

RULES of PROCEDURE FOR JCC

a. Letter From Secretary General

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to YönderMUN'26!

As the Secretary General, I am very excited to welcome you all to our conference. I hope YönderMUN'26 will be a place where you can share your ideas, meet new people, and improve yourselves while discussing important global issues.

Our academic team has worked hard to prepare your study guides, and I hope they will help you feel confident and ready for the conference.

I wish you all an inspiring, enjoyable, and memorable YönderMUN'26.

Best regards,

Gülce Nil Yılmaz

Secretary General of YönderMUN'26

b. Letter From Under Secretary General

Esteemed Delegates,

Welcome to the Trojan War Joint Crisis Committee of YönderMUN'26. My name is Eslem Yanık, and I am serving as the Under Secretary General for this conference.

In this committee, you will act as key decision makers during one of the most legendary and consequential conflicts of the ancient world: the Trojan War. Whether you stand within the walls of Troy or among the Greek forces gathered against it, every action you take will directly impact military strategy, political alliances, diplomatic relations, and the fate of both sides. Time will be limited, information will be incomplete, and consequences will be irreversible. This Joint Crisis Committee is designed to test your ability to think strategically, respond decisively, and operate under constant pressure. You are not merely representing historical figures; you are shaping the fate of kingdoms and armies.

Our academic and crisis teams have prepared a fast-paced and demanding simulation. We expect you to embrace uncertainty, take calculated risks, and remain fully aware that every decision carries weight. In the midst of siege, diplomacy, betrayal, and warfare, even the smallest decision may change the course of the conflict.

Should you require assistance at any point, the Secretariat remains at your disposal. Choose wisely; the fate of Troy is in your hands.

Diplomatic regards,

Eslem Yanık

Under Secretary-General

c. Rules of Procedure

1. General Rules

- **Scope:** The Committee Under-Secretary-General will be the final authority on what procedure to follow if a situation arises that has not been addressed by the Rules of Procedure. At the discretion of the Chair or Secretariat, these rules can be modified to better facilitate healthy debate, and any adjustment of the rules will be declared clearly to the entirety of the committee and will take precedence over any rules written in this document.
 - **Language:** English will be the official language used in the YONDERMUN, in all documents and debates the English must be used.
 - **Usage of Technological Devices:** Technological devices are prohibited by the committee's history. They are not to be used without USG or chair permission.
 - **Quorum:** It's the minimum quantity of delegates that are needed to start the conference. And it is 1/3 of the committee.
 - **Courtesy and Delegate Conduct:** Every Delegate must be respectful and courteous with Conference members. If someone is being unrespectful, the Chairs must be contacted to take the appropriate action. YONDERMUN will have zero tolerance for slandering, disparaging, or any other respectful act.
 - **Absence:** If a delegate doesn't appear during the Conference for more than 3 sessions, it won't be receiving the certifications and awards.
-

2. Committee Structure and Leadership

The committee is administered by the following roles:

- **Chair:** Presides over the committee. Manages debate, maintains order, enforces speaking time, and facilitates procedural motions.
- **Under Secretary General:** Oversees the fictional progression of events. Responsible for delivering crisis updates and determining the outcome of directives.
- **Academic Assistant:** Support the under secretary general. Assist in organizing documents, processing directives, and interpreting crisis outcomes.
- **Head of Crisis:** Read and discuss the directives with other crisis team members. Reports about the directives to the under secretary general.

Delegates do not have voting authority over the Crisis Director's decisions but may challenge outcomes through additional directives or debate.

Note: Specific to the JCC committee and the Trojan War, the chair also has a role like the delegates and can write directives.

3. Directives

What is a directive in crisis committees at MUN conference?

A directive in Model United Nations (MUN) crisis committees is a formal, written instruction that delegates use to propose actions or decisions in response to a crisis. Crisis committees are more dynamic and fast-paced than traditional MUN committees, as they deal with unexpected events or situations that require immediate attention. Directives allow delegates to respond quickly to changing circumstances by taking actions such as:

- Implementing military operations.
- Engaging in diplomacy or negotiations.
- Managing economic or social responses to the crisis.
- Influencing the course of events in the committee.

