2024 HUGO ADMINISTRATORS' REPORT

GLASGOW 2024
A WORLDCON FOR OUR FUTURES

2024 Hugo Administrators' Report

The below report gives an account of the decisions made by the 2024 Hugo Subcommittee about the administration of the 2024 Hugo, Lodestar and *Astounding* Awards, consistent with the commitment to transparency made by Glasgow 2024: A Worldcon for Our Futures in February 2024. It is a public document.

Please direct any questions arising from this report to hugo-admin@glasgow2024.org.

Membership of the 2024 Hugo Subcommittee

The Committee of Glasgow 2024: A Worldcon for Our Futures approved the following resolution on 20 November 2022:

> Per section 3.13 of the WSFS Constitution, the Glasgow 2024 Worldcon Committee completely and irrevocably delegates its authority to administer the 2024 Hugo, Lodestar, and Astounding Awards to a Hugo Subcommittee consisting of Hugo Administrator Kat Jones, Deputy Hugo Administrator Cassidy, WSFS Division Head Nicholas Whyte, and WSFS Deputy Division Head Kathryn Duval. The members of the Hugo Subcommittee will therefore be ineligible for the 2024 Hugo, Lodestar, and Astounding Awards. Kat Jones may add to or modify the Hugo Subcommittee at her discretion without having to return to the Glasgow 2024 Worldcon Committee for approval.

Laura Martins was added to the Hugo Subcommittee in January 2024, and the printed nominations ballot therefore specified her along with the four names specified in November 2022 as ineligible for the Hugos.

Kat Jones resigned as Hugo Administrator and from the Hugo Subcommittee on 15 February 2024, and Nicholas Whyte took over her responsibilities on 24 February, including the power to change the Subcommittee's membership. (In fact, no subsequent change to the Subcommittee's membership was made.) **We determined that** Kat Jones remained ineligible for the 2024 Hugos (in the event neither she nor any of the continuing Subcommittee members received any nomination votes).

Technology

We utilised several different technology solutions. Access to Hugo voting via the convention web interface was designed by STAXO, a commercial company. The front end of nomination voting and the front and back end of final ballot voting used the NomNom system, newly designed for Glasgow 2024 by Chris Rose. The back end of nominations used the Kansa system designed for Worldcon 75 in 2017 by Eemeli Aro, updated by David Matthewman. We understand that Kansa is now on its last legs, and that Chris Rose is designing an extension to NomNom which will also manage the back end of the nominations tally in future years.

We are enormously grateful to Chris Rose and David Matthewman for the time and resources that they invested in the 2024 Hugos.

Due to software problems, we had to pause Hugo nominations from 28 January to 6 February. This straddled the 31 January date for Glasgow members to acquire nominating rights. We received a query asking if we would extend the membership cutoff period to take account of the delay. However, the 31 January date is set in the Constitution by Section 3.7.1 and we cannot change it.

Eligibility research

We received a query as to whether the members of the Hugo Research Team were eligible for the Hugos. Like others in the wider Hugo team, they were not members of the Hugo Subcommittee, and therefore were not disqualified by Section 3.13 of the Constitution.

We are very grateful to the members of the Hugo research team for their work. Their responsibilities were:

- Claire Brialey and Mark Plummer - all non-Chinese nominees except in the Best Game or Interactive Experience category
- Alissa Wales - all non-Chinese nominees except in the Best Fanzine and Best Game or Interactive Experience category
- Fergal Whyte - the Best Game or Interactive Experience category
- Arthur Liu - all Chinese nominees except in the Best Fan Writer and Best Fanzine categories
- Regina Kanyu Wang - Chinese nominees in the Best Fan Writer and Best Fanzine categories.

Research began in early February. Non-Chinese language researchers were given alphabetized lists of the top twelve nominees in each category, as voting then stood, as long as they had at least 60% of the votes held by the currently sixth-placed nominee. These lists were updated as votes came in.

There were fewer Chinese nominees, and we simply flagged all of them to the relevant researchers as they were nominated.

