1 Accessibility Requirements	16
8. Complaint Procedures and Handling	16
8.1 Raising an Equity Complaint	16
8.2 Progressing an Equity Complaint	17
8.3 Resolutions and Mechanisms	17
8.4 3-Strike Policy and Equity Watch	18
9. Contact Details	18
9.1 Reaching out to the Equity Team	18



9.2 Who Else You Can Reach	19
10. Acknowledgements	19



1. Preface

1.1 Purpose

The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 is committed to providing a tournament free from discrimination, harassment, bullying and vilification, and which fosters equity, inclusion and respect for social and cultural diversity.

The purpose of the Equity Policy is to ensure all participants at The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 are treated with respect and consideration for their safety and dignity. Participants should (wherever possible) not be meaningfully excluded from full participation in the Tournament based on factors of sex, race, gender identity, age, sexual orientation, nationality, disability status, institutional affiliation, or any other protected characteristics.

This Policy explains what conduct is prohibited and outlines the procedures for raising complaints when participants feel that their equity has been breached.

Additionally, in line with its commitment to equity and inclusivity, The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 recognises the need to balance freedom of expression with protections against harmful speech. This Equity Policy aims to provide clear guidance on the boundaries between permissible discourse and prohibited conduct, including hate speech and inappropriate political messaging. Participants are encouraged to engage in robust debate while ensuring respect for all individuals and communities.

1.2 Background and Principles

Intervarsity debate should be about the respectful exchange of ideas, in a forum where all participants are able to feel welcome and are treated with dignity. No participant should be made to feel unwelcome or disrespected by another's words or actions. The Equity Policy articulates what behaviours will not be tolerated, in order to prevent potential equity violations from arising and to resolve complaints through due process should they arise.

The Equity Policy is not exhaustive and does not include all possible breaches or remedies. There are also possible instances of breaches of participants' rights and safety that the Equity Team is not equipped to deal with, even with the best of intentions and at the limits of our capacities. In instances where the appropriate action is to call for emergency responder services or other professional services tasked with ensuring safety and the rule of law, participants are expected to fully comply with such procedures outside the direct remit/control of the Equity Team.

Equity is more than just a punitive tool, and we, as an Equity Team, would like to play a greater role in education and prevention when it comes to equity issues. Equity is a positive tool for education in cases where remarks or actions were inappropriate but not intended to be malicious, instead arising from a lack of familiarity with certain backgrounds, issues or vocabulary.

During the course of the tournament, we seek to be present and available to assist with all equity-related issues, rather than merely at points where they have escalated to be worthy of a complaint. We are willing to mediate discussions between different parties about issues that arise during the tournament. We are also happy to speak privately with participants about equity issues that they are facing. We believe that by acting preventively, these functions can mitigate these issues and avoid intractable conflicts before they escalate.

Hence, we encourage individuals to feel free to bring all equity-related incidents to our attention, even if they might not seek to make a complaint or demand punitive action.



This Policy is a crystallisation of these principles, and it seeks to protect all participants of The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 from conduct that would make them feel uncomfortable or unsafe, to encourage and facilitate discussion and education and ultimately to make debate a more inclusive space for all.

2. Scope

2.1 Who Does This Policy Apply to?

The Equity Policy applies to all participants and organisers, who are expected to familiarise themselves with the contents of this Equity Policy prior to the start of the Championship.

This includes but is not limited to:

- Debaters
- Adjudicators (including members of the Adjudication Core, as well as external panellists)
- Coaches and Observers
- Members of the Equity team
- Members of the Tab team
- Members of the Organising Committee and tournament volunteers

2.2 When Does This Policy Apply?

This Policy applies to the entire duration of the Event, which includes, but is not limited to:

- During debates and adjudication, which include arguments, adjudication, and feedback made during or after the debates
- The time between debates, including meals organised as part of the event
- During any formal and social event organised as part of the event, including statements or symbols used in such events
- In walking parties organised as part of the event
- In accommodations and transportation organised as part of the event
- All interactions between participants in the context of the event, including online conduct and communications

Political messaging and expressions of free speech throughout the tournament are allowed only insofar as they adhere to the principles of equity, respect, and inclusivity outlined in this Policy.

2.3 What Is Inequitable Behaviour?

Inequitable behaviour encompasses a range of behaviours that can be very different from each other, ranging from entirely unintentional to purposeful, and from misunderstandings to malice. Please keep in mind that cases will be treated based on their specifics, and that we are not implying equivalence between the behaviours listed in the next section (or even between different instances of the same behaviour).

3. Prohibition of Discriminatory Conduct

3.1 Definitions of Prohibited Behaviour

Any instances of the behaviour below are prohibited and will not be tolerated by the Equity Team.



