

MINUTES

Event: IPC Nordic Skiing Technical Committee Sport Forum Meeting

Date: 6th April 2011

Place: Khanty Mansiysk, RUSSIA

Participants	Name	Position	(Initials)
	Rob Walsh	Chairperson	RW
	Len Apedaile	Vice Chairperson	LA
	Hans Peter Neeser	Head of Technical Control & Officiating	HP
	Kaspar Wirz	Head of Competition Biathlon	KW
	Tor Undheim	Head of Competition Cross-Country	TU
IPC Management	Eric Angstadt	IPC Winter Sports Manager	EA
IPC Guest	Hugh Daniel	Factor System lead	HD

Purpose of the Meeting	2011 Sport Forum STC Meeting
-------------------------------	------------------------------

**Executive
Summary/
Main
Outcomes**



AGENDA

Event: IPC Nordic Skiing Technical Committee Sport Forum Meeting

Date: 6th April 2011

Place: Khanty Mansiysk, RUSSIA

6/4/2011

13:00 PM

1. Welcome
 - Housekeeping items
2. Roll call

AUT, BLR, CAN, FIN, FRA, GER, ITA, JPN, NOR, POL, RUS, SWE, UKR, USA
3. Adoption of agenda
4. Adoption of the minutes IPC Nordic Skiing Sport Forum, Mt Washington, Canada 9 March 2009
5. IPC Nordic Skiing STC Reports and Initiatives
 - 1) Chairperson
 - A. Classification changes
 - B. 2014 PWG Qualification Criteria
 - C. 2014 PWG program
 - D. STC possible structure changes
 - 2) Head of Technical Control
 - A. Race Director Position for WCH/PWG
 - B. Jury composition changes
 - C. TD Education update
 - 3) Head of Competition Cross-Country Skiing
 - A. Calendar Planning 2012-2014
 - B. IPCNS points system
 - C. IPC athletes in FIS & IBU races
 - D. Middle Distance Pursuit format
 - 4) Head of Competition-Biathlon
 - A. Biathlon Target Diameter change



6. IPC Management Report
 - 1) Licensing System - SDMS
 - 2) Vancouver 2010 PWG Figures
 - 3) IPC Corporate Plan
 - 4) Relations with FIS-IBU
 - 5) Online Entry System Process Project
 - 6) Factor System Study
 - 7) IPCNS Regulations Section Rulebook
 - 8) Sochi 2014 PWG update

7. Coffee Break

8. Recommendations from NPCs and STC
 - i. Canada
 - ii. Japan
 - iii. Norway
 - iv. Russia
 - v. Ukraine
 - vi. STC

9. Other business

10. Closing (ESTIMATED 17:30)



SUMMARY

1. OPENING

1.1 Welcome

Housekeeping items

- **Procedures**
- **Breaks**
- **Toilettes**
- **Departure**

2 ROLL CALL

Discussion

Decision(s)

Action(s)

3 ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Discussion

Motion to adopt Agenda BLR Seconded by CAN Agenda adopted

Decision(s)

Action(s)

4 ADOPTION OF MINUTES SPORT FORUM 2009

Discussion

Motion to adopt Agenda NOR Seconded by FIN Minutes adopted 2009

Decision(s)

Action(s)

5 IPC Nordic Skiing STC Reports and Initiatives

Discussion

1) Chairperson

A. Classification changes:

Meeting in June for Classification improvements, with invited group of experts, coaches, and athletes. Similar to what was held last season for VI review. This included ophthalmologists and doctors. This has been implemented into the recently published

Classification Handbook.

Head of Classification: STC will be seeking to fill this position and to have seminars for classifier development. This past season two new classifiers were involved, both had alpine skiing classification experience.

B. 2014 PWG Qualification Criteria

PWG 2014 Qualification Criteria: will be similar to that of 2010 with some changes. Slots given to NPCs based on point system. No problems in 2010, enough slots to accommodate all requests.

C. 2014 PWG program

Request in the fall to the GB and SOCHI for a 3rd BT event. This will help promote BT. There is no official answer at this point in time.

D. STC possible structure changes

Addition of a Head of Development and Marketing possible. The STC welcomes any interest in these positions from the nations.

2) Head of Technical Control

A. Race Director (RD) Position for WCH/PWG

Jury composition change: RD can deal with LOCs in advance. It can ease the TDs job quite a bit. Earlier arrival to competition site. The RD may in the future be in charge of homologations.