Claire Brialey and Mark Plummer worked together, but otherwise the researchers worked independently and each reported directly to the subcommittee.

Arthur Liu and Regina Kanyu Wang were members of one of the editorial teams that qualified for the final ballot in the Best Fanzine category; but neither was responsible for reviewing the eligibility of non-Chinese nominees in that category.

Eligibility issues that were flagged by the researchers were referred to the Subcommittee, and discussed and decided by the Subcommittee alone. In several cases, including the three cases where nominees were disqualified, we were also able to get the views of the relevant creators. We in turn referred one eligibility issue in the *Astounding* Award (which is not part of the WSFS Constitution) to Dell Magazines, who duly ruled on it.

Invalidation of votes

> **Section 6.2: Natural Persons.** In all matters arising under this Constitution, only natural persons may introduce business, nominate, or vote, except as specifically provided otherwise in this Constitution. No person may cast more than one vote on any issue or more than one ballot in any election. This shall not be interpreted to prohibit delivery of ballots cast by other eligible voters.

It is clear from the above that the constitution empowers the Administrators to reject ballots if there is strong evidence that they have been cast additionally by a person who has already voted, or that the voter is not a 'natural person'. This is not the same as a 'slate' where different voters agree to align their votes, and which is considered (correctly) to be allowed by the Constitution.

We are aware of two previous occasions when it became known to the public that multiple Hugo **nomination** voting by or on behalf of a single individual had taken place, the well-known cases of 1960 and 1989. The administrators in 1960 decided to simply reject the dubious votes; in 1989 it was decided to count the ballots both with and also without the dubious votes, and to qualify all of the finalists who would have been on the ballot either way, so that there was an extra finalist in the affected categories. In the event, the relevant 1989 finalists withdrew from the ballot in two of the three categories in which they had been nominated, and lost badly in the third.

In our view the approach taken in 1960 is closer to the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, both as it was then and as it is today. We believe that finalists should not appear on the ballot as a result of illegally cast votes. The approach taken in 1989 would also be much more complex to apply now that EPH is used to determine the finalists.

We have no knowledge of what may or may not have happened in this regard in 2023, beyond the (frankly confusing) public reports, but we are also aware of other cases in other years when Administrators simply disqualified votes on the grounds that they were clearly not cast by natural persons, or were cast by a single person using multiple memberships, in violation of what is now Section 6.2. In those cases nothing was made public at the time, and we will not say any more about them either.

At the nominations stage in 2024, we investigated several cases where at first sight voting patterns warranted a closer look, but we did not in the end find convincing evidence that a significant number of nominating votes had been cast in breach of Section 6.2, so **no nomination votes were rejected**.

However, when it came to the final ballot votes, it became clear from early June that a pattern of suspicious votes among newly purchased memberships was emerging, all of which supported a particular finalist, who we will call Finalist A. The evidence available to us indicates very strongly that Finalist A was completely unaware of this campaign, and bears absolutely no responsibility for it.

As we stated on 23 July, much of this peculiar voting behaviour came from voters who clearly had fake names and/or other disqualifying characteristics, strongly indicating that the vote was not cast in good faith. The fake names included, for instance, a run of voters whose second names were

identical except that the first letter was changed, in alphabetical order; and a run of voters whose names were translations of consecutive numbers.

Additionally, we received a report from a reliable and confidential source that at least one person had sponsored the purchase of WSFS memberships by large numbers of individuals, who were then refunded the cost of membership by that sponsor, after confirming that they had voted as the sponsor wished. This was a sufficient and satisfactory explanation for the suspicious pattern of voting behaviour that we had observed.

There were also a number of voters who disputed their credit card charges for membership, all of whom had in fact voted for Finalist A. We refunded their memberships and also disqualified their votes. If these voters were also compensated for the cost of their memberships by the sponsor of the fraudulent voting scheme, they will have come out with a financial profit. We did not refund any of the other questionable memberships.

