IPC NORDIC SKIING

MINUTES

Event: IPC Nordic Skiing Technical Committee Sport Forum Meeting

Date: 02 March 2013

Place: Solleftea, SWEDEN

Participants	Name	Position	(Initials)
	Rob Walsh	Chairperson	RW
	Len Apedaile	Vice Chairperson	LA
	Kaspar Wirz	Head of Competition Biathlon	KW
	Tor Undheim	Head of Competition Cross-Country	TU
IPC Management	Dimitrije Lazarovski	IPC Snow Sports Senior Manager	DL
Nations	Listed under Roll Call		
Purpose of the Meeting	2013 Sport Forum Meeting		
Executive Summary/ Main Outcomes			

AGENDA

Event: IPC Nordic Skiing Technical Committee Sport Forum Meeting

Date: 2nd March 2013

Place: Solleftea, Sweden

10:00 AM

1. Welcome

2. Roll Call

3. Adoption on the Agenda

4. Adoption of minutes from 2011 Sport Forum

10:15 am

5. Reports by the STC
    a. Chairperson
        i. STC membership and structure
    b. Head of Competition
        i. Calendar
        ii. IPCNS Points
    c. Head of Technical Control
        i. Revision of Rulebook structure
    d. Head of Classification
        i. Report of classification from this season
        ii. Path forward for classification research/changes

6. Report IPC Snow Sports Manager

11:30 PM

Coffee Break

11:45

7. Motion from IPCNS STC
    a. Use of electronic Rifles for LW athletes

8. Recommendations/Motions from NPCs
    a. Administrative Motions
    b. Rules Motions
    c. Race Format Motions
    d. Classification Motions
    e. Percentage related Motions

9. Other relevant issues

12. Closing

IPC NORDIC SKIING

SUMMARY

1. Opening

1.1 Welcome

Rob Walsh provided introductory comments, welcomes and introductions of the STC

Housekeeping items

- **Procedures**
- **Breaks**
- **Toilets**
- **Departure**

2 Roll Call

Discussion

The following Nations were represented:

ARG, BRA, BLR, CAN, FIN, FRA, GER, ITA, JPN, KOR, NOR, POL, RUS, SWE, UKR, USA

3 Adoption of Agenda

Discussion

Motion to adopt Agenda USA
Seconded by NOR
Agenda adopted

4 Adoption of Minutes Sport Forum 2011

Discussion

Motion to adopt Minutes FIN
Seconded by USA
Minutes from 2011 adopted

5 Review of Sport Forum Roles and Decision Making Process

Discussion

Review provided by Rob Walsh

- Examples of Sport Forum Recommendations and approvals
- WCH Fee - General Assembly
- Classification – IPC Management
- Rule Change – IPC Governing Board

6 IPC Nordic Skiing STC Reports and Initiatives

Discussion

a. Chairperson
   i. STC membership and structure

- Reviewed STC structure
- Announced Hans Peter Neeser resignation (Head of Technical Control) after 2014 and advance notice of replacement process
- Inclusion Athlete Representative: – approved, plan will be to elect the athlete in 2014 in association with new elections for the IPC athlete's council.
- Discussion from the floor suggesting that an election take place now at WCH or in Sochi 2013 where we have the largest number of athletes.
- Question and clarification from CAN, NOR & JPN: only Nordic skiing athletes would vote for the representative and there would only be one representative.
- Forum agreed that teams would poll their athletes here in Solleftea regarding preference to do here now, or in Sochi 2013, or in Sochi 2014. Discussion and decision to be deferred to the Team Captain's meeting on Sunday Mar 3.
- Cooperation with Nations
- Discussed emphasis on working together, Nations WC forums, improved communication
- Increased emphasis on Development / Regional Competitions
- No formal development person, Kaspar has been leading this file

b. Head of Competition

i. Calendar

- TU presented calendar for next three seasons and asked for feedback

2013/14

- How many want to go to Finland: 3 yes/ 7 no
- Who would like to have a World Cup Final in Alps in February 18-23 2013? 8 yes, 3 no:
- USA would prefer to have it a week later (Feb 25…) NOR also supported this
- CAN proposed 26 Feb – Mar 2
- ITA clarified that from OC perspective, original date is preferred due to National holidays during the following week