Job Description of the RD was given

NOR: will the RD not be present at WC?

HP: Not at this time due to practicality and cost. WC jury composition will remain the same and continue to involve the nations in the Jury. Jury composition changes for PWG and WCH

Jury composition was described along with the general roles assigned to jury members at WCH & PWG. Will keep one Jury Member in addition to ATD's

to provide chances for development of jury members.

B. TD Education update

Ongoing process, reviewed list of seminars and plans for 2011 and current list of candidates from different nations.

Exchange Box Use:

STC would like to implement in the future as tested this season and asked Nations for their opinions.

NOR: original idea was for 50km. He likes the idea of this implementation, but probably not for sit skis.

Two persons are needed. Races are not really long enough to gain advantage with ski change.

HP: For both techniques?

NOR: Yes

HP: RUS?

RUS: believes it is useful for sit skiers as well.

UKR: Agreed with NOR, for Standing skiers in long races. For Sit ski we believe it is too complicated.

NOR: It can be that the boxes are there also for the sit skis, and whomever uses them ok, but then those boxes maybe require 2m, more space. If it can be implemented, nothing against it.

Homologation:

HP provided explanation of current homologation criteria and proposed amendments to upper limits for sit ski.

CAN: easier courses change with our proposal (being upright position on a sled). That could change how they see the proposal.

HP: what numbers do you think?

CAN: how many courses are close to the proposal?

HP: Data not readily available for all WC courses but profiles from Vancouver, Torino 2.5k sit were presented for comparison

RUS&BLR: We should keep to the figures from

Vancouver

HP: so should we then change the existing criteria?

RUS: Keep the numbers of Vancouver.

NOR: We agree with Russia, Vancouver was tough enough, number of total climb is important, but also single climbs, for 2,5km lower to 50. There should be a balance between tough and easy courses.

UKR: People must keep in mind homologation procedures. Maybe special adjustment for 2,5km.

HP: Homologation is not a rule, we must provide a range. Reference to issues faced in Khanty Mansyisk.

CAN: Top limit should not be too high

ITA: Same as Vancouver

GER: total climb max 60m. With more it becomes too steep, and it is difficult for LOCs.

USA: Check Solleftea, which is too difficult, and make sure we go below that.

NOR: agree with USA. Homologation is only a guideline, we should add max gradient (incline or climb?) We want to have as many B climbs of 10m, and no more than 12 percent? Vancouver had 8m climbs, but 4 times. Better than a long hill.

HP: not more than 60 for a 2,5km? All nations agree?

OK

FRA: Curves and turns: trying not to have them too sharp, could something be included in this manner?

HP: This is an ongoing discussion.

CAN: Diameter of turn specs?

HP: we analyze, but we try to adjust.

CAN: where is it stated?

HP: will show later.

3) Head of Competition-Cross country

A. Calendar Planning 2012-2014

Calendar responsibilities:

Presentation for next season:



May(2011) Finland Race

December Tumen, RUS (typical temperature =10-15 minus Celsius)

Late January/Feb -USA, 2 sites near each other

Late Feb/March - WC in Europe and then WC Finals in Vuokatti, FIN

NOR: To have an open forum in Vuokatti mid week during the WCF.

RW: we will definitely try to have it.

GER: good idea to have a WC in December. But this should be asked to the nations due to financial constraints.

UKR: Agree with GER, very difficult to attend in December, many athletes involved in summer till December, especially this season prior to London 2012. Maybe WC in Scandinavia is better as many teams are there.

TU: will take these comments.

CAN: 4 different separate trips to Europe will become too costly.

CAN: the Feb WC in Eur should be as close as possible to the WCF.

TU: We agree to this, keeping in mind the long break between the USA series.

CAN: dates in Vuokatti are fixed or can be earlier?

TU: will check although it seems they are quite fixed due to availability and desire to associate with their loppet. We will check with organiser.

Next season 2012-2013:

Maybe WCH after the WCF? Test event I Sochi.

New locations tbd POL and UKR with new facilities.

2013-2014

PWG in Sochi

IPCNS Points System:

Explanation on presentation

UKR: good idea as in FIS, also thinking of future integration, but this may need 2 years to be fully implemented.

TU: 180 IPCNS

RW: in the past the Qualification criteria for PWG was set at having WC points. The idea would allow us to use the IPCNS points as a QC indicator instead.

Athletes at IBU and FIS races:

Feedback from Nations about which races may be used? Maybe count the equivalent IPCNS points?

