

2009 IPC ISH SPORT FORUM MINUTES

Event: IPC Ice Sledge Hockey Sport Forum Meeting

Date: 7 May 2009

Place: Ostrava, Czech Republic

Participants	Name	Position	(Initials)
	Greg Lagace	Chairperson	GL
	Tom Goodings	Vice-Chairperson	TG
	Keith Blasé	Head of Technical Control & Officiating	KB
	Michael Pettersson	Head of Classification	MP
	David Grevemberg	IPC Executive Sports Director and IF Relations	DG
	Eric Angstadt	IPC Winter Sports Manager	EA
Not Present	Thor Erik Kleppe	Head of Competition	TK

Purpose of the Meeting	2009 Sport Forum Meeting
-------------------------------	--------------------------

Executive Summary/ Main Outcomes	
---	--



AGENDA

Event: IPC Ice Sledge Hockey Sport Forum Meeting

Date: 7 May 2009

Place: Park Inn, Ostrava, Czech Republic

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| 9:00 AM | 1. Welcome |
| | 2. Roll Call |
| | 3. Adoption on the Agenda and Minutes - 2008 ISH Sport Forum |
| | 4. IPC Ice Sledge Hockey Report |
| | 5. ISH Sport Technical Committee Structure Review and Recommendations |
| | 6. Rules and Regulations |
| | 7. Strategic Direction |
| | 8. Women's Participation |
| <i>12:00 PM</i> | <i>Lunch Break</i> |
| 13:00 PM | 9. Vancouver 2010 PWG |
| | 10. PWG Qualifying Tournament |
| | 11. WCH 2012 and IPC ISH Competitions |
| | 12. Motions |
| | 13. Questions |
| 15:00 PM | 14. Adjournment |



SUMMARY

1. WELCOME

Greg Lagace welcomed all NPCs and presented the STC Members and IPC Management members.

After a short introduction, principles for the sport forum were explained, taking place back to back in 2008 and 2009 at the WCHs. A few housekeeping bullet points were presented to the attendees.

2. ROLL CALL

NPCs Present (12 in total):

CAN, CZE, EST, GER, ITA, KOR, JPN, NED, NOR, POL, SWE, USA

Absent
GBR.

Observer
RUS.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

<i>Discussion</i>	Motion to adopt agenda by STC Chairperson Secunder to adopt: POL Voting: passed 12 in favour
-------------------	--

<i>Decision(s)</i>	Agenda adopted
--------------------	----------------

<i>Action(s)</i>	
------------------	--

4. ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES IPCIH SPORT FORUM 2008

<i>Discussion</i>	Motion for Boston Sports Forum
-------------------	--------------------------------



	Motion GER Second USA Voting: 11 Passed
<i>Decision(s)</i>	Minutes from 2008 Sport Forum adopted.
<i>Action(s)</i>	

5. IPCIH REPORT

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>GL mentioned why Thor Erik Kleppe was not present and hope that he will soon recover and be back in IPC activities.</p> <p>GL mentioned the overall activities highlighted in the presentation given to the NPCs:</p> <p>Main topics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Governance <p>KB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Development <p>Officiating program</p> <p>One focus is to promote local officials for national events</p> <p>Second focus is on the international aspect.</p> <p>More events to be identified so Officiating Training can be planned accordingly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Emerging nations <p>Coaching program</p> <p>Technical Guideline for development</p> <p>VANOC would present the following Monday to all the NPCs.</p> <p>Competition Cycle Review clarification: will be updated accordingly in the regulations as sent to the NPCs.</p> <p>A few words about the B WCH in Eindhoven were spoken, very high standard competition and well organized was the outcome.</p> <p>PWG Qualification Tournament overview.</p> <p>Technical Manual for TDs and LOC Manual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Classification
-------------------	---



	MP gave an overview of classification and explained the decision on last year's motion by GER.
<i>Decision(s)</i>	Feedback requested to the NPCs in order to have more information on future tournaments and events to build a consistent calendar for IPC ISH
<i>Action(s)</i>	IPC Management to send reminder of the Interest Form to the nations