In total, we disqualified 377 votes which were clearly part of the fraudulent voting scheme in support of Finalist A. We believe that many more votes may have been part of the scheme. Removing the 377 that were clearly fraudulent prevented Finalist A from winning the Hugo Award in their category. (It did not change the winner in any other category.) Again, we do not believe that Finalist A was in any way aware of what was happening.

After internal reflection, we have decided **not** to describe further details of how such dubious votes have been or could be detected, and we request that commentators be circumspect in any such discussion. Any exposition of the technical details will incentivise bad actors to try and find new ways of evading detection. Our standard of proof is that it is pretty clear when you see it (as it was in 1960 and 1989).

Translation

We acknowledge with gratitude here the work of the translators who made Hugo finalist material available to readers beyond the original language. Alex Woodend and Emily Jin's translations into English of Chinese works were in fact the texts nominated for the final ballot. Geng Hui, Xueting C. Ni, Dauvit Horsbroch, Gao Qipeng, Emily Jin and an anonymous individual also translated finalist materials for the Hugo Voter Packet.

Given the very large number of WSFS members of Chengdu Worldcon, all of whom had the right to nominate for the 2024 Hugos, we had all the necessary material efficiently and professionally translated by Sophia Xue.

Chengdu Worldcon had made an ad hoc ruling that the English word limits specified in the WSFS Constitution for the written fiction categories should be multiplied by 1.6 to get equivalent limits in Chinese characters (so, for instance, the 40,000 word limit between the novella and novel categories should equate to 64,000 Chinese characters). We carried out a number of spot checks and found the 1.6 ratio reasonable, so **we also chose to adopt it**.

Replacement of finalists

Section 3.9.4: After the initial Award ballot is generated, if any finalist(s) are removed for any reason, they will be replaced by other works in reverse order of elimination.

Two of us wrote in 2017, the first year that EPH was used:

> It was put to us that, in the early stages of processing nominations at least, in case a finalist turned out to be ineligible, or declined nomination, EPH should be re-run for that category with the former finalist removed *ab initio*, and a new final ballot determined on that basis.
>
> We **observe** that any "re-run" of EPH, with one or more candidates removed, carries the significant risk that nominees originally determined to have qualified for the final ballot (and meantime notified of their status as finalists) might be removed from it by a recalculation. We also **observe** that the 2016 Business Meeting explicitly removed a provision for re-running EPH for this purpose from §3.9.4 of the constitution.
>
> **We determined that** the only mechanism in the constitution for replacing ineligible finalists is that described in §3.9.4 - finalists which are removed from the final ballot, for any reason, are replaced in reverse order of elimination from the available nominees, in the order determined by EPH immediately after nominations close.

The subsequent years of administering EPH have only confirmed the correctness of this approach, and it is also mandated in the Constitution. To summarise:

1) Nomination voting closes.
2) Administrators generate the ballot in each category using EPH.
3) The top six nominees in each category are checked for eligibility and willingness to accept nomination.
4) Any who are ineligible or who decline nomination are replaced by the next available nominee from the original list generated at step 2.

In 2024, as noted below in discussion of the relevant categories, five nominees declined their places on the ballot, and we disqualified another three (one of which had also qualified in another category). Each was replaced by the next on the original case generated by EPH in that category. (In one case, the replacement also turned out to be ineligible and had to be replaced in turn.)

Best Novel

Martha Wells declined nomination for **System Collapse**. This brought 天帆 (**Cosmo Wings**) by 江波 (Bo Jiang) onto the ballot.

天帆 (**Cosmo Wings**) carries a copyright date of 1 December 2023. But our research revealed that it was not actually published until 2024, and was therefore not eligible in the Best Novel category for

the 2024 Hugos under Section 3.2.3 of the Constitution. We are grateful to Bo Jiang for accepting this disappointing news with good grace. This brought **The Saint of Bright Doors**, by Vajra Chandrasekhara, onto the ballot.

The following nomination votes were reallocated to the Best Novel category under Section 3.8.2 of the Constitution; this did not affect the outcome.