Several ideas can be made, like using FIS points in a consistent way? Comparison of results from different locations with a simple adjustment, but feedback from nations is required.

UKR: we already have results from FIN in two FIS races that could be used.

TU: interested to know from Nations how many athletes participated in FIS/IBU races this past season and also for the future to keep STC informed. Also will want to know if there are any issues with athletes allowed to start or not.

Middle Distance Pursuit:

Athletes seem more negative than what the nations survey showed. Not too keen on races broken up in two races on same day.

We would like your opinion on this format:

FRA: if we want to be like FIS, we need to change technique, even if % is changing. So same distance on both races.

HP: the reason we don't change technique was for organization reasons, to make it easier on OC and grooming.

FRA: to do something like Nagano?

HP: athletes suggested to have short race on first day, and then pursuit the next day.

For IPC, due to %, it can be a big challenge to ensure equal conditions.



CAN: any time we race a hunting race in IPC, we are only making a guess on what the winner's time will be to calculate start times. With weather changes it will be very difficult. If we want to be like FIS, we need to do two races in a row.

HP: In the past we used estimates of course speed for the basic time but this has large errors. The current system is much better.

CAN: question to other Nations: what is with fairness factor in these races?

HP: request from broadcasters to have a clear understanding, first to cross is winner, also to have a clear competition against someone on course.

RW: we are trying to work something that makes sense for IPC races, as not all FIS formats can apply to us.

We definitely want the athletes' feedback.

UKR: Is the IPCNS STC proposal to have the race in two days and two winners?

TU: maybe we can come back to this later with the BT recommendations.

4) Head of Competition-Biathlon

A. Biathlon Target Diameter change

KW: Last season was the best season in BT, everything was smooth. Finsterau was filled lanes with LWs, it worked fine. New rules for shooting lanes we had few penalties, 3m lanes in FIN, 2,75 in SWE.

Very good behavior of coaches.

Calculations of over 90% success of hits for LWs and VIs. Should we make target smaller?

Nations 15mm for youth are not so happy either.

Questionnaire was sent out, but not yet returned.

Kurvinen suggested 12mm, some athletes also suggested this.

Changes mean changes in material, and this needs to be carefully scoped.

Which way we go with all the different variables?

Accordinging survey, results will be taken to the STC to



	<p>devise the way forward.</p> <p>RW: athletes are not sure if this is a good change, also comments about changing the target distance to 12m-15m instead of changing size, but in IPC this would become quite complex, our ranges sometimes are very small.</p> <p>NOR: Shooting results from this season: we think the decrease in size will only help the ones using support for the rifles.</p> <p>RUS: better to leave as it is.</p> <p>UKR: against the decrease of size</p> <p>NOR: also be aware the IBU direction, thinking of integration as well.</p> <p>KW: electric rifles test if IBU uses them? The setup of IBU ranges would open a very wide variety of options for events for us. Recommendation to stay like this till 2014.</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	Recommendation to stay like this till 2014.

6 IPC MANAGEMENT REPORT

Discussion

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Communication with NPCs: EA reminded the present members about the importance of a clear and straight communication with their national paralympic committees. 2) Licensing System – SDMS: EA emphasized on the use of the SDMS system to ensure the accurate data is centralized. This has significantly improved the data used at events this season. 3) Online Entry System Process Project: one of the projects is to link an on line entry process to SDMS in order to register all entries for athletes to an event. The intent is to have this running for the 2011/2012 season. 4) Vancouver 2010 PWG Figures: EA presented some figures from the Vancouver 2010 PWG in comparison to the Torino 2006 PWG. <p>2) IPC Corporate Plan</p> <p>EA explained the current status of the corporate</p>



plan for each sport and how it is driven and what are the immediate priorities in the sport.

3) Relations with FIS-IBU

EA gave a brief explanation on where IPC stands regarding institutional relations with FIS/IBU. As for today with FIS, the cooperation is mainly on technical matters and with IBU there have been some engaged officials that have expressed further interest to participate at IPC events.

4) Factor System Study

The IPC and the Nordic STC have engaged Mr. Hugh Daniel, who has been in charge of the Alpine Skiing Factor System study to collect information and lead a working group that can define a base model from which further research and implementation can take place. Throughout the summer, it's expected to have a first draft.

5) IPCNS Regulations Section Rulebook

The IPCNS Rulebook, will contain a specific Regulation Section that will gather many topics that to date, were part of independent policies even if applied to the sport as common practice. These will apply as of 1 July 2011.

