



*EAST & CENTRAL AFRICA MODEL UNITED
NATIONS*

SPECIAL SUMMIT BOOKLET

2025/2026

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
COMMITTEE PARTICIPANTS	4
Senior Chairpersons	4
Junior Chairperson	4
Sides of Debate	4
The Judging Panel	5
PROCEDURE	6
Opening Statements	6
Crossfire	6
Closing Statements	7
The Ruling	7
Right to Explain Position	7
Procedural Summary	8
HOW TO PREPARE	9
Researching Topics	9
Preparing Statements	10
Opening Statements	10
Closing Statements	10
SAMPLE ARGUMENTS	11
Opening Statements	11
Proposing	11
Opposing	11
Rebuttals During Crossfire	12
To rebut	12
To concede	12
Closing Statements	13
Proposing	13
Opposing	13
JUDGING RUBRICS	13
CLOSING REMARKS	14

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Herein are the procedural conventions to be followed in the Special Summit committee for the 2025/26 East & Central African Model United Nations conference. Its purpose is to provide all participants with a comprehensive summary of the committee's activities, enabling effective preparation and successful debate.

This booklet shall cover the following:

- The participants of the committee and their roles within the committee,
- The procedure that the Chair will carry out within the committee,
- The research process and what delegates should do to prepare for the conference.

Within the Special Summit, delegates debate ongoing and relevant issues faced by today's leaders. By challenging themselves to develop nuanced arguments regardless of the position they are assigned, committee members learn to consider other perspectives on contentious topics. Delegates should also leave this committee with a deep knowledge of current events, better equipping them to go forth into the wider international community.

In accordance with the ECAMUN motto, *Bridging Minds, Building Nations*, this committee especially empowers students to explore the power they hold as the youth. In the Special Summit, delegates come to understand the power of their voice: their solutions are valued, their ideals are respected, and their input is appreciated. Age is not a hindrance, but simply a unique perspective. As a result of this, it is our hope that committee members achieve the self-assurance they need to blossom into promising future leaders.

The Special Summit further instills the importance of being global citizens in each committee member. This committee has the unique ability to draw connections between countries all over the world that struggle with similar controversies. By collaborating with peers to construct cohesive opening and closing statements, committee members develop a unique interconnectedness with one another.

Remember that to be successful in the Special Summit, one must also exhibit intellectual curiosity, tenacity, and courage. Intellectual curiosity inspires an earnest pursuit of the acquisition of as many perspectives as possible. Tenacity drives delegates to push through, despite not being assigned to the side of debate they were hoping for. Emboldened by intellectual courage, delegates learn to push themselves to engage in debate without being limited by fear.

The 2025/26 ECAMUN Executive Committee and Management Team sincerely hope this booklet will be invaluable during your process of preparation.

Yours sincerely,

The 2025/26 ECAMUN Executive Committee & Management Team.

COMMITTEE PARTICIPANTS

Senior Chairpersons

Appointed by the Executive Committee, the Senior Chairperson(s) of the committee shall have complete oversight over all committee proceedings, and are responsible for ensuring the completion of the cases to be considered. They shall be responsible for the crossfire that shall take place, and will oversee opening and closing statements, as well as the preparation periods.

In case participants have any questions concerning the procedure while the committee is in session, they should be addressed to the Senior Chairperson. They will also be responsible for setting time limits for procedures and ruling on motions of procedure. In short, their duties are as follows:

- Mediating debate and crossfires
- Ensuring all delegates understand the proceedings being undertaken
- Ensuring the smooth completion of the procedure

Junior Chairperson

They will act as the main spokesperson of the debate during these crossfires, and all debates must go through them.

It is important to note that they will be only chairing during crossfire periods and not any other proceedings, which refers to opening/closing statements and the right to explain position. They will always report and be guided by the Senior Chairperson and are in charge of mediating crossfire periods.

Sides of Debate

The term “sides of debate” refers to the two groups made up of delegates that are either proposing or opposing the designated topic.

For each topic, the Senior Chair shall assign each delegation to a particular side of the debate. Regardless of the delegate’s personal stance on this issue, the delegate is then required to work with the rest of their team to construct an opening statement, points for crossfire, and a closing statement. Teamwork is essential to creating a cohesive and persuasive argument.