- **System Collapse**, by Martha Wells, received 115 nominations for Best Novel and 20 for Best Novella. All were counted for Best Novel.
- **He Who Drowned the World**, by Shelly Parker Chan, received 73 nominations for Best Novel and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novel.
- **The Water Outlaws**, by S.L. Huang, received 67 nominations for Best Novel and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novel.
- **Bookshops and Bonedust**, by Travis Baldree, received 57 nominations in Best Novel and two in Best Novella. All were counted for Best Novel.

Northanger Abbey, by Jane Austen, received a single nominating vote for **Best Novel**. We did not rule on its eligibility, as it was nowhere near the top six nominees in this category (or even in the top two hundred), but any such ruling would have been negative. **Northanger Abbey** was first published in 1818, and first published in the USA in 1833. Neither of those dates satisfies Section 3.4.2 of the Constitution, which would require first publication, first USA publication or first English language publication to have been in 2023.

Best Novella

Two stories which had first been published in Chinese before 2023 received enough votes to qualify for the final ballot, and **we determined that** they were eligible because they were first published in English, and in the USA, in 2023 (per Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 of the Constitution). These were:

- "Seeds of Mercury" / 水星播种 by Wang Jinkang / 王晋康 first published in 2022;
- "Life Does Not Allow Us to Meet" / 人生不相见 by He Xi / 何夕 first published in 2010.

The following nomination votes were reallocated to the Best Novella category under Section 3.8.2 of the Constitution; this did not affect the outcome.

- **The Mimicking of Known Successes**, by Malka Older, received 184 nominations for Best Novella and two for Best Novel. All were counted for Best Novella.
- **Thornhedge**, by T. Kingfisher, received 175 nominations for Best Novella and four for Best Novel. All were counted for Best Novella.
- 人生不相见 / "Life Does Not Allow Us To Meet", by He Xi, received 120 nominations for Best Novella and one for Best Novelette. All were counted for Best Novella.
- **Rose/House**, by Arkady Martine, received 111 nominations for Best Novella and one for Best Novelette, All were counted for Best Novella.

- **Lost in the Moment and Found**, by Seanan McGuire, received 103 nominations for Best Novella and one for Best Novel. All were counted for Best Novella.
- **Untethered Sky**, by Fonda Lee, received 99 nominations for Best Novella and one for Best Novel. All were counted for Best Novella.
- **Linghun** by Ai Jiang received 31 nominations for Best Novella and one nomination for Best Novel. All were counted for Best Novella.

Best Novelette

"Introduction to *2181 Overture*, Second Edition" /〈2181序曲〉再版导言 by Gu Shi / 顾适, was first published in Chinese in 2020, but first published in English translation, and in the USA, in 2023, so **we determined that** it was eligible in this category (per Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 of the Constitution).

海漄 / Hai Ya declined nomination for his story 极北之地 / "The Far North". This brought "One Man's Treasure", by Sarah Pinsker, onto the final ballot.

The following nomination votes were reallocated to the Best Novelette category under Section 3.8.2 of the Constitution; this did not affect the outcome.

- 极北之地 / "The Far North", by Hai Ya, received 241 nominations for Best Novelette and 11 for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "The Year Without Sunshine", by Naomi Kritzer, received 116 nominations for Best Novelette and two for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "On the Fox Roads", by Nghi Vo, received 56 nominations for Best Novelette and two for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "Ivy, Angelica, Bay" by C.L. Polk received 47 votes for Best Novelette and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "Science Facts!", by Sarah Pinsker, received 31 votes for Best Novelette and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "Cold Relations", by Mary Robinette Kowal, received 22 votes for Best Novelette and seven for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "Six Versions of My Brother Found Under the Bridge", by Eugenia Triantafyllou, received 27 votes for Best Novelette and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "The Luck Thief", by Tade Thompson, received 25 votes for Best Novelette and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.
- "Prince Hat Underground", by Kelly Link, received 26 votes for Best Novelette and one for Best Short Story. All were counted for Best Novelette.