- **Bullying and Intimidation:** Repeated or hostile behavior by an individual or group directed towards another individual or group that intimidates, offends, degrades, humiliates, undermines, or threatens. This encompasses behaviors such as yelling, harassing, threatening, acting in a physically or verbally aggressive manner, or pressuring someone to engage in actions they find uncomfortable.
- **Direct Discrimination:** Unreasonably treating an individual or group less favourably than another individual or group on the basis of a protected attribute in the same circumstances or circumstances not materially different.
- **Indirect Discrimination:** Unreasonably imposing, or proposing to impose, a requirement, condition or practice that has, or is likely to have, an adverse effect on individuals or groups with a particular protected attribute, and which is not reasonable in the circumstances.
- **Harassment:** Any unwelcome, offensive, abusive, belittling or hostile behaviour that humiliates, offends or intimidates (1) an individual, or (2) group on the basis of a protected attribute. Behaviour that might constitute intimidation includes, but not limited to:
 1. Degrading public tirades
 2. Deliberate insults related to a participant's person, identity or competence
 3. Threatening or insulting comments, whether oral or written (including by e-mail or any form of social media)
 4. Deliberate desecration of religious and/or national symbols
 5. Malicious and unsubstantiated complaints of misconduct, including harassment, against others
- **Inflammatory Language:** The use of triggering language, particularly in debates where discussion of sensitive and difficult subjects might be necessary.
- **Sexual Harassment:** Any unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favours or any other unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature that humiliates, offends or intimidates a person and which a reasonable person, having regard to all the circumstances, would anticipate making the person humiliated, offended or intimidated.
- **Retaliation:** Causing detriment to a person because that person has made a complaint or taken part in proceedings of a complaint under this Policy.
- **Vilification:** The public incitement of hatred, contempt or severe ridicule of another individual or group.

For all of the above, please be mindful of the fact that certain standards of what may be perceived as acceptable behaviour depend on cultural backgrounds (for example, the extent of personal space expected, the tone of speaking, etc). Certain participants may feel less comfortable with conduct that may be considered normal for others. When in doubt, err on the side of caution.

Please note that you should refrain from derogatory comments, even if you believe (or even think you know) that they do not apply to an individual who is in attendance.

In a debate, arguments referring to different groups do not inherently constitute equity violations, and it is understandable that in the context of a debate generalisations may be made. **This might constitute an equity violation in cases where the remarks are derogatory in nature.**



3.2 Protected Attributes

It is a violation of this Equity Policy and the Code of Conduct for The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 to treat individuals differently on the basis of differences in one or more of the protected attributes below. This treatment could include, but is not limited to, any of the [prohibited behaviour mentioned above](#).

Where reference is made above to a protected attribute, this includes imputed or perceived protected attributes, and association with a person or persons with a protected attribute.

This Policy prohibits any participant or group of participants from bullying another participant or group of participants. The use of offensive language that perpetuates stereotypes, the casual or insensitive use of potentially triggering language (particularly including the language of violence or sexual assault) is also expressly prohibited. It is important to bear in mind that when making in-jokes or engaging in friendly teasing and banter, this is done in such a way that others within earshot are clear no offence is meant or taken.

Victimisation of those who initiate complaints or take part in complaint proceedings is also prohibited under this Policy.

The list of protected attributes includes:

- Age or age group
- Debating ability or institutional affiliation
- Disability (including but not limited to past, present and future disabilities, a genetic predisposition to a disability and behaviour that is a manifestation of a disability)
- Gender identity (the gender-related identity, appearance, mannerisms, and other gender related characteristics of a person, including but not limited to how people express or present their gender, recognising that a person's gender identity may be an identity other than male or female)
- Infectious disease (for example, HIV status)
- Language status or proficiency (for example, ESL / EFL status or speaking with an accent)
- Marital or relationship status
- Mental health
- Political affiliation or beliefs
- Race, colour, caste, descent, national or ethnic origin, or ethno-religious background
- Religious affiliation, belief, views or practice
- Sex or Intersex status
- Sexual orientation
- Sexual practices or experience (for example, previous partner(s) or lack thereof)
- Socio-economic status and background
- Any other attribute where discrimination:
 - a. Causes or perpetuates systemic disadvantage
 - b. Undermines human dignity
 - c. Adversely affects the equal enjoyment of a person's rights and freedoms in a serious manner that is comparable to discrimination on a protected attribute listed above.

3.3 Political Messaging and Free Speech

The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 Equity Team recognises that participants retain the right to express diverse opinions during debates, provided such opinions do not cross into hate speech or harmful generalisations as defined below.

Political Messaging includes any form of communication intended to endorse, oppose, or promote political ideologies, campaigns, or movements. Participants are **strictly discouraged from engaging in**



political messaging. The Equity Team hopes that this tournament is used as a forum of constructive debate and fruitful resolutions, rather than a means to promote any political agendas.

Overt political advocacy outside the context of debates, especially actions that rally others or disrupt the neutrality, inclusivity, and order of the Tournament, is also not permitted.

Hate Speech refers to any language or actions, whether verbal, written, or symbolic, that:

- Incite inflammatory language, violence or discrimination against individuals or groups based on protected attributes laid out [here](#).
- Demean or dehumanise individuals or groups in a way that contradicts the principles of equity.