Upon selection, the delegates will be required to:

- Be familiar with the topic at hand, with relevant research carried out.
- Write opening and closing statements according to their appointed side of the debate.
- Present the opening and closing statements in front of the Special Summit.
- Partake in the crossfire between the two sides (refer to “procedure”).

The Judging Panel

The final group of participants within the Special Summit is the judging panel. This panel will choose a side of the debate as the “winner” and announce it to the committee after both sides have presented their closing statements.

The judging panel is composed of 5 volunteer delegates who will be required to pay close attention to committee proceedings to reach a fair verdict. No two delegates from the same delegation may oversee the same topic.

It is expected that the appointed judges will:

- Examine all sources relevant to the topic before their judging session
- Be familiar with all the parties involved in the topic
- Impartially hear out the arguments of both sides
- Elect one judge to announce the winners and provide a well-considered explanation for their decision

PROCEDURE

The Chair shall call the committee to order, announce the topic on the agenda, and read out a short description of the topic.

“The first/next topic on the agenda is [Topic and Description].”

Once the topic and description have been read, the Senior Chair will then divide the committee into two sides of debate and announce which sides are proposing or opposing.

Opening Statements

After the sides have been allocated, the Senior Chair will announce that each side has 10 minutes to prepare its opening statements. At this point, rules will be suspended, meaning devices will be permitted (but **only for research purposes**).

“We will now move into the 10-minute preparation period for opening statements. All rules have been suspended.”

Delegates will then gather with their respective teams to discuss who will propose opening statements and what should be stated. A maximum of three speakers may present the opening statements for each side, and any delegates who spoke during opening statements may not speak during closing statements.

When the 10-minute preparation period ends, all rules are reinstated, meaning all devices must be put away. The Chair shall then give each side 5 minutes to present their opening statements. Speakers may not be open to any points of information.

“Time to prepare opening statements has just expired. All rules are now in session. We will now move into 5 minutes for the proposing/opposing side’s opening statements. Delegates wishing to speak, please raise your placards.”

Once a delegate has spoken during opening statements, they may yield the floor to another delegate on the same side of the debate or yield the floor back to the Chair. Again, a maximum of 3 people may speak during opening statements.

NOTE: All timings are up to the discretion of the Chair and may differ from the timings mentioned in this booklet.

Crossfire

“Crossfire” refers to the rapid-fire debate that takes place after both sides have presented their opening statements. There may be two speakers from the same side before the floor is yielded to the opposite side. Each *side* must be open to a minimum of one Point of Information, and each *speaker* can be open to a maximum of two Points of Information.

Here is an example of how this would function during debate:

The Chair says, *“Time for the opposing side’s opening statements has just expired. We will now move into 45 minutes of crossfire. Are there any requests for the floor on the proposing side of the question?”*

The delegate of Burundi raises her placard and is selected by the Chair. Burundi gives her speech, and is open to one Point of Information before yielding to Italy.

Italy gives his speech, and chooses not to be open to any Points of Information. He yields the floor to the Chair, and the Chair yields the floor to the opposing side.

NOTE: The following motions are in order within the Special Summit: *Vote of No Confidence, Point of Privilege, Orders of the Day, Point of Parliamentary Inquiry, Point of Information, Point of Order, Appeal, Withdraw a Motion, Previous Question & Extend Debate.*

Closing Statements

Once the period for Crossfire has expired, the committee will get 5 minutes to prepare closing statements.

“Time for Crossfire has just expired, we will now move into the 5 minute preparatory period for closing statements. All rules have been suspended.”

Again, the use of devices for research purposes is permitted only until the end of the preparation period. After the 5 minutes have expired, each side has 5 minutes to present their closing statements.

“The preparation period for closing statements has just expired, we will now move into 5 minutes for the proposing/opposing side’s closing statements.”

There may be a maximum of 3 speakers, but no speakers who had the floor during opening statements may speak.

The Ruling

The end of the opposing side’s closing statements will mark the end of debate time on that particular topic. Before moving on to the next topic on the agenda, the judges must announce the winning side. An elected representative will announce the winner and give a short explanation for their decision.

“Time for the opposing side’s closing statements has just expired. The Chair now yields to the judging panel to announce their decision.”