6) Sochi 2014 PWG update

Two Site visits conducted so far, the main challenges remain the travel time for the athletes from village to the Nordic Venue as well as the sit ski courses, yet to be defined.

Project Reviews and Co-Coms have already taken place with SOCHI OC in order to implement the planning of all functional areas.

HP short clarification on Homologation proposal:
HP presented new proposal for nations to provide input.

NOR: agreed to the proposed values

UKR: limit for A? 12% max 200m

HP: this will go into the guidelines

Decision(s)

Action(s)

7 COFFEE BREAK

8 RECOMMENDATIONS RULE CHANGES

Discussion

- Canada

Recommendation 1 discussion:

This year a nation decided to use what could be defined as a loophole that would not comply with the 2nd part of our proposal. If we are calling this a sit ski category, we think our rationale should be applied.

RW: Questions?

NOR: DO we need to clarify how much part of the body shall be in contact with the seat? Or how big should the seat be?

CAN: maybe further clarification is required, seat must be fixed to the structure. Or defining that all the sitting part of the body shall be in contact with the sit ski.

We are also dealing with a very open limitation to sit skis in comparison to other sports.

NOR: was the rule of 30cm removed precisely to enable more liberty for development in equipment?

RW: this was done as a request from the nations together with some other items.

NOR: we can discuss exactly the scope of this case.

RW: we need maybe to better define some rules, i.e. related to equipment. This case was maybe more of a technique change, and a different level of impairment for that class for instance. If an athlete is more capable then he should be allowed to compete in a more restricted class only if he is limited to the same restrictions they have.

This could be brought up as a classification matter, with maybe a potentially different class?

FRA: May have to consider classification because

this is not fair play for the double amputee.

CAN: It may be a classification matter, but in absence of a clear rule, we need to ensure fairness and await the outcome later of the classification resolution.

POL: Keep in mind that it maybe is not so clear that development of equipment may help using some classes to maximize the use of their muscles. It may be a mix of both equipment and classification.

RUS: if someone is using all his muscles, it is important they are competing in their class. It is important to define the limits of equipment. In other sports there are clear limits with the issue of lifting your buttocks.

FRA: development of specific elements for equipment, but if this is accepted, very likely the factors would have to change. Not fair for instance for a double amputee.

ITA: We agree with the 1st part of the CAN motion.

UKR: we agree with CAN with 1st connotation.

RW: explained the formal process for voting and what happens with passed recommendations.

GER: we need to define the fixture to the seat. During competition moving the seat should not be possible

USA: do we want to limit the full ability of an athlete despite his/her impairment? We believe in this manner we disable...and not enable.

NOR: to allow the full athlete's potential, maybe we should allow a sit ski that can change angles?

CAN: we believe this is a classification issue. But sit skiers are classified in a sitting position. Who can actually use a sit ski in the two different positions is very limited. Do we want to limit the innovation or do we want to promote the best athletes.

All sports with sit skis have clear regulations on equipment. This should be about an athlete being able to propel himself/herself on a device.

NOR: in this position, the athlete is still propelling him/herself.

USA: best definition would be to have a fixed seat for the sit skis.

RW: We can make this rule change now, but in the future we may make further classification changes that cause reconsideration of this rule

Motion was amended to:

Amendment of IPC rule 222.7

The Nordic sit-ski shall consist of a sitting device with a fixed seat, which is not adjustable during the race, mounted on a pair of cross-country skis or rolling devices (summer competition). The sit-ski athlete shall be seated on the sit-ski at all times during the race, meaning that the athletes buttocks shall remain in contact with the seat.

11 in favour

3 against

Recommendation passed

Recommendation 2 discussion

POL: proposal reflects particular cases, with regular hips, but this may not always be the case for example one Polish athlete does not have a normal hip structure.

HP: from Jury, when do you expect that Jury is checking the angles?

CAN: most athletes meet the criteria, so in effect you would be checking 3 -4 athletes before or after the race.

GER: maybe check before races.

HP: not even during the PWG could check if athletes had marked skis or not, so we may not be able to enforce this process. Maybe a random draw.

CAN: maybe at the same time as chip or skis are placed or checked.

RW: how to measure this?

CAN: two rulers that mark the angle or other

devices available (eg i-phone app with angle measure).

RW: ensuring a level service and accuracy and tolerance. We may have different findings depending where & how done.