There are six main types of directives used in crisis committees:

- **Personal Directives:** Personal Directives are written by individual delegates to carry out specific actions that fall strictly within the authority, resources, and limitations of their assigned role or position. These directives are generally confidential and focus on targeted, role-specific initiatives.
- **Committee Directives:** Committee Directives are written collectively by multiple delegates and represent the general consensus or collective decision of the committee. These directives usually address broader strategies or large-scale actions and require coordination among committee members.
- **Joint Directives:** Joint Directives are official documents jointly prepared and issued by two or more institutions, organizations, cabinets, or command structures. They outline a coordinated approach toward achieving a shared objective and define the responsibilities, authority, and procedures of all participating parties. Joint Directives reflect collective decision-making and shared execution responsibilities.
- **Top Secret Directives:** Top Secret Directives contain highly classified actions or plans that involve sensitive intelligence, covert operations, or strategic initiatives. Access to the content and outcomes of these directives is strictly limited to the relevant delegate(s) and the Crisis Team. Unauthorized disclosure may result in severe in-committee consequences.
- **Information Directives:** Information Directives are submitted to request intelligence, clarification, reports, or updates regarding the current crisis. These directives do not

initiate direct action but are used to gather information that may influence future decision-making.

- **Press Release Directives:** Press Release Directives are used to communicate official statements, announcements, or narratives to the public or international audience. These directives aim to shape public opinion, influence morale, apply political pressure, or control the flow of information during the crisis.

Note: Within the framework of this committee and its established procedures, **Committee Directives** and **Joint Directives** may be submitted under **Top Secret** classification when the nature of the action requires confidentiality. Such usage is considered appropriate and legitimate for the functioning of this committee and does not require prior approval. The confidentiality of these directives shall be preserved in accordance with crisis committee practice.

The visual presented below illustrates, in a clear and structured manner, all mandatory structural and content-related elements that must be included in a directive written within a crisis committee. In addition to serving as a formatting template, the visual also contains a sample directive text intended to guide delegates in drafting their own directives throughout the crisis simulation. All six directive types outlined above shall be prepared strictly in accordance with the format demonstrated in this visual, without exception.

Accordingly, the following components must be clearly and completely included in every directive: the directive title (Type of Directive), cabinet name (Cabinet Name), recipient information (To), sender information (From), date (Date), time (Time), and the directive body text. Should any of these components be missing, incomplete, inaccurately presented, or inconsistent with the prescribed format, the directive may be deemed procedurally invalid and excluded from substantive evaluation.

Directives that fail to comply with these formatting requirements are subject to rejection at the discretion of the Head of Crisis, Under-Secretary-General, and Academic Assistant. Delegates are therefore strongly advised to adhere meticulously to this template in order to avoid unnecessary delays, strategic disadvantages, or procedural rejection during the crisis process.

Note: Please be kind to the Crisis Team: ensure that all handwritten directives are clearly legible. While enthusiasm is appreciated, deciphering unreadable handwriting is not a designated crisis skill, and illegible submissions may test both patience and eyesight. ☺

Type of Directive

(cabinet name)

To:

Date:

From:

Time:

Sample Directive

At 05:00 hours on the third day of the war, a force of approximately 4,800 personnel composed of four mechanized infantry battalions and one armored regiment will be deployed across the Eastern and Northern operational axes, focusing on the Aras–Kars supply corridor and the adjacent high-ground positions within a 25-kilometer radius. The operation will be conducted under the direct command of the Regional Military Authority, with logistical support provided by three supply units capable of sustaining continuous operations for 72 hours.

The plan aims to secure 60% of the corridor currently used for enemy troop movement and resupply, thereby reducing opposing operational capacity by an estimated 45% within three days. Initial deployment will involve simultaneous advancement along two axes to divide enemy attention, followed by the establishment of fortified checkpoints at five strategic junctions to ensure long-term control.