Right to Explain Position

Either after the winner has been announced or after the end of Crossfire, the Senior Chair may decide to move into a session of Right to Explain Position. This is called when the Chair wishes to confirm that all delegates have been actively paying attention to the debate, even if some delegations did not have the opportunity to speak.

“We will now move into Rights to Explain Positions, delegates please raise your placards.”

In a Right to Explain Position, a delegate may be required to state the side of the debate they are on, give some arguments for their side, and respond to counterarguments made by the opposite side.

“Delegation of [Country Name], please state your assigned side and give a short defence for your position.”

Procedural Summary

1. The Chair shall call the committee to order, announce the topic on the agenda, and read out a short description of the topic. *“The first/next topic on the agenda is [Topic and Description].”*
2. The Senior Chair will announce that each side has 10 minutes to prepare their opening statements. At this point, rules will be suspended, meaning devices will be permitted (but **only for research purposes**).
3. When the 10-minute preparation period ends, all rules are reinstated, meaning all devices must be put away. The Chair shall then give each side 5 minutes to present their opening statements. Speakers may not be open to any points of information.
4. After the time for the opening statements of both sides of the question has expired, the assembly will move into a crossfire (usually lasting 45 minutes).
5. Proceeding this, the assembly will be allowed a leeway of five minutes to prepare for closing statements. Once again, rules will be suspended.
6. Time for closing statement preparation expires, and the assembly will move into a 5-minute time for the closing statements.
7. Proceeding, both sides delivering their closing statements, the judges will announce a verdict on the motion at hand.
8. If time permits, the assembly may move into the Right to Explain Position.

HOW TO PREPARE

Researching Topics

Researching Special Summit topics before the conference is not only expected, but also incredibly influential on one's success as a delegate in the Special Summit.

This also holds for judges. At least a cursory pre-understanding at hand will help them greatly in understanding the arguments made by both sides.

While researching, committee participants should try to answer the following questions:

- What are the key arguments people on both sides make?
- Who are the stakeholders in this issue? How are they affected by this issue in both positive and negative ways?
- What are aspects of this issue that are often neglected?
- What are the causes of this issue?
- What statistics support my stance? What statistics challenge my stance?
- Are there any case studies that detail how this issue was solved in different countries? Was the solution successful?
- How do both sides of the issue fit in with the ideals of the United Nations and the Sustainable Development Goals?

During their research, committee members should keep in mind that they will be assigned to a side of the debate irrespective of their beliefs. Their ability to present a persuasive argument should not in any way be inhibited by their personal points of view.

One way to organise data in support of both sides can be to create a chart or graphic organiser similar to the one below.

Topic: [topic name]					
	Claim #1	Evidence	Claim #2	Evidence	Sources
Arguments For					
Arguments Against					

Preparing Statements

Before creating arguments in response to a topic, delegates must understand what kind of argument the topic requires in response. Is the topic at hand a debate about morality? Such topics tend to be emotionally heavier, meaning that banking on empathy and commonly held values could be helpful. Is it debating the factuality of a statement? In that case, logical evidence may be the way to go. Is it an argument of policy? Arguments of policy look into the future and discuss what should be done to address an issue. During topics that relate to policy, the research question about past attempts to respond to this issue is particularly useful.

While preparing their arguments, delegates should make use of various rhetorical devices to strengthen their argument. They should appeal to the committee's logic by pointing to definitive evidence in support of their claim. At the same time, arguments should be emotionally persuasive, convincing the judges not only to see the truth in their argument, but to feel emotionally attached to their argument. Getting committee participants riled up at the injustice of an issue can be a powerful tool in presenting a compelling argument.

Delegates can further enhance their claims by underlining the credibility of their statements. Citing reputable sources to support a stance can make a side seem knowledgeable and well-reasoned.

Opening Statements

A persuasive opening statement lays the groundwork for the side's argument. It states the broader themes that delegates intend to further explore during Crossfire.

During the preparation period for opening statements, each side should settle on its plan of action. Based upon this plan, the side should highlight key ideas that they wish to build upon during crossfire. These ideas should be included in the opening statements.

At this point, each side of the debate should discuss who should present their opening statements, and in what order. This will allow for seamless transitions once time begins for opening statements.