RUS: check skis at start as well as the angles.
Device (Caliometer)

CAN: remove upper limits

UKR: check and protest time to mark before race only if there is a protest.

NOR: how do we measure athletes with no femur? Consequences? Seconds? DSQ? Should the sledge be within the limits? Or the sledge him/herself? It is too hard to measure this without an X-ray. Agreeing to this means having too many people controlling this and probably not viable.

CAN: Femur discussion. It is the angle of the bone that determines the power of transmission. The mechanical advantage comes into play with 15-20 degrees differences.

NOR: there is too much variety out there, why limit that? We want to see a sport that develops, this will not bring new athletes to the sport.

LA: is this not more of an issue specific to single amputees?

CAN: in 7 years, changes in equipment and their rules approval happen much faster than changes to the classification system.

USA: we should not penalize all athletes, we open a can of worms, checking this before the race will be too much trouble.

RW: add comments: changes in classification require that the athletes demonstrate their new abilities.

POL: what about athletes that do not fit into this? Are they not going to be allowed to compete?

HP: what is the penalty for the non compliant athletes? What about new athletes coming into the sport?

CAN: not something that needs to be tested in all

races.

HP: we would be happy to know if

POL possibility to amend the voted motion?

RW: if we eliminate the one end of the range,

CAN: it would be in the higher end, but we were not thinking of the POL athlete.

RW: further discussion on this topic to potentially change the existing classification Classes. Changes in the Classification system and percentages need data to be collected and take time.

Voted recommendation:

LW 12

femur angle: zero to -20 degrees. (Please see Addendum: Picture No. 1).

LW 11.5

Femur angle: zero to -20 degrees. (Please see Addendum: Picture No. 2).

LW 11

Femur angle: 10 to 20 degrees. (Please see Addendum: Picture No. 3).

LW 10.5

Femur angle: 20 to 30 degrees. (Please see Addendum: Picture No. 4).

LW 10

Femur angle: 30 to 40 degrees. (Please see Addendum: Picture No. 5).

Current equipment that should require modification to be in line with fellow competitors:

(Please see Addendum: Picture No. 6 and Picture No. 7).

In favour: 9

Against : 5

Recommendation passed

CAN Recommendation 3:

As the issue of power-to-weight ratio has never been addressed in sit-ski classification and it is a crucial aspect of skiing fast in a sit-ski, we seek to rectify this issue by adjusting the classification percentages



of 4 of the 5 sit-ski classes. To compensate for the dramatic advantage offered to double-amputee siskiers in terms of not having to move around unusable weight in the form of legs, this proposal seeks to adjust down all of the sitski classes' percentages by 4%. Since single-leg amputees only have half of this advantage, they will receive 2% and LW12 athletes with 2 legs will receive 4%.

With the adjusted percentages, the sit-ski classes will now look as follows:

LW12a(double-amputee) 100%

LW12b(single-amputee) 98%

LW12c(2 full legs) 96%

LW11.5 94%

LW 11 90%

LW10.5 87%

LW10 82%

CAN: will need to be addressed by a classification committee. We are seeking a more formal discussion and consideration than a formal voting.

RW: can we have a short discussion.

NOR: this may not consider all our athletes. Having done some calculations, seems like more of a 2%. Top 5 would more or less remain the same.

POL: with this recommendation and previous we are not covering many athletes.

RW: the STC will take this recommendation for internal discussion and evaluation during the classification review.

Proposal was tabled and referred to STC.

- Japan

Recommendation 1:

IPC Nordic Skiing propel discussion and examination with INAS regarding the possibility of the re-inclusion Rationale for the recommendation:

The Joint Statement of the IPC and INAS-FID (2008) refers possibility to re-include the ID class in 2012



London Paralympic Games, and some of the sports have already approved to offer the program for ID athletes. The similar examination should be needed for winter sports when we think about the possibility of 2014. IPC Biathlon and Cross Country Skiing have to prepare for the re-inclusion of ID class in early stage. By holding a pilot test, we should start to examine the possibility whether the ID class could be included in our competition like other summer sports. We recommend having such a pilot test in the IPC Biathlon and Cross Country Skiing World Championships or World Cup.

In order to realise the above step, it is inevitable to establish a tight cooperation between IPC Biathlon and Cross Country Skiing Technical Committee and INSD classification team.

EA: Presented the General Assembly Motion that addresses this matter and gave some background on the topic.

UKR: Classification process for NS ready? If positive

When would this come into place?