Best Short Story

"Answerless Journey" / 没有答案的航程 by Han Song / 韩松, was first published in Chinese in 1995, but first published in English translation, and in the USA, in 2023, so **we determined that** it was eligible in this category (per Sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2 of the Constitution).

The following nomination votes were reallocated to the Best Short Story category under Section 3.8.2 of the Constitution; this did not affect the outcome.

- 没有答案的航程 / "Answerless Journey", by Han Song, received 68 votes for Best Short Story and one for Best Novelette. All were counted for Best Short Story.
- 音桶人希文的故事 / "The Story of Xiwen, the Sound Barrel Man", by Dan Shi, received 25 votes for Best Short Story and one for Best Novelette. All were counted for Best Short Story.
- 庄子的梦 / "Zhuangzi's Dream", by Cao Baiyu, received 18 votes for Best Short Story and one for Best Novelette. All were counted for Best Short Story.
- "Counting Casualties", by Yoon Ha Lee, received 18 votes for Best Short Story and one for Best Novelette. All were counted for Best Short Story.

Best Series

> **Section 3.8.3:** If any series and a subset series thereof both receive sufficient nominations to appear on the final ballot, only the version which received more nominations shall appear.

We received a query suggesting that the reference to "subset series" in Section 3.8.3 of the Constitution prohibits both a series and one of its component works from being on the ballot in different categories in the same year. Consistent with practice since the Best Series category was instituted, **we determined that** Section 3.8.3 affects only the Best Series category. The intent of the constitution is clear - that no series should get two bites of the cherry in the same year.

There were 65 nominating votes for Charles Stross's series **The Laundry Files**, 8 for the subset series **The New Management**, and 6 voters hedged their bets by voting for "**The Laundry Files/The New Management**". Should we count the 65, 8 and 6 votes separately, or combined in some way?

One other writer's work came close to being affected by this situation. T. Kingfisher's series **The Saint of Steel,** aka **The Paladin Romances**, is a subset series of her **World of the White Rat** stories. 21 voters voted for **The Saint of Steel**, 2 for its equivalent **The Paladin Romances**, 18 for the parent **World of the White Rat** and 19 for the combined "**World of the White Rat/Saint of Steel**". Again, should we count the 21, 2, 18 and 19 votes separately, or combined in some way?

We determined that voters for the works by Charles Stross wanted to see a series on the ballot including the 2023 novel **Season of Skulls**, and that voters for the works by T. Kingfisher wanted to see a series on the ballot including the 2023 novel **Paladin's Faith**. This was clear from the ballots, where voters are invited to specify a qualifying volume from the series that they nominate.

We accordingly merged all of the votes in both cases in favour of the series or subseries which had the most support. The final tally therefore reports 79 votes for **The Laundry Files**, which include as stated above 65 specifying **The Laundry Files** alone, 8 for **The New Management** and 6 for "**The Laundry Files/The New Management**; and 60 for **The Saint of Steel**, including 21 specifying **The Saint of Steel** alone, 2 for **The Paladin Romances**, 18 for **World of the White Rat** and 19 for "**World of the White Rat/Saint of Steel**".

This did not affect the outcome - the 65 votes for **The Laundry Files** alone were enough to qualify it for the final ballot, and the 60 for T. Kingfisher's work combined were not sufficient for it to qualify. But it is a departure from the approach taken in some previous years, and hopefully a useful precedent for future Administrators.

Best Graphic Story or Comic

We received an enquiry about the eligibility of **Wonder Woman Historia: The Amazons**. The album, which qualified for the 2024 Hugo final ballot, was published in 2023. It comprises three issues which were published in 2022 (the third issue's cover date is 2023, but it became clear from our research that it was already available for purchase in 2022). The query was therefore whether the album satisfied the criterion of publication in 2023, specified in Section 3.3.6 of the Constitution.

As has been done in previous years, **we determined that** an album first published in 2023 was eligible, even if it comprised individual issues of a comic all of which were published in years previous to 2023, as long as none of those issues had previously been a finalist in this category. This is settled Hugo practice. In most cases (including **Wonder Woman Historia: The Amazons**) the album includes some previously unpublished material anyway.