4. Conduct and Matters Regarding Debates

4.1 General Conduct

Debaters and adjudicators must treat each other and other participants with respect by:

Respecting the rules of the competition

Refraining from disrupting or distracting other debaters or adjudicators, whether through words, sounds or conduct

- Accepting the decision of the adjudicator(s), or majority of the panel(s) in the event of a split
- Refraining from insulting or non-constructive commentary on speeches, speakers, oral adjudications, or judges
- Avoiding inflammatory, dehumanising, or hate speech during debates.
- Ensuring arguments about political systems, governments, or ideologies are framed thoughtfully, avoiding assumptions that individuals inherently support or embody the actions or beliefs of a group based on their nationality, political affiliation, or other protected attributes.
- Even outside of tournaments, all members of the debating community are required to treat each other and all debaters with respect. This includes but is not limited to:
 - Respecting each individual and their boundaries in interactions
 - Refraining from generalized comments that hurt any group especially one with protected attributes
 - Refraining from personalized attacks on any individual of the circuit

Use of Graphic Language

Language used within debates can often unintentionally lead to equity violations, particularly regarding appropriate language while debating about sensitive topics. Not everyone can be expected to know everything about a sensitive topic, but the expectation is on participants to educate themselves and be sensitive and considerate when interacting with others. This includes both during a debate and afterwards.

Please note that there is a distinction between passionate, emotive language and triggering language, but when in doubt we would urge you to err on the side of caution. Be sensitive to the fact that motions often affect real people, maybe even someone in the room. Use of personal information about a speaker to deliberately upset them will be taken very seriously.

Arguments referring to sensitive subjects do not automatically constitute equity violations, and can be useful persuasive mechanisms in certain debates. When making such arguments, please make sure to pay attention to the way in which they are presented to avoid causing discomfort to other participants.



Harmful Generalisation

Teams will argue about different identity groups in a debate. These generalisations do not inherently constitute equity violations.

Generalisations may constitute an equity violation in cases where they are derogatory, false, or extremely harmful. Examples might be: “Women cannot lead” or “People from [X] race are inherently violent”. More importantly, they can perpetuate harmful stereotypes and cause direct emotional harm to someone from that group in the room with you.

Below are the things you can do to avoid harmful generalisations:

- Avoid arguing in absolutes, e.g., “X people will always engage in a specific action”
- Acknowledge that many conditions are externally imposed as opposed to being intrinsic to any group of people
- Give reasons as to why these external conditions make a group/individual from that group likely to behave a certain way or do something
- Speak as respectfully as you would if the person you are speaking of were in the room with you
- Sometimes we might slip up despite our best intentions, so keep an open mind and be willing to listen when people try to explain why something was harmful.

Harmful Generalisation about Political Affiliations or Beliefs

The equity team wishes to remind people that while the critique of any government is well within the bounds of and even encouraged by debating culture, **one should be careful to draw a distinction between a government and the private citizens of a nation**. Not every single questionable action committed by a government or governing body should necessarily need to be explicitly condoned by private citizens of said nation. People have a right to maintain privacy over their political affiliations or beliefs for any number of reasons. It is unwise to draw arbitrary conclusions about someone’s political affiliations and/or beliefs simply based on nationality, race, religion, gender etc. as they can often lead to direct/indirect discrimination against individuals and is against the spirit of debating as a whole.

Personal Attacks

Attacks on a person’s background or identity (e.g., “people like you shouldn’t even say [X] because you believe in [Y]”) have no argumentative value, and are demeaning in nature. This specific phrasing attacks the person and not the content in that person’s speech, and hence must be avoided. This extends to phrases that state that a person does not have the appropriate background to run an argument in the debate (“what would you know of X’s struggles, you are not from X community!”) Both these types of arguments can upset a person and are personal attacks that have nothing to do with the discussion of the debate.

Reclaimed Language

There are certain words that hold significant historical and cultural weight, which members outside of particular communities might not understand. Using these words can be extremely hurtful to individuals.

As an example, some LGBTQIA+ people have reclaimed previously derogatory words, which should not be used by participants who are not part of the LGBTQIA+ community. Similarly, terms such as the N-word may be reclaimed by some people, but members outside that community should not use these terms.

It is important to note that individuals within communities should exercise caution when using reclaimed language to refer to others. Even within the same community, certain terms—though reclaimed by some members—may still be considered offensive or inappropriate by others. Sensitivity and respect for individual preferences remain paramount in fostering an inclusive and considerate environment.



Slurs

A slur is a term designed to insult someone on the basis of race, ethnicity or nationality. The use of slurs and derogatory terms meant to undermine someone's dignity is not permissible under any circumstances. The Equity Team has zero tolerance for racist, homophobic, antisemitic, Islamophobic, gendered slurs and other slurs that are intended to undermine individuals.

Participants should be mindful that the meaning and impact of certain words, including slurs or potentially offensive terms, may vary significantly across cultures and countries. Words that are commonly used or considered acceptable in one cultural context may be deeply offensive in another. As such, all participants are encouraged to exercise sensitivity and caution when using words.