6. RULES AND REGULATIONS

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>KB: explained how refining of the Rulebook has occurred as ISH has experienced competition.</p> <p>There are now only slight modifications to the rulebook and any feedback is more than welcome.</p> <p>Next change to rules will be in 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 min period: there was a motion in Boston to start after PWG. This might imply a change to the roster. The ISH STC opened the floor for discussion. No formal voting on this would take place, only valuable feedback to indicate current status of the sport and immediate viability for this change. • NED: it has not been medically proven that 20 min enhances the physical performance of the athlete. • NOR: many NPCs do not have many players, with 17 players will destroy some of the teams. This would affect development. Difficult for small nations • USA: do we have numbers on NPCs being struggling to meet that number of players? We need to give the sport a chance to grow and develop and increasing. • ITA: has there been a study for athletes to play 15 min more still being competitive? • STC: no study. • ITA says their players can not perform to that
-------------------	--



level. Maybe other nations can

- CAN: this sport is another way of playing the same game. Being like able body adds legitimacy to the sport. We should go for that level. We thought it would be for this year.
- JPN: we thought it would be implemented. Neutral about the change. CZE: we are doing it in the CZE league. We have 15 players and 3 teams have less than 15 players but we are playing 20 min.
- NOR: have doubts about endurance for 15 min more. NOR asked if teams in the B pool have 15 players. This would also mean more cost around the team. Last season we believe we lost the final because of being too tired. The problem is still there. Nowadays a game is 2-2:30 hours and otherwise it could reach 3 hours. This is ok for able body but not for our sports. More focus should be on women or under 23 categories.
- CAN: try to set things as high as level as possible, it will encourage teams internally to grow.
- GER: expressed being in favour of both, increase roster and period. Good for the sport to go that way.
- MP: from a medical point of view you will have to be ready for more injuries. More use of specific parts of the body like shoulders, which cannot be trained so much, it is not like the hip in able body
- GER: we will start a program for the shoulder movement on a wheelchair and in sledge hockey. We hope to have results in 3 years. Many of our athletes are doing other summer sports.
- DG: this discussion has been ongoing for 10 years. There are tech advantages and disadvantages. Impact on schedule, such as PWG. Operationally it has impact on items like broadcasting because promotion is a main part of what we want. Impact on Technology, the capacity and critical mass of athletes, number of competitions in the calendar, related to the performance of the athletes.

If this is going to be further legitimized, there needs to be more critical activity, the STC and IPC Management to be able to justify the size, licenses,



number of competitions to have an evaluation. We need to find a sustainable model.

- CAN: could there be a survey amongst the teams to get a full understanding?
- STC: to request feedback
- USA: we haven't heard that many nations totally complaining but we would like to hear from the Nations the reality of nations not being able to do this both athlete wise and financially wise.
- Straw vote

Nations who clearly see they could not move in this way as of today:

SWE

NOR

ITA

NED

EST

- EST: at PWG level we need the max number of teams that CAN play 20 min at max level. Maybe a period of 4-6 years to implement.
- CZE: maybe for A pool yes and no for B
- NOR: How will players handle within their nations reaching the desired level? From 35 players in NOR, 17 cannot play on national level.
- KB: why not set some goals that would allow moving slowly towards that? Maybe a gradual raise in the next few years. Could this be a good idea?
- NED: everyone wants to increase the sport. One thing is to increase athletes and another to increase teams (competitive teams).
- DG: How many of the nations have a league system? 4 CAN, USA, JPN, CZE. The number of teams regularly playing is critical mass.
- CAN: increasing the roster will allow NOT losing players to other sports.
- CZE: Many implications with this change. Juniors would help



KB: Reminder of Equipment check and how this will be enforced.

EA: Reminder on the licenses process and that all official communication is delivered to the NPCs.

DG: this has been institutionalized across all IPC sports. This license system, allows creating RTP for Anti-Doping. Also there will be implementation for biographies. This Eligibility Code is signed once and allows you to participate in all competitions.

POL came to meeting at this moment.

-
Action(s)

STC to prepare questionnaire about feasibility of increasing the periods to 20min

7. STRATEGIC DIRECTION

Discussion

Survey amongst nations. 7 came back

Total number of players in country: only 2 had more than 15, the rest less. One country had more than 10 coaches, the rest less.

Overview of the results of the survey was given to the NPCs.

Top barriers to participation:

- Awareness
- Financial
- Facilities

There has been a lot of growth for the sport, live games at Test Event, Vancouver.

We need to ensure the quality on the ice.

Strategic Direction

Review of structure: GL explained how the STC would like to recommend a review on the structure of the STC to the IPC GB.



Calendar: to get involvement and engagement from the NPCs and teams.

IPC ISH would like to have a clear and defined seasonal calendar. TG will work on this.

GL: We need to seek for non conflictive events.