2014/15

- WCH North America + Asia
- No discussion

ii. IPCNS Points

- Factor (currently 600) reviewed every second year – includes WCH & PWG results. Calculation per FIS system
- Calculation of Race Points: published by Dimitrije, some issues noted this season to be resolved (missing points, latest list)
- IPCNS points for all sanctioned races on calendar

c. Head of Biathlon

- Removal of B class marshals, good TV coverage
- Penalty loop review
- Electronic Rifles, 4 companies making rifles, need to consider laser vs infrared: recommend infrared
- See ppt

c. Head of Technical Control

- Len Apedaile on behalf of Hans Peter Neeser
- Revision of Rulebook structure
- See ppt

d. Head of Classification

i. Report of classification from this season

- Rob Walsh on behalf of Dia Pernot
- See ppt
- Clarified that IPC policy is not to have classification at WCH or PWG going forward
- 2013/14 classification opportunities to be announced in May 2013

ii. Path forward for classification research/changes

- See ppt – summary of current processes LW & VI classification

- Question from CAN – are there any people involved in current research (expert group) with actual high level experience in Nordic skiing (ie coaches or past competitors?). RW: Don't know specifically, STC to followup and provide information on structure and membership

- CAN – is this designed as a research project or to actually have an impact change on classification? RW Answer: Both

- USA – can you define timeline for this process? RW Answer: see paper re sit ski ~ 9 months, then standing – timelines currently not well defined due to nature and structure of research work.

- RW : STC goal to work within the IPC structure to

	make interim adjustments to the classfication process while research process takes place.

7 IPC Management Report

Discussion	Report made by Dimitrije Lazarovski • See ppt presentation • Budget overview (all figures in Euros) • Relationship between FIS & IBU • FIS Working Agreement • Currently CC races not on FIS calendar until Hg and TD requirements are worked out – future goal. • Next Step Business Agreement • IBU Agreement – preliminary meetings to take place with IBU in Sochi • IPCNS management: encourage Nations to bring Nationals and Regional Championships onto the IPCNS calendar, provides opportunities for new athletes to achieve IPCNS points on lower level races • NOR: race fees – who sets these fees? DL answer: STC responsible to set these fees. • JPN: asked for update on IPC position on involvement of ID (INAS) athletes into IPCNS events. DL answer: recapped previous sport forum discussions / vote, and IPC GB proposal. • Reviewing accommodation fees at IPCNS races based on feedback that many OC can not meet these • Licence fee: two fees in system 60 & 90 Euro • Marketing: working with IPC marketing dept to develop a title sponsor for IPC WC • GER: when will event sponsor be sought for series? Concern about timing of implementation and potential conflicts with existing (next season) WC organisers seeking their own sponsors. DL answered that WC contract structure needs to be reviewed and updated but that current system provides for recognition / coordination with OC sponsors • Strategic Plan to 2018 to be completed by June 2013 for GB approval • SDMS system development – ongoing, intent is that all nations register for all events on SDMS, will consider rule changes to formalise requirement. • Results upload directly into SDMS via IPCNS staff • NOR – trying to enter athlete / guides into SDMS but cannot see them on SDMS. DL answer: only NPC can assign guides, issue of multiple guides is how to address overall titles when an athlete has used multiple guides. • NOR – needs SDMS to do more than just online entries

- Goals:
    - See ppt presentation
    - Increase awareness
    - Increase # of athletes (currently 200-250) , especially female athletes. Concern about meeting PWG quotas
    - Increase regional connections and inclusion of development camps and regional competitions onto calendar, including sanctioning
    - Title Sponsor for IPC WC
    - Constant Dev of SDMS system
        - In addition to entries will include classification assignments, and provide LOC access to system to see entries. One gap is that SDMS currently does not include team officials. NOR pointed out that SDMS currently also does not show IPCNS points – DL to follow up.

Please send any comments or questions to DL.

8 Coffee Break

9 Recommendations Rule Changes

Discussion

<u>STC Motion:</u> Use of Electronic Rifles for LW Athletes

Presentation by RW

Discussion:

USA: had initial concerns but found that we had more pros than cons and made point that need to consider needs of athletes in future not just current interests. Cons: temperature reliability, travel restrictions, electronic rifle may be more acceptable given recent shooting events and public perception, could allow for additional safe events inside city's to raise profile and promote sport further. US coaches support