4.2 Cheating and the Use of Internet

- **The use of the internet is prohibited at all times**, and should you be granted permission to use electronic devices, such devices used must be in airplane mode with the Wifi disabled during preparation time and during the whole debate. The devices must be on silent mode to avoid disturbances to the debate.
- **The use of electronic devices to access such informational materials is prohibited**, which may include, but not limited to: browsing the internet, accessing the digital version of the said matter files, using generative AI tools, etc.

Debaters are only allowed to communicate among themselves during preparation time unless there are emergencies beyond the boundaries of prepping, in which debaters are encouraged to reach out to either the organisers or the Equity Team. Communicating with other individuals (e.g., coaches, observers) during preparation time is considered cheating.

4.3 Gender Pronoun Policy

The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 recognises that participants have diverse gender identities that need to be respected, and that a key component is referring to someone by their desired gender pronoun. Misgendering someone or failing to use their correct pronoun is alienating and hurtful. **Please do not assume a person's gender identity or their pronouns based on appearance.**

It is also expected that participants respect both the pronoun introduction process and the pronouns of each speaker, and to refer to speakers by their correct pronoun or with gender-neutral language.

We invite speakers to use gender-neutral language as a default in rounds. You are encouraged to refer to other speakers in the room using their position in the debate or refer to the judging panel as a whole (e.g., "First Negative", "Third Aff Speaker", "judging panel").

During the in-rounds, the chair judge should:

- Introduce themselves to the entire room and, if they choose to do so, state their preferred pronoun; then
- Allow each of their wing judges, if present, to do the same; then
- Invite all debaters to introduce themselves and leave the opportunity for speakers to declare their pronouns, without explicitly calling on them to do so, when asking for speaking positions.

Debaters or judges are at liberty to:

- State the pronoun by which they wish to be addressed
- Not state a pronoun
- State that they don't want to be gendered
- State 'no preference'



If a debater or judge does not wish to identify a pronoun, they are not required to do so. This deviates from practice, in which speakers are sometimes called upon explicitly for their pronouns. Instead, all speakers are expected to use gender-neutral language as the standard unless a speaker or judge explicitly indicates otherwise. If you happen to misgender someone, please apologise and move on.

Chairs should note the pronouns of all speakers if they are offered, and remind the room of their preferred pronoun when introducing them for their speech in the round.

4.5 Iron-Person Teams

“Iron-personing may occur only in the preliminary rounds, and only when:

- 1. A member of a team is taken ill and requires medical treatment, or a recognised medical condition prohibits them from participating in a given Preliminary Round.*
- 2. Other circumstances as deemed appropriate by the Adjudication Core and/or Equity team.”*

This is handled differently than if they had missed rounds for no legitimate reason at all.

In these situations, “The remaining two debaters are only permitted to deliver two speeches each during the round (e.g. one speaker does 1A and 3A, the other does 2A and AR). It is not allowed for one debater to deliver three or all speeches (e.g. no one person can do 1A, 3A, and AR). For the speaker that delivers two substantive speeches, the better score of the two speeches will be used for the speaker tab, and there is no need for the speaker to indicate a preference regarding which speech they would like to be scored by to the judge. All scores for iron-speeches will be used for the team tab and when determining the break, but there will be no individual score for the speaker that missed the round.”

No team that competes as an ‘iron-person’ team in more than 1 Preliminary Round may be eligible to break. Additionally, no team shall be able to compete as an ‘iron-person’ team in the outbounds.

When this occurs, teams should contact both the Equity Team and Adjudication Core to inform them that this is the case. It is recommended that individuals in need of medical help should seek out medical help before contacting the Equity Team and Adjudication Core.

This Policy will apply to cases of illness and recognised medical conditions, as well as cases of equity considerations more broadly, including, but not limited to, mental health and well-being of the participants. **This will operate at the discretion of the Equity and Adjudication Core.** For more details about this, please refer to this [section](#).

If all speakers in a team miss a round, the team will also receive 0 team points and 0 speaker points, even if both speakers are missing the round for the types of reasons outlined above.

The rules relating to iron-person teams shall operate at the discretion of the Adjudication Core and Equity Team. Where there is a dispute between the two bodies regulating iron-person teams, the judgement of the Equity Team shall take precedence. For the avoidance of doubt, the bodies regulating iron-person teams shall determine only whether a team is to be allowed to compete as an iron-person team in a given Preliminary Round, and may not make any variation to the consequences of that decision under this section.

A team forfeiting a round without prior notice will count as an immediate strike to a team’s eligibility to compete in the elimination rounds.

For instances where teams need to opt out based on equity grounds, please refer to the following section.



4.6 Opting Out of Preliminary Rounds on Equity Grounds

Participants (both debaters and judges) may request to opt out of a round on equity grounds (e.g., motion sensitivity related to physical and mental well-being, personal trauma, and security concerns). Such requests must be:

- Submitted to the Equity Team no later than 5 minutes after the motion announcement.
- Members of the Equity Team will be present at the main hall of announcements. Participants may wish to reach out to us directly for a more timely response.
- The team shall inform which equity ground is the basis of the team's intention to opt out of the round.