NOR: Need to get invitation in timely fashion.

Discussion on WCH Bids, A and B Pools being together:

It is better for Sport Forum

NED: it can be a benefit to have it separate

CZE: maybe all teams playing together

EST: Club level competitions should be considered.

We need to know about these competitions.

DG: maybe a deadline to submit a schedule, what is needed, what are the challenges? What is required, the constraints?

- Communication

Newsletters

R&R updates

Website updates

Conference calls

- Integration with IIHF – plan

DG: There has been a transfer of sports in the last years. For Winter sports, FIS, IIHF, are very membership driven, so at national level it is critical to make this pressure from the bottom.

How this can strategically be implemented is to be defined in the business plan.

DEVELOPMENT

Bullet points

NED: who will lead on these activities?



	<p>GL: KB</p> <p>POL: NHL Dreams and Goals program?</p> <p>DG and EA gave an overview on the planned scope for Classification at Vancouver 2010 PWG.</p> <p>GL these are the priorities as of now, not so much competitions but these other elements that will enhance the key aspect of the sport.</p> <p>This needs to be done with the nations contribution and co-operation.</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	<p>GL to finalize strategic plan, send to EA for IPC Management approval and circulate to countries.</p> <p>TG will work on calendar template and updates with EA.</p> <p>KB will lead activities on Development.</p>

8. WOMEN IN ICE SLEDGE HOCKEY

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>GL:</p> <p>GB approved the motion from SWE with a friendly amendment. This comes from able body Hockey.</p> <p>The objective of competing for women at PWG was not the main intent of the motion put forward to the GB.</p> <p>The main intent is to stimulate growth and provide competitive opportunities.</p> <p>USA: we welcome the proposal, but the wording is a little conflictive. We were requesting roster to 17 but now we get 16 if we bring a woman.</p> <p>GL: the intent was to provide immediate competitive opportunities for women to play sledge hockey and to enable emerging and re-developing countries to field competitive teams; while we work towards a long term plan on developing women's sledge hockey.</p>
-------------------	--



NOR agrees with USA, if women prove competitive they should be on the team, but if not, no as a non competitive male athlete.

CAN: agrees and says it puts pressure on them, by leaving out some competitive men, and taking a non competitive woman.

GL: It was done in this way to meet IPC bylaws.

DG: there are no open competitions at PG. To promote women in sport, the challenge has been around for long. Many items to be considered since Torino. To find the balance between what was happening but still achieve find a solution that satisfies everyone.

USA: should ISH be treated as other team sports?

GL: explained the discussion for 15+1 and how it came about.

DG: what happened with Wheelchair Rugby at 3 editions of PG was that there were no women present and still called mixed.

CAN: explained how this attracted Media and the problems this has caused.

GL: the intent was never to make this decision solely for PWG, but mainly in every other IPC competition.

CAN: the +1 is what puts the teams in problems.

CZE: maybe there has not been enough discussion

CAN: on behalf of the women that practice, they have stated that this doesn't seem like the best solution they are seeking, but to have ISH for women themselves.

GL: this came from the motion from NPCs, not initiated from STC side. By sticking to the bylaws, the proposal was made.

EA: requested NED to give their experience as they had the first women competing in Eindhoven B WCH.

NED: problem was about not having enough players. It was good to bring the female as we got more attention and it was considered a unique situation, but we always clarified that they would be on the team if they were good enough. Goal is to get more females.



	<p>But Media knew we would not put a non competitive female on the team.</p> <p>She played 5 of 6 games at the WCH B.</p> <p>DG: if more clarification is required about the fact the best athletes should be selected this could be done.</p> <p>The current Bylaws still need to be respected but still offer the opportunity.</p> <p>GL: This should be considered a starting point. Based on WCH the sport should move in the same way, media should not be an issue.</p> <p>DG: the GB approved this as an immediate resolution through PWG 2010.</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	Create an IPC Women's Ice Sledge Hockey Working Group to develop a plan
<i>Action(s)</i>	GL to prepare terms of reference for the working group and send to countries requesting nomination of reps.