We observe that most readers will buy albums rather than individual issues, and that the date of publication of an album should normally be taken into account when considering eligibility, provided that none of the individual issues in that album has appeared on the final ballot previously.

Best Related Work

雨果X访谈 / **Discover X**, a series of video interviews conducted by Tina Wong, received enough votes to qualify for the final ballot in both Best Related Work and Best Fancast. After consultation with Tina Wong, **we determined that** it is clearly a professional production as defined in Section 3.2.12 of the Constitution, and therefore not eligible in Best Fancast, but in Best Related Work. The votes were not combined across the categories (many ballots had nominated it in both).

中国科幻口述史 / **Chinese Science Fiction: An Oral History** received 97 nominating votes as such in Best Related Work. In addition, 23 voters jointly nominated volumes 2 and 3 of 中国科幻口述史; 18 voters nominated just vol 3; 10 voters nominated just vol 2; and 1 voter nominated vol 1.

Volume 1 of 中国科幻口述史 is not eligible for the 2024 Hugo Award because it was a finalist in 2023 (per Section 3.2.2 of the Constitution). **We determined that** 中国科幻口述史 as a whole is also not eligible in 2024 for the same reason.

Volumes 2 and 3 are however eligible, individually and collectively. **We determined that** votes in 2024 for 中国科幻口述史, without further specification, should be taken as votes for volumes 2 and 3 jointly.

The final reported vote total therefore combines the 97 votes for the whole series of 中国科幻口述史 and the 23 votes specifying both volumes 2 and 3, but not the votes for volume 2 and volume 3 individually.

Volume 3 received enough votes on its own to be reported as one of the top 16 nominees.

Bigolas Dickolas Wolfwood declined nomination in this category for their promotional tweets for **This Is How You Lose the Time War** (which itself won a Hugo in 2020). This brought **The Culture: The Drawings**, by Iain M. Banks, onto the final ballot.

Best Dramatic Presentation categories

We were asked if the Watermill production of the **Lord of the Rings** musical (first performed in England in 2023, and currently playing in Chicago) was eligible in either of the Best Dramatic Presentation categories. We clarified that while we do not make specific rulings in advance of counting the nomination votes, there are several precedents for live theatrical productions qualifying for the final ballot. In the event, it did not get sufficient votes to qualify for the ballot in either Best Dramatic Presentation category.

Best Editor, Long Form

Natasha Bardon declined nomination in this category. This brought Kelly Lonesome onto the final ballot.

Best Fancast

As noted above, we determined that 雨果X访谈 / **Discover X** was not eligible in this category as it is a professional publication.

铥铥科幻电波 / **Diu Diu Sci Fi Radio** received enough votes to qualify in the Best Fancast category, and had produced 90 episodes in 2023. It is owned and produced by 未来事物管理局 / the Future Affairs Administration (FAA), a private sector body with several full-time staff. After consultation with the FAA, **we determined that** 铥铥科幻电波 must also be considered a professional production under Section 3.2.12 of the Constitution, and therefore ineligible in this category. We are grateful to Li Bucheng for accepting this disappointing news with good grace.

As a result of these two disqualifications, 科幻Fans布玛 / **Science Fiction Fans Buma** and **Publishing Rodeo** were brought onto the ballot.

科幻Fans布玛 / **Science Fiction Fans Buma** had also been nominated, but without enough votes to quality for the ballot, in Best Related Work. We therefore investigated its status as a fan production. However, **we determined that** it is **not** a professional production in the definition of 3.2.12, and

therefore qualifies for Best Fancast and is not eligible for Best Related Work. We did not combine votes across the two categories.

Best Fan Writer

Camestros Felapton declined nomination in this category. This brought James Davis Nicoll onto the final ballot.

Lodestar Award for Best Young Adult Book

Unraveller, by Frances Hardinge, was first published in the UK in 2022, but in the USA in 2023 and is therefore eligible for the **Lodestar Award** per Section 3.4.2 of the Constitution.