Closing Statements

Closing Statements are the final thing the judging panel hears before they make their decision. Therefore, closing statements should restate the highlights of their argument, rebut any remaining points, and end with a call to action.

As the preparation period for closing statements is much shorter, the sides of the debate must be efficient in communicating and deciding on what should be included in closing statements. It is also key for each side to decide upon (up to) 3 different speakers to wrap up their argument, just as the sides are expected to do during the preparation for opening statements.

SAMPLE ARGUMENTS

Included in this section are some sample arguments for a topic that was debated in the Special Summit at the previous Conferences. These arguments can serve as examples of what strong, well-researched arguments should look like.

Topic: *Affirmative action is a functional way of levelling out the opportunity landscape.*

Opening Statements

Proposing

It is a universally accepted concept that as time progresses, so does society. In turn, society should become more equitable with every passing day. In theory, more opportunities in academia should exist for people of colour than they did 35 years ago. And yet, according to the New York Times, students of colour are more underrepresented in selective American universities now than they were 35 years ago. Affirmative action is an effective way to combat these disparities; a recent study found that students of colour are 23% less likely to be accepted into selective public colleges after an affirmative action ban takes place.

The effects of affirmative action bans stretch even further than education. To quote the founder of Advancing Health Equity on the effects of banning affirmative action on healthcare, “fewer black health professionals means less culturally responsive and equitable care for Black patients.” Her argument holds for most minority groups, especially Latinos, with many Hispanic/Latino individuals lacking access to quality healthcare. Unless there are people from these minorities conscientiously ensuring that people of colour receive quality care, the needs and cultural backgrounds of these individuals remain ignored. Affirmative action gives people of colour a seat at the table and enables them to advocate for other people of colour, which is a theme the proposing side will continue to explore throughout our argument.

Because of affirmative action and nondiscrimination policies in higher education and in the workplace, the academic and professional spheres have become far more diverse in the last several decades. Affirmative action has afforded millions of people success in their careers. However, do not be misled. The success of affirmative action programs does not mean they are no longer needed, as was expressed at the start of this speech. Programs like these are still relevant as UN member nations seek the fulfillment of Sustainable Development Goal 10: reduced inequalities.

Opposing

Renu Mukherjee is the daughter of immigrant parents and grandparents. Her father and grandmother migrated from the north of India around the time the Civil Rights Act was passed. Her grandfather. As an Asian American, affirmative action means she is not considered to be “diverse” based on the fact that Asian American enrollment in American schools is disproportionately larger than the Asian American demographic in the country.

Affirmative action is not only wrong because it makes it more difficult for certain demographics to gain admission, but it also perpetuates the belief that certain stories are more

worth accepting than others. The value of someone's story no longer relies on the resilience that led them to succeed, but rather on the "uniqueness" of this story. The definition of diversity imposed by affirmative action is incredibly restrictive. For example, a Caucasian student from a small town in Utah, who is both a harpist and a first-generation graduate, and a South Asian student with a rich background in computer science and theatre, apply to a highly competitive university. They stand a high chance of acceptance based on their achievements alone, but when the admissions officer sees the tick next to Caucasian and South Asian, a warning signal goes off in their head. Diversity of thought holds no value. Now imagine that both these students were from the Bahamas, and it becomes an entirely different scenario.

Affirmative action does anything but level the playing field. It places value on racial background over life experience. It makes already competitive application processes even more difficult for those with ethnic backgrounds that are not in high demand. An applicant is no longer admitted based on merit alone, but based on factors entirely beyond their control. As the opposing side will continue to assert throughout this debate, affirmative action only serves to further racial inequalities in academia.

Rebuttals During Crossfire

The fast-paced nature of crossfire makes it perfect to rebut points brought up by the opposite side of the debate, or to concede a point brought up by the other side and use that to strengthen your side's argument.

To Rebut

In their opening statements, the opposing side used the example of a white university applicant struggling with admission to an institution of higher education because of their race. However, white women have benefited more from affirmative action than anyone else. While certain racial groups remain significantly underrepresented, white women's admission rates outpace that of white men, with 72% of white women enrolled compared with 62% of white men. Affirmative action is based on both gender and ethnic background, so why aren't all men vehemently opposed to affirmative action? And if gender-related affirmative action has proven to be so successful, after only 35.3% of undergraduate recipients in the 1960s were women, then this should be a testament to the effectiveness of affirmative action. The aim of affirmative action has never been to devalue members of privileged races or genders, but rather to allow the underprivileged to catch up.