This action is initiated in response to verified intelligence indicating that opposing forces have increased their regional presence by approximately 30% over the past 48 hours, signaling preparation for an offensive maneuver. Civilian risk mitigation will be implemented through the designation of exclusion zones and the maintenance of open evacuation routes, with success evaluated based on territorial control, disruption of enemy logistics, casualty limitation, and operational sustainability beyond the initial 72-hour window.

4. Motions

What is a Motion?

A motion is a formal request made by a delegate to take a specific action within the committee. Motions help structure debate, introduce new procedures, or shift the committee's focus during a crisis. In Crisis Committees, motions are especially important due to the fast-paced and reactive nature of the discussions. Once a motion is proposed, the Chair will call for votes, and depending on the type of motion, a simple or qualified majority may be required for it to pass.

CAUCUSES

a) Semi Moderated Caucus:

A semi-moderated caucus is a more flexible debate format where delegates still follow some formal rules, but the structure is looser than a moderated caucus. It's used when the committee wants focused discussion on a specific issue, but with more freedom for delegates to engage in direct exchanges than in a formal setting.

Features of a Semi-Moderated Caucus:

- **Time Limits:** Like a moderated caucus, there are still overall time limits for the entire debate as well as individual speaking times, but these may be more relaxed.
- **Chair's Role:** The Chair or the dais (the group leading the committee) still oversees the debate, but their control is more lenient. They may allow freer dialogue between delegates, or they might intervene less frequently.
- **Flow of Debate:** Delegates can interact more freely compared to a moderated caucus, with less formality in speaking order or point-raising. However, unlike an unmoderated caucus, there's still some structure such as a speaking list or directed questions that keeps the debate focused on the topic at hand.
- **Delegates' Interactions:** Delegates are given more opportunities to directly respond to one another's points or to ask questions, fostering a dynamic and focused discussion. It's a chance to engage more deeply with the specifics of the issue.

When to Use a Semi-Moderated Caucus?

- When the discussion needs to be flexible, but still guided: If the committee is debating a complex or contentious issue and wants to allow more interaction, a semi-moderated caucus is ideal.
- When you need productive but faster-paced debate: This format can be used to generate ideas and promote deeper collaboration while keeping the focus on a specific topic or sub-topic.

Example Scenario: Let's say the topic being debated is climate change and global energy policies.

During a semi-moderated caucus:

- The Chair may set a general speaking time for each delegate, but allow back-and-forth exchanges.
- Delegates can respond to each other more fluidly without waiting for formal recognition after each point.
- The discussion remains focused on solutions or specific areas, like “renewable energy investments,” with less formality compared to a moderated caucus.

b) Unmoderated Caucus:

An unmoderated caucus allows delegates to move freely around the room, speak with any other delegate, and negotiate in smaller groups or one-on-one discussions. Unlike the formal, structured debate of a moderated caucus, an unmoderated caucus has no set speaking order or time limits for individual delegates.

Features of an Unmoderated Caucus:

- No Speaking List: Delegates are not called upon in any particular order. Instead, they can approach other delegates and speak freely without waiting for permission from the Chair.
- Freedom of Movement: Delegates are allowed to move around the room, form groups, and speak to others without the formality of raising placards or waiting for their turn. This creates a more informal atmosphere where collaboration is easier.
- Collaboration and Resolution Drafting: This is the time when delegates can work together to draft working papers, resolutions, or directives. It's common for like-minded countries to come together and outline their proposals or amendments during this time.
- Building Alliances: Delegates often use unmoderated caucuses to form alliances with other delegations that have similar interests. This is key for gaining support for resolutions, amendments, or particular actions in the committee.
- Chair's Role: While the Chair will set a time limit for the unmoderated caucus (e.g., 10 or 15 minutes), they do not oversee the actual debate. They allow delegates to work independently during this time.

How to Request an Unmoderated Caucus:

- A delegate must motion for an unmoderated caucus by proposing a time limit (e.g., “Motion for an unmoderated caucus for 15 minutes”).
- The Chair will then ask for a vote. If the motion passes, the unmoderated caucus begins.
- Once the time is up, the Chair calls the committee back to formal debate.