UKR: is more negative of situation because biathlon will lose its nature which includes firing a projectile, compensation for wind, weather etc which requires additional skills and makes the Bt competition more unpredictable and therefore more interesting for spectators. UKR currently experiencing problems with B rifles which require a lot of maintenance. Believe that same transportation problems will continue with new types of rifles. Electronic rifles also suffer from weather conditions – particularly heavy snow. UKR feels the present format is working perfectly and brings a lot of excitement so we do not want to change

JPN: positive about change, but feel we should make a decision at a later stage, athletes currently against and have not had enough opportunity to test the system

NOR: agree with the UKR team. Discussion with Kurvinen indicates that system has been designed so far for indoor use and not tested enough outside, target is not waterproof, feel this is wrong direction to go if we want to get closer to IBU, recognize IBU is also considering and if we make any changes then

Vote:

FOR: USA, GER, FRA, CAN

AGAINST: NOR, ITA, UKR, JPN, FIN, RUS, BLR, SWE

Defeated -

Administrative Motions

CAN # 3: Recommend review of special IPC WCH fee structure – waive or modify

Discussion:

CAN: some athletes specialize, observe that majority of income is from WCH fee – unfortunate, understand that the original fee was based on a per day charge and Canada proposes that the fee only be applied to the number of days that an athlete actually attends. CAN also charged for a nanny and kids at 2011 WCH – seems extreme.

RW: discussed ways that STC can review current application of the fee.

FIN: total period fee for two athletes versus 4 or 5 athletes

NOR: to support Canada – had to register and pay for # people several months ahead before we knew actually how many people and who we would bring. If had a per day rate would bring people in and out more than are doing now.

USA: separating CC & BT could be helpful – and USA supports this approach

CAN: budget wise – can the fee be broken down into three parts?

Base event structure Portion plus a CC and Bt additional portion?

No vote taken.

ACTION: That the STC review and explore application of the WCH fee to address questions raised and we encourage the teams to discuss this issue with their NPC

FIN # 1: Standardize timetable for calendar, preliminary entries, entries and payment.

FIN: thinking of this season – have to make budget early on but we don't know where we have to go and in the past few years we don't really know where and when we go until Sept/Oct and that this is way too late to properly consider budgets, camps, travel etc. Second point is that there are very big differences between OC's on when they require information and that some requirements are much too variable – therefore we would like to have a consistent system regardless of venue – NOR.

NOR# 6: Timelines for entry to World Cup Events

NOR: similar motion but suggest using the IPC entry system to provide entries and information to the OC through one portal – this would bring it closer to IBU and FIS system

TU response: working on SDMS development, but need help from Nations to find and confirm organizers.

CAN – point of discussion is that we need a simple system for entering an event and not receive random emails after the fact.

GER – Oberied, have asked questions about budgeting , so it is important from OC perspective to know how many people will arrive for budgeting perspective, therefore information needed from teams

Question: if calendar can be confirmed early, can teams also provide an early indication of intent to participate?

NOR" Calendar by June, Intent by August

Consensus from group that improvements are needed.

ACTION:

STC and staff to work to define and create standard timelines and process, including electronic entry system to improve.

NOR # 2: Wax cabins (WC & WCH, standard amenities, size, max cost + ability to order extras)

NOR: spoke to motion – provide information once through IPC online system rather than multiple times for each different organizer, eg Sochi very difficult. Can provide consistent, accurate data to organizer: could also include athlete bibs – issued for the season.

GER: agrees with this idea. Note that for GER team do not always have same staff at each competition, therefore data should not be personalized for staff which may vary over time.

Consensus

ACTION: STC to follow up

NORWAY # 4: License for Guides

some athletes have more than one guide, NOR had a problem that guide was sick therefore needed to use coach replacements. Would make easier exchange a guide in the event of illness.

GER: suggest that guides do not pay license fee but that B athletes pay a double fee as a way to address the guide.

RW: part of issue is the registration of guide for admin purposes, insurance, anti doping

Amendment to Motion: GER: Each VI athlete pay for one guide. Additional guides have to register but do not have to pay.

Vote: unanimous

RULES MOTIONS:

NOR # 1 Wax Cabins

NOR – trying to get closer to the FIS system. See that this is now in IPCNS regulations. If this is included then this may be moot. But regulations should be for a WC event and WCH event (not for continental cup regulations).

ACTION: motion rescinded

NOR # 3: Prizes

Have seen a lot of different prizes at WC events. Only rule is that prizes must be awarded by end of WC event. Suggest get rid of medals at WC events. Athletes would prefer money. OC guidelines should include standards for what type of prizes should be handed out.