This Equity Opt-out is available *inclusive* to the Iron Person Policy.

Specifically in situations where all speakers are unwell and unable to debate, the team members or their representative must inform the Adjudication Core and the Equity Team prior to the draw release, which is the same procedure that teams should go through if they want to iron-person in a given round due to sickness and other equity-based concerns.

For scenarios where teams wish to opt out of a round based on equity grounds other than both speakers being unwell, the Equity Team will determine if the request is valid.

Participants are encouraged to engage with all motions in the spirit of debating. Refusal to debate a motion on political or ethical grounds unrelated to equity will be treated as a forfeit, with no points awarded for the round.

Lastly, participants are not allowed to opt out of a round by using any of the protected attributes as a ground of the refusal (e.g., refusing to debate against a specific team or individual due to their protected attributes).

Teams can opt out of a maximum of 1 preliminary round to be break eligible.

4.7 Disruptions

Participants have the right to express concerns about the tournament. Disruptive actions (e.g., interrupting debates) may lead to sanctions, including warnings or removal from the tournament. Participants wishing to express their concerns may submit formal complaints to the Equity Team or Organizing Committee as laid out in this section.

4.8 Double Adjudication

For the purposes of this Equity Policy, we define double judging as *judging two or more tournaments simultaneously*. This includes but is not limited to - judging two tournaments in the same time zone when it clashes with indicated availability, judging two rounds simultaneously, judging two tournaments in similar or different time zones (tournaments can run late, so even if you have signed up at a tournament which is in a similar time zone it can run late, thus leading to scheduling conflicts), etc. Additionally, if anyone is found to deviate from their indicated availability without prior notice or at the last minute due to judging at another tournament, that also constitutes double judging.

This practice as a whole is not just severely unfair to teams that are not being fairly adjudicated, but also to the tournament at large, which entrusts the judges with the responsibility of providing fair adjudication.



Double judging shall constitute an equity violation, and any individual who is found to be guilty of the same shall be penalised by the Equity Committee in consultation with the CAP, including but not limited to dropping the individual off tabs, revocation of remuneration, if any. This policy recognises that the Equity Committee shall have the power to exercise Suo Moto cognisance on this matter.

4.9 Interactions with Minors

As observed, anybody under the age of 18 will be considered a minor.

There might be school-age teams (i.e. minors) or just minors in university participating in this tournament. In addition to the prohibited behaviour mentioned above, additional measures are in place to ensure the safety of all minors, including (but not limited to):

- Do not record videos of any minors
- Do not engage in private chats with any minors
- Do not stay in a place physically or virtually where you are alone with another minor
- Do not share contact details for text/call feedback one-on-one.

Any participant found to violate the safeguarding policy will have their accounts suspended and be removed from the tournament.

Look for the equity officer and /or the CAs if a situation arises where you need to be with a minor in a room alone (for example, for adjudication).

4.10 Regarding Leaking and Clashes

Leaking refers to the revealing of confidential or otherwise secretive information within the tournament space. Information in this sense may look like:

- Speaker scores before tab release
- Results of silent rounds
- Any and all other sensitive information as deemed so during the course of the tournament (eg, Clashes and complaints)

All such information is inherently confidential. By participating in The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025, participants consent to the usage of their data, including but not limited to the declaration of protection attributes for the purposes of equity at this tournament.

Additionally, participants agree to take on the responsibility to ensure the confidentiality of the information such as the pronouns of other participants, equity violations they become observers or party to, verdicts of closed rounds until the same has been officially revealed, statements made during rounds where teams either explicit or implicitly did not consent to recording and/or live-streaming

Anyone, including Equity Officers, found to be in contravention of the above shall be penalised proportionately.

4.11 Prohibition on Intoxication on Venue

The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 Equity Policy prohibits intoxication of any kind at the venue premises. This includes the consumption of alcohol, cigarettes, vape, and/or any other intoxicants, as they may be deemed to be.



The policy notes that individuals are free to engage in intoxication outside the event venue, whether individually or in a social group. In such cases, positive consent should be explicitly ensured by all members of such social group. Any coercion/intimidation/force whether verbal or physical, used by any individual(s) to intoxicate (an)other individual(s), regardless of whether it is outside the event venue, does count as an equity violation and will be treated as such.

The violation of this clause can and may result in instant disqualification of the guilty participant from The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025, future editions of the tournament, and/or any other tournaments that may be hosted by the Organising Committee.

This policy also recognises that inebriation or intoxication is *not a mitigating factor* to any Equity Violations. The burden rests on participants to maintain a respectful code of conduct regardless, and any other violations committed in such a manner can and will be investigated and redressed to the fullest extent as deemed necessary by the Equity Committee.