The *Astounding* Award

Both Moniquill Blackgoose and Sunyi Dean had sufficient votes to qualify for the *Astounding* Award, but also have publications pre-dating 2022. After investigation, **we determined that** neither author's pre-2022 publications fulfil the criteria to be considered a **professional** publication for *Astounding* Award purposes.

Xiran Jay Zhao also had sufficient votes to qualify for the *Astounding* Award, but had been deemed a first-year eligible finalist by the Hugo administrators in 2022 (some of whom were also on the 2024 team) and would therefore not normally be eligible again in 2024.

Xiran Jay Zhao was deemed ineligible by the Hugo administrators in 2023 for reasons that are not known to us. Dell Magazines, the sponsor of the *Astounding* Award, requested that we extend eligibility for the 2024 *Astounding* Award to include Xiran Jay Zhao. **We did so**.

Hugo Voter Packet

The Hugo Voter Packet has become a standard expectation from Worldcons. We remind everyone that it is not in fact a constitutional obligation; indeed it is not regulated by the Constitution in any way.

At least 1,600 Worldcon members downloaded some or all of the Hugo Voter Packet in 2024. The real number is probably quite a bit higher than that, but we can't be sure.

We provided the Packet as a set of downloads, one for each Hugo category. We also provided the option to download the entire Packet as a single download except for the (very large) Dramatic Presentation, Long Form category.

Unfortunately, the service where we hosted the Packet doesn't provide detailed information about what's being downloaded. The only information it provides is a daily report on how much total data has been downloaded.

So, for example, after the first day that the Packet was available, 10,400 GB of data had reportedly been downloaded, but we do not know what had been downloaded, or by how many people.

The entire Packet was about 25 GB of material. (20 GB for DPLF, 5 GB for everything else.) So as a rough proxy for the number of people downloading the Packet, we counted each 25 GB of data that was downloaded as a "full-Packet-download equivalent," or FPDE.

It's unlikely that very many people downloaded *more* than 25 GB worth of data from the Packet. (That could only happen if someone downloaded at least some materials more than once.) So the number of FPDEs is a reasonably good approximate lower bound for how many people have downloaded Packet materials.

Over the course of the 62 days that the Packet was available, the total amount of data downloaded was 40,539 GB. Dividing that by 25 gives 1,622 FPDEs. So we can be pretty sure that at least 1,622 Worldcon members downloaded Packet materials.

But the number of people who downloaded Packet materials is probably significantly higher than that, because probably some members only downloaded one or two categories' worth of materials.

We don't have enough information to even guess at a likely upper bound on the number of people who downloaded Packet materials, but we know that it was no more than the total number of Worldcon members. About 8,500 members who are eligible to vote, and 3,813 votes were recorded (including the 377 disqualifications) so that's an upper bound, but it seems unlikely all of them downloaded the Packet.

Almost 50% of the total amount of data downloaded was downloaded in the first three days after the Packet launched: about 750 FPDEs in those three days. Almost 20% of the total was downloaded in another activity spike in the last seven days before voting closed: nearly 300 FPDEs. In the 50 or so days between those two download spikes, the average was about 10 FPDEs per day.

Thanks

We have already noted the contributions of the researchers, programmers and translators above. We also want to acknowledge and thank Terry Neill and Rosemary Parks as the Hugo Help team; Dave Gallaher, Jed Hartman and Scott Bobo as the Hugo Packet team; Mark Slater and Meg McDonald for producing the final ballot announcement video, and all the contributors to the video; Randall Shepherd as Hugo finalist liaison; and Bridget Chee as our on-site wrangler. We want to gratefully acknowledge the energy and commitment of the original Hugo Administrator for 2024, Kat Jones. And we thank Esther MacCallum-Stewart, the Chair of Glasgow 2024, for everything.

Nicholas Whyte, WSFS Division Head and Hugo Administrator
Cassidy, Deputy Hugo Administrator
Kathryn Duval, WSFS Deputy Division Head
Laura Martins, Hugo Subcommittee member