CAN: would be happy to pay 65 Euro per day WCH fee if some of entry money came back to the athletes as prize money. NOR agreed also for WC.

VOTE – Unanimous that there should be a rule for prizes.

Should there be medals at WC events: No

Preference indicated for cash prizes but recognition that this may be in the future.

NOR- general is that medals are at CH, PWG – don't like medals

RUS: agree

STC – to follow up

NOR # 5: Monetary fines for coaches and staff

NOR: disagree that athlete should suffer from coach problem. Also note that IPC has no system for handing out and collecting monetary fines.

Suggestion – could set up account (eg 500 euro) at beginning of season, to collect monetary fines, could also be used to deposit prize money.

DL: in AS, procedure is to invoice NPC for monetary fines, system is working well.

ACTION: STC to take recommendations and include in rules update.

RACE FORMAT MOTIONS:

USA # 1: see recommendations letter: proposal for biathlon mass start

USA: each class would start as a wave mass start. Each athlete would start with their class – would be chasing class that starts in front and be chased by athletes chasing from behind. One potential issue is range congestion. Question becomes how many waves or limitations should be put on the standing classes.

TU: main point will be the number of lanes. Should be fairly easy to test an event like this next season. Biggest challenge is for the number of athletes at 96-97%. Could use two day pursuit format, is technically possible to do this.

GER – we could test this event next year in Obereid as have shooting range with 25 lanes. Note that need also lanes for VI but lower numbers mean that these lanes could be reduced.

RW – discussed in open forum in Vuokatti with general agreement on idea. Should vote and if approved should involve coaches to help work out the details and how to reduce the risk of range issues. Would do calculations same as currently do this.

NOR: Need to consider time calculations and impact of changes in weather between one day and next and group sizes relative to shooting range.

GER: good to have another biathlon format. Note that calculated competitions are mostly gone now due to the variable impact of the weather conditions over two days. In IBU mass start everybody goes together – under this proposal the difference in start times creates more risk. Suggest finding another format like relay of something.

USA: answers: percentages most of the time will be accurate as usually don't have massive changes in weather. Percentages a re null and void after first shooting miss – therefore shooting variable becomes much more important rather than differences between athletes and weathers. Could have forerunning rules to deal with first athletes out issues. This would give athlete exciting head to head competition opportunity that currently does not exist.

CAN: do not necessarily see this as a championship event but could be used at WC to test. Also suggest could try more mass start events with percentages and winners applied at the end.

VOTE: IN FAVOR: CAN, SWE, POL, USA, FRA, GER, RUS, FIN, BLR, JPN

AGAINST: NOR, ITA, UKR

RUSSIA # 1: Short distance biathlon

Note Russia's analysis of results and comparison with IBU races.

Have two medium distance races (12.5k & 15k) that are quite similar and tend to favor endurance athletes over good shooters so suggest implementing a shorter race format.

General discussion about different formats including a two day event proposal with longer and shorter event one with time penalty and other with penalty loop.

CAN – agreed that 12.5k and 15k distances are too similar but did not support two day format proposal

GER – proposed shortening penalty loop for sit skiers and designing an event that would be comparable with short IBU event

CAN, RUS – supported proposal to base event on similar to IBU times

NOR – lets not introduce too much before Sochi – as next season is preparing for Sochi

UKR : by shortening – may end up with more athletes on the range at the same time – but currently coaches are barely in time working on the range to support athletes as it is therefore this creates other problems – would need more support persons – UKR would need twice the amount of staff – does not work for big teams, if we are thinking about a new format lets be careful and not try it next year.

RW – discussed scheduling considerations with respect to Paralympic.

GER – reiterated that if a shorter event comparable to IBU times is introduced that there should be a shorter penalty loop for sit skiers to simulate avg PL times.