5. Clashes

In the context of a debate tournament, a clash (otherwise known as a conflict or a scratch) exists where an individual believes that:

- They cannot be impartially adjudicated by a particular adjudicator (for debaters),
- They cannot impartially adjudicate a particular team/set of teams (for adjudicators), or
- They cannot impartially adjudicate alongside another adjudicator (for adjudicators)

Clashes can exist for either positive or negative reasons; both are of equal importance in weighing whether a clash exists.

The following is a list of mandatory clashes that one must declare:

1. Having been in a past or current intimate relationship with the individual in question
2. Having a familial relationship with a person
3. Having regularly debated together with the individual in question in the past (more than two (2) times)
4. Having coached, or been coached by, the individual in question
5. Having previously been affiliated with an institution as a student, coach or as an employee (if this has already been declared in the registration tab forms, please fill out again in case of such a clash with a composite/cross team, or for Independent Adjudicators).
6. Having severe interpersonal clashes (including but not limited to past equity issues), or
7. Having certain financial obligations (please read our policy below for some clarity)

Clashes do not exist for the following (non-exhaustive) reasons:

- You do not like someone (e.g., someone 'annoys' you),
- You don't like the arguments that someone makes (though you may submit a complaint separately if you believe the arguments made violate the Equity Policy),
- You think it is strategically favourable to clash a judge,
- You have been told to clash a judge for strategic reasons, or
- You think someone is a bad judge, or disagree with a decision made by a judge (either in a past tournament or at this tournament).
 - a. This includes debaters being unhappy with a judge's oral adjudication or feedback, or a judge being unhappy with the way a team approached them for feedback
 - b. Teams should instead submit feedback accordingly through their Private URL or report the issue to the Adjudication Core should this happen.



In situations in which you are not certain whether or not you should clash with a person, please don't hesitate to contact the Equity Team. We are happy to provide advice. The equity team may follow up on some of the submitted clashes.

You may submit your clash(es) through the Equity Clash form ([link](#)), which will be kept open throughout the tournament.

Important notes regarding submitting clashes:

- **Submit clashes ONLY through the form shared above.** Every clash needs to be verified by the Equity Team. **DO NOT approach the Adjudication Core or the Tab Team.**
- This form is only accessible to the members of the Equity Team. We will only share the clashes where necessary (Tab Team & Adjudication Core), but **we will not be sharing the circumstances behind the clashes filed.**
- **If you have multiple clashes to declare, fill out this form multiple times,** with one submission for each clash.
- A copy of your submission will be emailed to you. **You MUST use the same email address as provided in individual registration;** submitted clashes which do not have a matching email will take significantly longer to process.
- If you have a clash that develops during the tournament, please reach out to any of us if you do not feel comfortable sharing the clashes to all of the members of the Equity Team.

Clashes form should be submitted by 7 AM, 22 November 2025. Clashes registered after that will be significantly difficult to process and would potentially affect the tournament schedule.

5.1 On “Financial Obligations”

Please note the following policy for Reason 7:

A financial obligation can take many forms. It can be a debt to a person or company, or employment by a person or company. If your relationship is with a specific person, you can file a clash like normal. If your relationship is with a company, but only applies to an individual (for example, if your boss at work is judging or speaking at The Dialogue by GDi Partners), then also please clash with that specific person.

There are specific disclosure obligations if you are involved with a debating company (which provides services specifically to the debating community, like coaching). In this case, write the name of the debating company, and the Equity Team will ensure that a judge is clashed from debaters and judges who have registered a clash regarding the same company.

Judges must disclose if they have regularly provided services to any debating company. **“Regularly provided” means that you have been paid to attend or organise 4 or more private events (including exclusive live streams) hosted by that company in the last 2 years.** This does not include being an IA or Adjudication Core member at a full scale tournament or league, but includes being an IA or Adjudication Core member at private practice days or spar sessions for 4 or more times within the last 2 years.

Judges who have bought a judge spot from any institution (whether you paid in full, got a discount or got a free spot from said institution) **should also fill the clash form and indicate this as a financial obligation.** When registering the clash, write the name of the institution from which you bought/were given the judge spot. For institutional judges, indicate from which institution you were given your judge spot.

However, **in scenarios where there are excess judges from certain institutions who are helping fulfill the n-1 requirements of other institutions without any financial obligations involved,** they are not required to submit a clash.



Similarly, **teams who have purchased a team slot from another team should submit a clash against individuals from the team they purchased the slot from in case they are present in the tournament as a judge.** Teams are expected to indicate this as a financial obligation in the form.

Speakers must disclose if they have regularly provided services to OR regularly consumed services from a debating company. **“Regularly consumed” means you have paid to attend 4 or more private events hosted by that company in the last 2 years,** not including debating at full scale tournaments or leagues, but including paid attendance at any practice days, exclusive live streams, spars, classes, or seminars.