Example Scenario: Let's say the topic being discussed is refugee migration due to war. During an unmoderated caucus:

- Delegates representing countries with shared interests (e.g., countries with high refugee intake or those affected by the crisis) may form groups to draft a resolution or create amendments.
- Smaller nations may approach larger, more influential countries to seek support for their positions.
- Delegates will negotiate, bargain, and compromise, trying to find common ground on how to address the refugee crisis.

Why Is an Unmoderated Caucus Important?

- **Fosters Informal Negotiation:** This is when most of the real diplomacy happens. Delegates have the chance to directly negotiate and persuade others, outside of the formal speaking process.
 - **Resolution Building:** Unmoderated caucuses are where the actual writing and editing of resolutions take place, with delegates sharing ideas and collaborating on proposals.
 - **Forming Blocs:** Countries with similar views can come together, form blocs, and present united positions when the debate returns to formal session.
-

5. Decree (Ferman):

A decree is a binding order issued by a single authority, often historically a king, emperor, or sovereign, without the involvement of a legislative process or the consent of the governed population. In this sense, a decree reflects a top-down, authoritarian decision-making mechanism, where power is centralised and decisions are made unilaterally. In modern political systems, decrees are typically used in emergency or exceptional circumstances, and even then, their scope and duration are often limited by constitutional or legal frameworks. Unlike a bill, a decree does not pass through a democratic process and is not debated or voted on by representatives. Thus, decrees symbolise absolute rule, in contrast with participatory or representative governance.

6. Vote of No Confidence

In the context of the Trojan War Joint Crisis Committee, a Vote of No Confidence is a formal motion that allows delegates to remove the current ruling leadership, such as King Priam and the Trojan royal court, the Trojan military high command, or the Greek command under Agamemnon and his council, on the grounds of strategic incompetence, loss of authority, internal betrayal, or failure to protect their state during wartime.

This motion may be introduced when a significant portion of the committee believes that the existing leadership, whether within the Trojan royal court or the Greek ruling and military leadership, is no longer capable of maintaining political stability, military cohesion, or territorial control against the opposing faction.

If the motion passes with a simple majority (affirmative votes exceeding the combined total of negative and abstaining votes), the current leadership is immediately dissolved. Following this outcome, a new governing authority is established, either through internal consensus among senior officials or through further deliberation directed by the Crisis Team. This may result in the appointment of a new king or regent of Troy, a new military commander, a new Greek commander, or a ruling council, depending on the political structure of the faction.

A Vote of No Confidence is considered a high-risk, high-impact maneuver. While it has the potential to introduce more decisive or capable leadership, it also carries serious consequences. These may include internal power struggles, fragmentation of military command, weakened troop morale, disputes over succession, or opportunistic advances by the opposing side. In the volatile conditions of the Trojan War, such a motion can decisively alter the balance of power, for better or for worse.

7. Doctrine

In the context of the Trojan War Joint Crisis Committee, a Doctrine is a strategic framework that is directly embedded within war directives and serves as the foundation of military planning. Rather than functioning as a standalone document, a doctrine is used to strengthen and structure War Directives, transforming them from simple action orders into coherent, long-term military strategies. For this reason, doctrines are generally divided into two main categories: Attack Doctrine and Defence Doctrine.

This distinction allows delegates to construct military plans not merely through isolated tactical decisions, but through a consistent strategic mindset that reflects their faction's overall approach to warfare. When drafting a War Directive, doctrinal elements are incorporated at key stages of the plan, making the directive more advanced, realistic, and logically sound.

An Attack Doctrine defines how a faction intends to gain the upper hand and ultimately prevail in the war. In the context of the Trojan War, an attack doctrine outlines where, when, and how offensive force will be applied.