Vote to change 12k to 10k (Men) and 10k to 7.5k (Women)

VOTE In favor: FIN, GER, USA, JPN, SWE, CAN, FRA, RUS, BLR

Opposed: NOR, ITA, UKR

RUS 2: Return of Short Distance to Competition Program (cross country)

RUS – clarification, this motion applies to sitting only, for WC, WCH and perhaps in future PWG

CAN – shorter distance races tend to favor the highest percentage athletes

VOTE: in favor: ITA, RUS, USA

Opposed: CAN, NOR, JPN, FIN, SWE

Abstentions: others

Break for lunch at 13:45 – return to continue at 14:15

Continued at 14:25

– approval of minutes from 2011 Moved FIN, Seconded USA, Approved Unanimously

- follow up discussion on pre games training camps & WC dates proposal

CLASSIFICATION MOTIONS:

CANADA # 1: Sit Ski rule proposal to add seat angles to equipment rules (moved from rules to classification)

CAN: presented proposed rule change as follow up to 2011. Baffled this has not been addressed in the last two years, particularly with changes in skiing position (kneeling) in 11.5 & 12's. Feel that every athlete who has switched to kneeling position has seen advantages and benefits but nothing has been done about classification. This could have been fixed in 2011 (Sport Forum) and should be fixed in lead up to Sochi to create a level playing field.

USA: this is related to USA #2 motion regarding LW classes, if we are to continue along the direction of separating classes then this should occur first. Comment that it does not readily apply to existing 12 class: double vs single amps

GER: re CAN #1: cannot change a rule prior to PWG. Sled development is expensive, if rules changed now some athletes could find themselves without a sled. Also questioned who decides whether the angle should be 30^{o} or 31^{o} ? Feels that this should be left to the scientific research group to determine differences.

NOR: agrees with GER regarding question about how and who to define the angle. Asked what happened with 2011 proposal.

RW: clarified why this motion was included in the classification section rather than the rules section. Described the STC and IPC expert meeting follow-up to 2011 question which resulted in updated height rule and strapping rules. Height restriction was designed to limit the potential for keeling and strapping / buttock rule added to clarify that must remain in contact with seat (seated position).

CAN: felt that there had been no action on what had been passed in 2011. Asked what is the definition of sitting? Weight on buttocks? Felt that current rules that allow different femur angles created benefits for some people but disadvantages for others and therefore the ability of some to modify their angle is unfair to others who cannot.

TU: pointed out that the statistics do not support the tenant that LW 12's are benefiting relative to other classes (in terms of results)

CAN: evidence that LW 12's are favoured illustrated by changes in sport currently 50% of the athletes or more are LW 12 whereas higher disabilities are disappearing.

GER: speaking as a coach in the sport, equipment is a part of the games as is wax and skis. Some athletes have the same sled as in 2002. Experience with high disability athletes suggest that sit skis can be like prosthesis and provides and individual athlete a chance to use their abilities to the fullest.

JPN: opinion: don't think it is a fair competition with an athlete standing on their knees, therefore a change should be made before Sochi

NOR: cannot change anything before Sochi. How can changes be made – send it to a WG?

ITA: agrees with JPN. Kneeling option favours LW 12 and disfavours LW 10. It is too hard for them to compete. Pointed out that the same discussion took place in hand cycling prompting separation into 4 separate categories

USA: cautioned that the sitting vs kneeling debate cannot be applied across all LW12 athletes for example an athlete without femurs cannot kneel

CAN: have an athlete without femurs

LA: There appear to be three separate themes that need to be considered with respect to this issue and how it should be addressed.

From an equipment perspective, sit skis and individual skiing positions are inherently different between athletes and presumably reflect the best position for an individual athlete to optimise their abilities (within all classes) Adding design limitations (such as seating angle) has the potential to limit the abilities of some athletes when the objective should be to remove limitations. The creation of a standard sit ski design is another option (say like sledge hockey) but does not seem like a practical option for sit skiing. Either way, if equipment standardization is the objective, then this will require significant consultation and research to arrive at a solution – this would not be a simple process as envisioned by this motion.

From a classification perspective, the question of sitting vs kneeling position in classification and during competition should be referred to the classification research project to determine its significance relative to functional performance and current assessment criteria and determine whether this is a classification issue or not. The question of sitting versus standing, and the definition of sitting has been raised and is a sport and classification rule question. Currently these are defined within the respective rules and differences between the LW2-9 and LW10-12 classes.

From a performance perspective, if one class is benefiting over other classes due to the development of this sitting (kneeling) position then statistically valid differences or advantages realised from this development should show up in the results data and be able to be addressed through percentage adjustments rather than classification or equipment rules.

NOR: suggest two options: vote no or send this issue to a working (research) group to assess

GER: proposed that this question be referred to research

At this point there was a side discussion by ITA, NOR, GER and CAN questioning the process by which percentages are derived, perceptions and concerns around the process, and criticizing the late notice (just before first competition) in Nov 2012. These points were taken as feedback and a brief description by which the STC uses results statistics to guide percentage setting and offer to interested nations to speak to Tor Undheim for more detail on this.