To Concede

The delegation of São Tomé and Príncipe was correct in its assertion that affirmative action does not prioritise individuals of certain demographics, particularly Caucasians. While this may be the case, banning affirmative action would cause even greater race-based inequality. The admissions process has been heavily skewed in favour of wealthy white families. Things such as legacy status and donations have secured generations of white individuals from wealthy families a spot at some of the most prestigious universities in the world. This cycle of power and education has greatly limited the chances of working-class people of colour to remain competitive with their wealthy white peers. As long as these policies stand, the education system will always favour the white man over people of colour and women. Even with its many

drawbacks, as it stands right now, affirmative action is the most effective way there is to level out the opportunity landscape.

Closing Statements

Proposing

The opposition towards affirmative action stems from well-funded campaigns to battle political reforms in response to the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. White conservatives propagated a media campaign to create white opposition to affirmative action with quotas that they claimed discriminated against white people. The phrase “affirmative action,” however, was originally an amiable term used by presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, stating that the government needs to act *affirmatively* and assertively to end race and sex-based discrimination.

We cannot let the labour of generations before us go to waste by failing to ensure that people of colour are given more opportunities to make up for decades of institutionalised racism. Affirmative action, as we established before, enables people of colour in various fields to address the systems of racism within their field and provide other people of colour with deliberate and exceptional services. Millions of professionals from various backgrounds have built careers on affirmative action. Implementing affirmative action policies was a decisive step towards equity, but the need for affirmative action remains. In 2023, it is unacceptable that people of colour are still heavily underrepresented in institutions of higher learning. For these reasons, the only answer to the question of whether affirmative action is a functional way of levelling out the opportunity landscape is an emphatic “yes.”

Opposing

The proposing side has repeatedly failed to acknowledge that affirmative action harms people of colour too. East Asians and South Asians are affected negatively by these policies as they come from minority groups that are in low demand. Does this make them any less of a minority? Do they also not require shielding from systems of racial oppression?

There are other alternatives to race-conscious admissions practices, which this side had discussed during Crossfire. Top-percent policies and a holistic view are two alternatives that institutions of higher education, such as Minerva, have been using for decades. They provide ways for admissions officers to aid the disadvantaged by considering how their story will affect their future without defining applicants by their skin colour alone.

The opposing side stated that while affirmative action was created with people of colour in mind, it has mainly benefitted white women. If this process has been failing in its objectives since the 1960s, how can one say it is in any way effective? Affirmative action may have been a viable solution in the 1960s, but in today’s society, it is simply archaic and unconstructive. Rather than equalising the playing field, affirmative action serves to skew it further.

JUDGING RUBRICS

The rubric for judging within the Special Summit can be found

 [SAMPLE JUDGING RUBRIC](#)

CLOSING REMARKS

The Executive Committee would like to offer a warm thanks to all those who have read this booklet. Delegates, judges, and advisors, you have already taken the first step in ensuring that the Special Summit is a resounding success in this upcoming conference.

The Co-Chairpersons of the Second General Assembly, who have complete oversight over this committee, are confident that delegates who have referenced this booklet will be lively, intelligent, and well-reasoned debaters. The Senior Chairpersons of the Special Summit shall do their best to guarantee that all delegates within the Special Summit have a wonderful experience. Alongside the rest of the committee, the Senior Chairpersons will develop a stronger understanding of current events as they guide the committee through each topic.

As for the judges, having referred to this booklet will allow them to fulfil their duties to the best of their abilities. Equipped with the knowledge of what is expected in each aspect of debate found in this booklet, judges will be uniquely able to spot strong rhetoric and arguments, and award the deserving side the title of winner for the topic at hand.

Advisors, a thorough understanding of the committees in which delegates will be debating is essential. The Executive Committee would like to commend you on your dedication to ensuring the success of your students during the 1st Annual East & Central African Model United Nations/

We hope you enjoy the Special Summit!

Fenet Taye,

Co-Chairperson of the Second General Assembly

Kai Savala,

Co-Chairperson of the Second General Assembly