9. VANCOUVER

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>GL explained the reason why TK has been replaced as TD</p> <p>Competition Cycle review – why it was separated and clarified. This was notified to the nations.</p> <p>NOR: it is clearer now. What about number of teams in each pool?</p> <p>STC: aim is to have 8+8 till 2014.</p> <p>CZE: if A and B are at the same place, the qualifier represents extra cost. We would like to see a different proposal for year 3.</p> <p>In year 2 what happened 3 years before at the WCH is what is reflected, and this is not the best</p> <p>GL: this is due to the cycle we follow. We are not</p>
-------------------	--



	<p>ready yet for this.</p> <p>CZE: suggest to have WCH 2011</p> <p>STC agrees that this is the way to move forward, but a balance needs to be found.</p> <p>DG: you want to participate, but how many nations are willing to host?</p> <p>CZE: Budget Planning should be the priority</p> <p>CAN: Hosting guidelines will help</p> <p>NED: are IIHF having WCH after OG?</p> <p>STRAW VOTE:</p> <p>WCH on year 1?</p> <p>EA gave a Qualification Criteria reminder, Deadlines</p> <p>DG: clarification no later than end of NOV and please ensure if you have new players for classification to go to existing classification opportunities at the events that will be announced. As of now, only the PWG Qualifier is in the scope for Classification.</p> <p>SPORT EVENT Report</p> <p>KB review – VANOC presence</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	

10. PWG QUALIFICATION TOURNAMENT

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>EA explained to the NPCs the process that will be followed after knowing the last two teams that will join EST and SWE for the Qualification Tournament for the Vancouver 2010 PWG.</p> <p>The event shall be hosted sometime between late September and Mid November.</p> <p>A basic Tech. Requirements Manual will be sent to the nations with an Interest Form to express interest in hosting and IPC to accept incoming bids. A timeline will also be set to define the process.</p> <p>FIN NPC has expressed interest in hosting the even</p>
-------------------	---



	as part of their developing programme.
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	EA to send notification to all NPCs

11. WCHs 2012 AND IPC ISH COMPETITIONS

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Bid for the 2012 will be released in the fall of 2009.</p> <p>The Interest form for hosting competitions will be on the website and should be sent to ipcicesledgehockey@paralympic.org</p> <p>JPN: will 2012 take the top 7 teams from 2009?</p> <p>DG: 2011 WCHs? Strategic and Regionally maybe make a plan? This might be something to consider.</p> <p>JPN: Why not in year 1 same nation from PWG to host also WCH.</p> <p>DG: to put it in writing.</p> <p>Oregon Tourism:</p> <p>USA has not been contacted so this happening is unlikely.</p> <p>Teams to explore options.</p> <p>CZE: If some LOC would have money to host WCH could they?</p> <p>STC: this would mean changing regulations and it would have to be discussed previously.</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	

12. MOTIONS FROM NPCs AND STC

<i>Discussion</i>	<p>Motion 1 EST</p> <p>GL invited EST to explain the motion in detail.</p> <p>EST: some teams in Eindhoven did not fully follow equipment rules.</p> <p>KB: there were issues with a couple of sledges but we believe it was more due to ambiguity in the rulebook so we gave 1 or 2 NPCs who had</p>
-------------------	---



sledges without foot protection time to fix this during the first days of competition. It was goalkeepers. We made the decision on the spot due to the conflicting rules we allowed them to play for a game until they could fix.

It was voted by the nations so that this would be accepted the first days of the competition.

Therefore we released the clarification before the A pool.

We all want to reinforce the rules but we also want to apply common sense especially if we are at fault.

GL: reminder of last year's motion from JPN but making sure we're not cutting off emerging nations when it is first appearance.

Reinforced as you have witnessed through equipment check.

POL: situation with the picks as well.

GL: development as we go by creating a more complete rulebook.

KB: the STC is also learning as we progress. The records of what exists will be shared amongst the teams.

EST will remove the motion.

Decision(s)

Action(s)

13. QUESTIONS

Discussion

JPN: locker room assignment. It seems like it was done first come first serve. GL explained where in the Regulations it is explained, based on seeding.

KB decision was made based on that, but we assumed teams would prefer bigger lockers. It is never easy to please all the teams once arrivals are made. With exact same size of lockers it would be fine.



	<p>GL: STC noted.</p> <p>GL: Requested the NPCs When to do the Sport Forum:</p> <p>CAN: prior to competition but preferably not overlapping with training.</p> <p>Everyone agreed this was better.</p> <p>Maybe away from the WCH, in the summer.</p> <p>Sport Technical Committee after PWG will be open for nominations: GL requested NPCs to have enough nominations; this will be in the fall of 2010.</p> <p>Big thank you to everyone, for contribution, best of luck.</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	

14. CLOSING

GL thanked everyone for their presence and co-operation. Meeting was closed.