Following this discussion a vote was held on the original motion.

VOTE: in favor: ITA, CAN, UKR, BLR

Opposed: NOR, POL, SWE, USA, FRA, GER

Abstentions: others

CANADA # 2: Provide more classification opportunities (2-3 per year) including WCH

CAN: presented motion and rationale including fact that WCH is an event where many small nations show up due to funding opportunities (vs WC) and that in general more opportunities for athlete classification and review classification are needed. The situation this season was used an example where classification was only available at Vuokatti and USA Nationals prior to WCH and that there were limited opportunities to challenge classification at US Nationals where most Nations were not present.

USA: clarified that US Nationals classification plan was already in place before they know about the replacement WC in Cable.

NOR: supports the motion except for classification at WCH. NOR feels that WCH is not the place for new athletes to show up. Proposed revised wording that IPC STC provide classification opportunities at the first two events of every season.

RW: commented that the STC supports having more classification opportunities but that it is always a balance of resources.

Two votes were held on :

Vote 1: to hold more classification events including NOR proposal to provide classification at first two events:

In favor: Unanimous

Opposed: None

Vote2: to hold classification at WCH

In favor: CAN, ITA, SWE, USA, RUS, BLR, JPN, ARG, UKR

Opposed: NOR, GER, FRA

RUSSIA 2: Proposed changes to LW10-12 and LW2-9 classes (including percentages)

and

GERMANY 1: Subdivision of LW5/7 into different classes with different percentage

and

GERMANY 4: add a new class between B1 and B2 (congenital vs acquired blindness)

and

USA 2: Sport Class Modifications

These four recommendations presented for discussion together due to similarity. Preface by STC reviewing the classification code policy to use evidence based research as the basis for a new classification system.

USA: necessary to consider creating new sport classes to address differences based on new athletes coming into the sport. Eg – double amputee being in full musculature compared to someone missing a complete limb or hip single or double disarticulation.

NOR: are we allowed to make new subclasses within LW 12? Are we allowed to make as many classes as we like? If we are allowed to make more subclasses we should forward this to the working group. We cannot make decisions today or before Sochi.

RW: clarified misunderstanding from last year after Vuokatti presentations. No vote was called on this motion but discussion was continued to other similar motions.

GER: proposed that these proposals be referred to the research group

NOR: supports the principle of having more sub-classes

Decision:

There was no vote on the motion however there was a consensus vote that these proposals and supporting information should be sent to the classification research group.

GERMANY 2: Percentage correction for VI biathlon (B1) related to time advantages in aiming at first target between classes.

GER: STC percentages analysis currently does not consider biathlon competition factors

UKR: Bt is a difficult technical sport and that speed of shooting is based on training and therefore trainable. (eg V Bentele)

GER: agreed that shooting is trainable, but the additional challenge for B1 over other classes is the time to find the target and take the first shot. After that shooting times are consistent based on training.

ITA: questioned the statistical basis of percentage calculations based on different population size between classes and asked how the data is derived

RUS: recognized that first shot is longest for B1 and proposed using a blinder (screen) in front of the rifle to level the playing field between classes in terms of aiming the first shot

NOR: seconded RUS proposal

UKR: UKR team train with closed eyes in order to concentrate on the sound

	GER: Screen could be a good idea though shooting starts when the athlete arrives at the range and how they lie down on the mat and this is one of the factors that affect that initial aiming time for B1 The motion was tabled (in terms of the 2% proposal) and instead a vote was taken on how many Nations agree that this question is an issue and requires further analysis and consideration. Vote: In favor: Unanimous **GERMANY 3: Recommendation that points and qualification criteria be reduced to 20% from 30% (behind winning time)** GER: clarified that this is more of a statistical question about percentages than a hard proposal and that they are asking it to clarify why percentages show differences and does this highlight a problem with classification TU: provided an overview of the percentages calculation CAN: stated that statistics do not take into account mis-classifications RW: percentages statistics are not perfect and this is compounded by our small sample sizes. If anyone can find a better way to do it please let us know. Solicited interest in participating in a percentages working group. GER: withdrew motion saying that no vote was required at this stage but that the discussion has been helpful in understanding the process and rationales.
Decision(s)	See vote results above
Action(s)	STC to take action where indicated and report to Governing Board

10 OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion	There was no other business
Decision(s)	
Action(s)	

11 CLOSING

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