RW: In the summer would start the process

NOR: we were discussing to get closer to IBU and FIS, and FIS point system, getting closer to able body athletes. This goes in an opposite direction in a way, maybe INAS belongs more to Special Olympics. Maybe at NC level it can be a go, but not for WC, or WCH.

USA: agree with Nor, it is also a safety concern, we don't think it is a good idea, especially considering weapons.

TU: It will not be ready for Sochi

EA: The earliest possible Paralympics for inclusion would be 2018.

KW: how many nations have athletes that can go to WC and be competitive?

RUS, JPN, FIN, SWE...

HP: do we have the ability to really know who is competitive in ID? Why not test? I am not against or in favour, but it may be beneficial to see first

hand and then have a clear idea.

RW: athletes don't seem to be in favour of this due to the fact they are trying to see themselves in FIS/IBU.

4 in favour

8 against

2 abstentions

Recommendation NOT passed

- Norway

Recommendation 1 discussion:

1)NOR: explanation of athlete's working group, but they select.

UKR: how it is done in FIS, but make it maybe based upon invitation, with no voting right.

13 in favour

1 abstention

Recommendation 2:

RW expressed the athletes' concern of having only one CC race if a relay was added in a 4 race event at World Cups. An option may be to play with the formats. Format to be determined to test next season.

UKR: maybe only at WC Finals.

CAN: ok for WC if format changes and there are more participants.

9 in favour

2 against

3 abstentions

Recommendation passed

Recommendation 3:

NOR 7.5 ind, 12,5 pursuit based on the 7,5 and then a long 15km with penalty minutes.

HP: How do we consider the penalty loops into the calculation of basic time for the 12,5km?

NOR: yes, used.

RW: the penalty time would be considered in the pursuit part, although currently they are not considered to set the ski time for the second race. There are two part to determine the start time for 2nd race

- 1) ski time using % system predicting ski time for next race and then
- 2) adding the penalties to this.

NOR: maybe advantage for those who shoot better or if we could measure the course time.

TU: this was discussed with the athletes: the penalties on first day should count. This gives a longer race on the 2nd day. Using penalty loops both days, seems to be what athletes want. We should test this.

KW: to see this next winter would be the desired option.

GER: we said we do not want hunting start, and now we discuss this?

RW: athletes wanted this even if it has a possibility of error.

CAN: Then distances will have to be changed to 6 and 10 for women like UKR.

HP: racing ski time for 2nd day will not be like on first day...

RW to CAN: why the relation with distances?

NOR: gave distances:

HP: this would mean adding a 2km loop to our specs.

RW: review wherever possible this season. Ok for NOR? YEs

USA: will this still fit with the proposal for PWG?

Voted

Individual start 7,5km Men - 6km Women which makes the start list for the Pursuit Men 12,5km and 10km Women

Third event Long Distance 15km Men – 12,5km women

Favour: 10

Against: 2

Recommendation passed

- Russia

Recommendation 1;

Voting on the addition of the two BT events.

10 in favour

Recommendation passed

Recommendation 2: Done together with the INAS recommendation from Japan. No further discussion

Recommendation 3:

- 1) Increase of women quotas.

RW: never has been for discrimination, but more to meet realistic quotas.

NOR: does an increase of women represent a decrease of men?

RW: probably not

NOR: would it lift the maximum quota per nation?

RW: we need to be careful with this for LOCs

EA: quotas

RW: this allows for nations to have more staff if they have more athletes specializing in BT for instance.

RUS: women are competing in the same number of races. We don't have 3 persons per class.?? If we increase the quota, we can at least have 4 persons in each category. This may attract more female athletes in other countries

In Favour 5, against 1

There was general support for the principle of providing more equal quota for women however the specific mechanism was not defined (relative to current overall quota, reallocation mechanisms etc).



	<p>The STC/IPC for further discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ukraine <p>Recommendation 1:</p> <p>HP: we can put each category after the other, but then the simulation is not exactly like race day.</p> <p>NOR: why not Standing and Sitting together?</p> <p>HP: with 10 lanes it may be an issue.</p> <p>13 in favour 0 against Recommendation passed</p> <p>Recommendation 2 was removed as per NORWAY'S recommendation being the same.</p>
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	

9 OTHER BUSINESS

<i>Discussion</i>	
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	

10 CLOSING

<i>Discussion</i>	Meeting was adjourned by Rob Walsh at 18:10
<i>Decision(s)</i>	
<i>Action(s)</i>	