#### Current Rule

#### Rule II. B. 1 (5) e. If there is a tie among two districts that would exceed the 46 bid limit, an extra bid will be allocated from the second round pool; if the tie is between more than two districts, the tie will be broken by total subscription rates of those districts.

#### Proposed Amendment

Rule II. B. 1 (5) e. If there is a tie districts that would exceed the 46 bid limit, extra bids will be allocated from the second round pool.

#### Justification

The current rule punishes a district in a statistical tie with another district for having fewer subscribing members. The fact that a future action would affect this district first due to the smaller denominator in the calculation of percentages, it still stands that they would be in a statistical tie at the time. This rule punishes a district for its size, which is mostly out of its control. It does not provide a sufficient incentive to increase district participation, due to its complex effects—for example, the third-largest district could be punished in the same way that the smallest district could.

We have valued district qualification processes to try to maintain regional representation in complete disregard to how competitive those teams are, it makes sense to preference district allocation of bid-slots to the NDT over at-large selections.

This would likely be exceedingly rare, but could be very impactful when it does happen. There is very little chance that it could take more than 2 slots from the second round pool, which is merely one more than we currently allow. The circumstances where there are 5 tied for 1 slot is the most that is mathematically possible, but the situation would not be likely to occur.