

# CRISIS HANDBOOK

## **-Opening Speeches**

Opening speeches are mandatory for all participants in the committee, regardless of whether they are envoys, unit members, or lawyers. Each participant is required to deliver an opening speech at the beginning of the conference.

These speeches should briefly introduce the participant's position, perspective, and initial stance on the agenda. For unit representatives, this serves as a preliminary outline of their broader unit position, which will later be expanded during the GSL process.

Lawyers are also required to deliver opening speeches. While their procedural role does not significantly differ from standard delegates, their speeches are especially important in establishing the legal framework, arguments, and interpretations they will bring into the debate

## **-General Speakers List (GSL)**

In this committee, the General Speakers List (GSL) is conducted on a unit-based structure rather than individual delegates. Each unit listed in the study guide will take the floor as a whole, represented primarily by its envoy. When a unit is called to the floor, the envoy will deliver the main GSL speech on behalf of their unit, outlining their stance, priorities, and perspective regarding the agenda.

Once the envoy has concluded their speech, the chair will grant speaking time to the other members of the same unit. These members may, on a voluntary basis, contribute with additional remarks, clarifications, or supportive arguments reinforcing the envoy's statement.

This procedure ensures that each unit presents a cohesive and comprehensive position while still allowing internal diversity of thought. All units will take the floor one by one in this structured manner.

Additionally, lawyers present in the committee will retain their right to speak as individual participants. Although they are not bound to a specific unit structure in the same way, they may contribute to discussions similarly to regular delegates when recognized by the chair.

## **-Motions**

In this committee, both envoys and unit members are permitted to raise motions. Motions must be formulated in alignment with the “Questions to be Asked” section provided in the study guide, and it is mandatory that these questions are addressed throughout the debate process.

Motions can be used not only to guide general discussion but also to initiate focused inquiry between units. A unit may raise a motion directly concerning another unit, encouraging inter-unit debate, accountability, and deeper analysis of positions. This creates a dynamic and interactive debate environment where units actively challenge and engage with one another.

All raised motions, once approved, must be discussed thoroughly by the committee to ensure that no critical aspect of the agenda is overlooked.

Lawyers, as independent participants, are also allowed to raise motions. Their procedural rights in this regard are equivalent to those of regular delegates, and they may use motions to introduce critical questions, or steer the debate toward legal interpretation.

## **-Turn the Table**

Turn the Table is a structured speaking round designed to ensure that all units actively contribute to the discussion and provide updates on the ongoing investigation. While it is generally initiated by the chairboard, delegates also have the right to propose it as a motion.

Once initiated, all units are required to take the floor in an order determined by the seating arrangement. Each unit is given a limited amount of time to present a concise evaluation of the current situation. These evaluations may include updates on their findings, interpretations of newly received evidence, responses to recent developments, or comments on other units’ actions and conclusions.

Participation in Turn the Table is mandatory for all units. The envoy or any designated member of the unit may deliver the statement on behalf of the group. Units are encouraged to be clear, analytical, and direct in their remarks.

Lawyers also retain the right to speak during this round. They may use this opportunity to briefly challenge claims, highlight inconsistencies in arguments, or introduce legal perspectives relevant to the current stage of the investigation.

## **-Directives**

Directives are the primary tools used in crisis committees to carry out specific actions in response to developments that arise. Each crisis introduced to the committee requires delegates to actively assess the situation and take action.

Crises presented to the committee may include developments such as the emergence of new evidence, changes in the current situation, or the introduction of information that may affect the course of the investigation. These developments are considered factors that directly influence the direction of the committee.

Delegates are expected to write directives in order to manage these crises and intervene in the process. While writing directives is not strictly mandatory for every participant, it is of critical importance for taking an active role in the committee and being effective both individually and at the unit level.

Directives may be written individually or collectively on behalf of a unit. This allows delegates to exercise both personal initiative and coordinated action within their teams.

For a directive to be implemented, it must be clear, logical, and sufficiently detailed. Incomplete, vague, or impractical directives may not be taken into consideration. Properly written directives, however, will directly impact the committee process and may result in either successful or unsuccessful outcomes.

Lawyers may also take an active role in this process. When deemed necessary, they may write directives to intervene in developments. In particular, they are expected to evaluate the legal aspects of proposed actions and suggest appropriate courses of action accordingly.

Lawyers are not limited to writing directives; they are also responsible for assessing the legal validity of proposed actions. They may object to initiatives that lack sufficient legal basis, draw attention to potential violations of rights or procedural errors, and assume a guiding role in ensuring that the committee's actions remain within legal and ethical boundaries.

## **-Advocates in the Committee**

Advocates in the committee are not assigned to represent a specific suspect or individual; rather, they are responsible for ensuring that the investigative process operates within a proper legal framework. Instead of defending a single person, advocates serve as a general mechanism of legal oversight for all allegations and suspects presented throughout the committee.

Their primary responsibility is to evaluate whether accusations are supported by sufficient and credible evidence, to challenge claims that lack proper justification, and to prevent potential

violations of individual rights. In doing so, advocates are expected to identify inconsistencies, question procedural irregularities, and present alternative explanations that maintain the possibility of innocence.

Advocates may actively intervene when actions taken by other units risk exceeding legal or ethical boundaries. This includes, but is not limited to, situations such as the collection of biological evidence without sufficient justification or the public portrayal of individuals as guilty without conclusive proof.

Advocates must not attempt to determine or declare who is guilty. Instead, they are expected to approach all allegations with a critical and impartial perspective, ensuring that the committee proceeds in a balanced, lawful, and evidence-based manner.

## **-Committee Objective**

The primary purpose of this committee is to conduct a comprehensive analysis of unfolding crises and the information presented, with the aim of advancing the investigation. The units within the committee are expected to examine available data within the scope of their respective areas of expertise, identify gaps, and highlight noteworthy details.

Delegates are required to carefully evaluate the information provided in the Study Guide, recognize critical details, identify inconsistencies, and develop their analyses accordingly. The progress of the investigation depends not merely on the repetition of given information, but on its interpretation and expansion.

The effectiveness of each unit is not only dependent on its individual work but also on its ability to collaborate with other units. Coordination between units enables more efficient processing of information and contributes to a more effective advancement of the investigation. In this regard, the committee emphasizes both individual analytical skills and collective cooperation.