For example, a Trojan Attack Doctrine may prioritize launching sudden attacks against the Greek siege camps, disrupting enemy supply lines arriving by sea, exploiting the defensive strength of Troy's walls, and conducting cavalry or chariot-based assaults against vulnerable Greek positions. When embedded into a War Directive, this doctrine justifies actions such as coordinated sorties from the city, surprise attacks against Greek camps, raids against enemy supply routes, and operations aimed at weakening Greek morale and command cohesion.

Conversely, a Greek Attack Doctrine may be based on overwhelming Troy through sustained military pressure, maintaining control of the surrounding territory, disrupting the city's access to external supplies, and gradually weakening its defensive capabilities. This doctrinal approach forms the basis for War Directives that emphasize prolonged sieges, coordinated assaults, control of supply routes, naval operations, and long-term attrition strategies.

A Defence Doctrine focuses on preserving strength, preventing defeat, and maintaining stability under pressure. It outlines how a faction responds to enemy offensives, manages retreats, and protects internal cohesion.

From the Trojan perspective, a Defence Doctrine might rely on utilizing the formidable walls and defensive structures of Troy to avoid unnecessary open-field engagements, concentrating forces at vulnerable gates, conducting controlled counterattacks, and preserving military resources during a prolonged siege. Within War Directives, this doctrine materializes through decisions such as maintaining fortified defensive positions, rotating troops along the walls, conducting limited sorties, protecting food and water supplies, and preventing breaches in the city's defences.

For the Greeks, a Defence Doctrine may center on securing their siege camps, protecting naval supply routes, maintaining control of the surrounding coastline, and preventing Trojan counterattacks from disrupting the siege. This approach supports War Directives focused on fortified camps, defensive formations around key positions, protection of ships and supply depots, and maintaining military cohesion during a prolonged campaign.

Ultimately, doctrines elevate War Directives beyond a collection of orders and turn them into strategically coherent, historically grounded, and logically consistent plans. Delegates who effectively integrate Attack and Defence doctrines into their War Directives produce decisions that are more persuasive, more realistic, and more likely to succeed within the crisis framework. As such, doctrinal integration is one of the most critical elements of writing a high-quality War Directive in the Trojan War Joint Crisis Committee.

8. Veto

In the context of the Trojan War Joint Crisis Committee, veto power refers to the unilateral authority of the supreme ruler of a faction, namely King Priam of Troy or Agamemnon, the leader of the Greek forces, to block, nullify, or prevent the implementation of any decision, directive, or action proposed and approved by their own governing council, royal court, or war council.

This authority reflects the political and military structure of the period, in which neither the Trojan Kingdom nor the Greek coalition operated under fully collective rule during wartime. Ultimate decision-making power rested with the recognized supreme authority of each faction, who could override council consensus whenever strategic necessity, political survival, or military urgency demanded it.

The veto power may be applied to any written or verbal action proposed within the ruler's own cabinet, including but not limited to:

- Military directives (such as troop deployments, offensives, withdrawals, defensive maneuvers, or siege operations)
- Political appointments, promotions, or dismissals of officials, generals, commanders, or other senior figures
- Diplomatic communications, negotiations, alliances, or formal declarations
- Economic, administrative, or religious policies affecting the faction
- Strategic or secret negotiations involving internal or external actors
- Military or political agreements reached between members of the faction's own leadership

The veto power is strictly limited to internal governance. Neither King Priam nor Agamemnon may veto, alter, or directly interfere with decisions made by the opposing faction's cabinet, royal court, or command structure. However, the use of veto may have indirect consequences, influencing the broader course of the Trojan War and the strategic balance between the Trojans and the Greek forces.

9. Declaration

A Declaration is a formal written statement issued to inform both the domestic population and the international community of decisions that have been taken, or are intended to be taken, by a faction under the current circumstances of the crisis. Declarations serve as an official communication tool through which a side explains its policies, justifies its actions, and shapes public perception.

Each Declaration must be sponsored by a minimum of ten delegates. Prior to publication, all Declarations are subject to review and approval by the Chairboard to ensure procedural compliance, clarity, and consistency with the crisis framework. Only after this evaluation may a Declaration be officially released and considered part of the public record.