If anything creates a financial relationship between you and another participant similar to what is described above, regardless of whether it fits within those formal definitions or not, **we encourage you to proactively disclose it to the tournament.**

5.2 Clashes Against Members of the Equity Team

If you have a clash against a member of the Equity Team and feel uncomfortable about disclosing this via the form, please directly reach out to someone else on the team to confirm this clash with them personally. **Remember that such clashes are still subject to the ordinary vetting process followed by Equity. The only difference is that the person from Equity who you are clashing will not be privy to any of the information you share.**

6. Sexual Interactions and Positive Consent

Participants are required to seek positive consent when engaging in any conduct of a sexual or potentially sexual nature, including but not limited to sexual intercourse, physical intimacy, flirting, making sexual jokes, or suggestive bodily contact (e.g., dancing). A lack of consent for any such interaction is a breach of this Policy.

Failure to acquire consent for certain interactions, such as flirting or suggestive remarks, may constitute sexual harassment. More severe conduct, such as non-consensual physical intimacy or sexual intercourse, constitutes sexual assault and will be treated accordingly under this Policy.

Positive consent requires a person to actively affirm that other parties in any sexual or romantic interaction are freely and voluntarily agreeing to what is occurring. All parties should enquire as to what other people are feeling (e.g., “Are you OK with this?”, “Are we going too fast?”, “Do you like this?”).

If you cannot determine the consent of the parties involved, you should end the sexual or romantic interaction. **The lack of a “no” should not be misconstrued to be a “yes”.**

Additionally, consent can be withdrawn at any time, and the consent to one interaction (i.e., flirting) does not mean consent to further interactions (i.e., kissing, physical intimacy or sexual intercourse).

You have not obtained positive consent if:

- Someone is too drunk to understand what they are doing, is under the influence of drugs, or is otherwise asleep/unconscious; or
- You are using your actual or perceived authority to pressure someone into commencing or continuing a sexual interaction.



7. Accessibility

7.1 Accessibility Requirements

The Dialogue by GDi Partners acknowledges that adjustments may need to be made for participants with disabilities, such as allocation of debating rooms close to the briefing hall or with step-free access.

The Equity Team will make an assessment and provide recommendations to the Adjudication Core, Tab Team and the Organising Committee, who will make any adjustments deemed reasonably necessary.

8. Complaint Procedures and Handling

8.1 Raising an Equity Complaint

Complaints may be raised with a member of the Equity Team regarding breach of this Policy or at any time during the duration of the tournament. All complaints raised are treated as confidential, and the complainant will determine whether or not a complaint is investigated further.

Complaints may be made informally or formally.

- **An informal complaint** is one that raises concerns, but does not require formal responses such as investigation or mediation. These may be made in person **with Equity Team members or in writing via the online complaint form ([link](#))**.
- **A formal complaint** is where a formal response is sought, such as investigation or mediation. Formal complaints may be initiated in person with Equity Team members, but must have a written record registered via the Equity Complaints form to be actioned.

The Equity Team feels that all participants should feel comfortable to raise concerns they have as freely and easily as possible. **However, for *due process reasons*, the Equity Team cannot investigate or provide remedies for anonymous complaints – all anonymous complaints are treated as informal.** Anonymous complaints will inform our handling of situations during The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025, but will not trigger investigation, mediation, or any other direct action.

However, if you do wish to further communicate with the equity team with any concerns regarding the matter or to pursue a more expansive set of actions, please feel free to appoint a contact person who will be in charge of communicating between you (thus helping you maintain a level of anonymity) and the equity team. **It is important to note that this is a course of action one can pursue in highly sensitive cases where you would feel severely uncomfortable to identify yourself to the equity team.**

We will exercise discretion in deciding whether to treat it as a formal complaint or an informal one, while also taking into account preferences of the original complainant.

Members of the Equity Team will excuse themselves from investigating and handling complaints that are made against them personally, or where a personal conflict arises (e.g., one of the parties belongs to an institution the Equity Team members are affiliated with or the Equity Team members have a close personal relationship with one of the parties).

In addition to complaints, participants are also encouraged to contact the Equity Team to raise general equity-related concerns, even if they do not feel an incident has occurred. Both anonymous complaints and general concerns enhance the Equity Team's overall understanding of relevant issues occurring at the tournament, which will further assist in the prevention of future equity violations.



To submit a complaint, you may submit it through this form, or you may reach out to any of the equity team members, whichever is more convenient and comfortable for you.

8.2 Progressing an Equity Complaint

If the complainant does wish to progress with a complaint, the Equity Team shall:

- Speak with the complainant to obtain full details of the incident
- Speak with the offending participant to hear their account of the incident
- Speak with any other participants as required by the circumstances

Following this process, the Equity Team will determine whether or not a breach of this Policy has occurred. Both members of the Equity Team shall undertake this process.

At any point during this process prior to resolution, a complainant may withdraw their complaint. At such a point, any investigation automatically ceases.

8.3 Resolutions and Mechanisms

The core principle guiding the Equity Team in determining resolution mechanisms is to give significant weight to the complainant's wishes while ensuring those actions remain consistent with tournament policies and are reasonable in the given circumstances.

For anonymous complaints, the Equity Team will proceed with the resolution they deem fit, such as making a general announcement, or flagging the issue to relevant parties without proceeding with investigations.

If, following the investigation of the Equity Team, this Policy is found to have been breached, the Equity Team is empowered to take any/all actions that it deems appropriate which include but are not limited to:

- Making general announcements to the tournament
- Issuing warnings to participants
- Conducting mediation between parties
- Preventing a participant from attending social gatherings
- Reporting conduct to law enforcement or an Institution or an Institution's University
- Recommend that a participant be removed from The Dialogue by GDi Partners
- Involving the Internal Complaints Commission of GDi, or of the violating party's Institution

Given that this event is organised by GDi Partners, all cases of violation pertaining to the ambit of GDi's POSH policy will necessitate the involvement of GDi's ICC (Internal Complaints Committee). The Equity Committee will be present to assist the ICC in such cases.

The Equity team shall work with the Organising Committee and Adjudication Core for enforcement of these decisions.

The Team shall proceed with the investigation within twenty-four hours of the receipt of the complaint or before the end of the Championships, whichever is sooner, issue a decision on the complaint to the Adjudication Core, Organising Committee, and to the parties involved.

It is important to note that the investigation and corresponding resolution might diverge from the timeframe mentioned above depending on the nature of the complaint and/or violation. In the event that the gravity of the issue warrants a more thorough investigation, the Equity Team shall strive to resolve the issue in one week maximum upon receipt of the complaint.



The Equity Team shall communicate to the Adjudication Core for decisions pertaining to complaints that will affect the tournament within the same day to ensure timely investigation and resolution.

8.4 3-Strike Policy and Equity Watch

The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 operates under a 3-Strike Policy, i.e if a team/adjudicator/individual has three equity violations, they are liable to be pulled out of the tournament or lose break eligibility. This policy works on a good-faith assumption, where isolated instances are attributed to lack of awareness/ignorance, and allows us to monitor repeat incidents of equity violations which limit others' ability to enjoy the competition.

Understand that this 3-Strike Policy works under the discretion of the Equity Committee, and may be waived in case of severe violations, dangerous behaviour, or otherwise as the Equity Committee may deem fit.

Equity Watch: An Equity Watch may be placed on participants against whom concern is raised by any other participant(s) and/or external parties. This Watch may take place in order to monitor a participant's behaviour following the First Strike, or may be in place from the beginning if concern is raised before the tournament's beginning, which the Equity Committee may take cognisance of under the Suo Moto Policy.

9. Contact Details

9.1 Reaching out to the Equity Team

Please note that you can approach any individual member or members of the Equity Team if you wish to discuss an issue that has caused you concern, even if you are not sure if you want to file a formal complaint at that stage.

- Verbal complaint: you may approach any of the members of the Equity Team at any point throughout the Championships if you wish to make a verbal complaint.
- Formal written complaints: Formal complaints alleging a breach of the Equity Policy/Code of Conduct must be made in writing to the Equity Team (i.e., by filling in the Complaints Form).

Complaints can be submitted through the [form](#). Please include your name and relevant contact information for the Equity Team to contact you regarding the complaint.

Submitting an anonymous complaint is possible, but will severely restrict the ability of the Equity Team to mediate the matter. Individual members of the Equity Team can be reached on in the following ways:

Name	Contact no.	E-mail
Aryan	+91 8920196295	aryan.awasthi1910@gmail.com
Rajnish	+91 8427413737	rajnish@gdipartners.in



9.2 Who Else You Can Reach

The Equity Team shall recuse themselves from hearing any complaint that they may be unable or be seen to be unable to assess in a manner fair to all parties, and appoint an appropriate delegate to do so where necessary.

If you are clashed with one of the members of the Equity Team, you may reach out to other members of the Equity Team, and the clashed individual will be removed from discussions surrounding the complaint(s) you submit. The members of the Equity Team are fully aware that such situations are possible, and will respect the complainant's wishes under any circumstances.

In the event that you are clashed with majority (if not all) of the Equity Team members and/or you do not feel comfortable reaching out to any member of the Equity Team, you can also reach out to the Adjudication Core, the Organising Committee (Umang Bhola - +91-7837833100), or law enforcement as you deem appropriate.

10. Acknowledgements

The Dialogue by GDi Partners 2025 Equity Team would like to acknowledge the following documents that were used to inform the creation of this policy:

- The Panama WUDC Equity Policy
- The Thessaloniki WUDC 2016 Equity Policy
- Dutch WUDC 2017 Equity Policy
- Mexico WUDC 2018 Equity Policy
- Cape Town WUDC 2019 Equity Policy
- Thailand WUDC 2020 Equity Policy
- Belgrade WUDC 2022 Equity Policy
- Madrid WUDC 2023 Equity Policy
- Vietnam WUDC 2024 Equity Policy
- Malaya Australs 2018 Equity Policy
- Athens EUDC 2018 Equity Policy
- Uhuru Worlds 2022 Equity Policy
- South China Australs 2025 Equity Policy
- Qaynaat WGSM PD 2025 Equity Policy.

