



Meeting title	APSO General Assembly
Date	24 October 2019
Time	13:30-17:00 CET
Venue	IPC Headquarters, Bonn, Germany
Chair	Sabrina Ibáñez, President
Minutes	Sergey Lyzhin

Updated: 18 December 2019

Participants			
APSO Representatives	Initial	Title	IF
<input type="checkbox"/> Ms Sabrina Ibáñez	SIB	APSO President	FEI
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr Tom Dielen	TD	APSO Vice President	WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Mr Henk van Aller	HVA	APSO Treasurer	IBSA
<input type="checkbox"/> Mrs Maureen Orchard	MO	APSO Executive Board Member	IWBF
<input type="checkbox"/> David Hadfield	DH	President	BisFed
<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas Lund	TL	Secretary General	BWF
<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Kurzo		Vice-President	BWF
<input type="checkbox"/> Bettina De Rham		Director, Para-Equestrian	FEI
<input type="checkbox"/> Liz Soutter		Sports Manager	FISA
<input type="checkbox"/> Robert Fenton	RF	Vice President	IBSA
<input type="checkbox"/> John Edwards	JE	Chair Paracanoe	ICF
<input type="checkbox"/> Alistair Williams	AW	Head of Wheelchair Tennis	ITF
<input type="checkbox"/> Raul Calin		Secretary General	ITTF
<input type="checkbox"/> Leandro Olvech		ITTF Foundation Director	ITTF
<input type="checkbox"/> Debra Alexander	DA	Executive Board Member	ITU
<input type="checkbox"/> Eric Angstadt	EAT	Paratriathlon Senior Manager	ITU
<input type="checkbox"/> Charmaine Hooper	CH	CEO	IWAS
<input type="checkbox"/> Pal Szekeres		Wheelchair Fencing Executive Committee Chairperson	IWAS
<input type="checkbox"/> Norbert Kucera		Secretary General	IWBF
<input type="checkbox"/> Richard Allcroft		President	IWRF
<input type="checkbox"/> Eron Main	EM	CEO	IWRF
<input type="checkbox"/> Dominique Ohlmann		Para Archery Committee Chairperson	WA
<input type="checkbox"/> Jiri Snitil		Competitions and Development Officer	WCF
<input type="checkbox"/> Roman Suda		Wheelchair Curling Classifier	WCF
<input type="checkbox"/> Barry Couzner OAM	BC	President	WPara-Volley
<input type="checkbox"/> Gen. Ahmed Fouly		Vice President	WT
<input type="checkbox"/> Olof Hansson		Para Taekwondo Director	WT
<input type="checkbox"/> Gilles Peruzzi		Head of Para Cycling	UCI
<input type="checkbox"/> Sergey Lyzhin		Head of Media and Communications	APSO



Invitees				
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mr. Alexis Schaefer	ASC	Commercial and Marketing Director	IPC
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mr. James Sclater	JSC	Anti-Doping Director	IPC
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ms. Elizabeth Riley		General Counsel	IPC
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mr. Dimitrije Lazarovski	DL	Head of World Para Snow Sports	IPC
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mr. Sebastien Gillot	SG	Director, European Office and International Federation Relations	WADA
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mr. Peter Weber	PW	CEO & Founder	IRIS

Agenda			Speaker	Annex
1	Welcome		Chair	
2	Approval of the APSO GA minutes 2018		All	
3	Finances		Treasurer	
	3.1	Treasurer's Report		X
	3.2	2019		
	3.3	Annual Subscription fee		
4	Update and clarification from WADA		WADA	X
5	TV Viewership research for Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games		IRIS	X
6	IPC Classification Code		All	
	6.1	Board of Appeal		
	6.2	Classification Jurisdiction		
7	Tokyo 2020		IPC	
	7.1	Broadcasting		
	7.2	Pre-Tokyo 2020 update on Antidoping matters		
8	IPC & APSO General Assembly 2020		Chair	
9	Other Business		All	

DRAFT Minutes	
R: Resolution T: Task I: Information	
1	<p>Welcome</p> <p>The Chair welcomed everyone to the APSO General Assembly and acknowledged that all members were represented at the meeting. The Chair informed members on Henk van Aller's (HVA) appointment to AGITOS Foundation Grant Support Programme Selection Committee and on Kris Dent's from the ITF appointment to the IPC Paralympic Games Standing Committee.</p> <p>The Chair explained that the agenda may be adjusted during the course of the meeting to accommodate presentations from external speakers. Each member was invited to introduce themselves to the group. Colin Grahamslaw, Secretary General of the World Curling Federation, was excused. (I)</p>
2	<p>Approval of the APSO GA minutes 2018</p> <p>The minutes were approved, with the recommendation to amend the header and the footer to include the date and location of the GA. (R)</p>
3	<p>Finances</p>
3.1	<p>Treasurer's Report</p> <p>HVA explained that the main income was from the IPC Grant and from membership fees. Expenditures comes from meetings hosting and annual GAISF membership fee. (I)</p> <p>HVA presented the IPC Grants Report. Fifteen complete reports were submitted by APSO members but due to different accounting standards they were rarely comparable. With IPC Grant of EUR 25.000 per federation the APSO members have spent approximately EUR 4.9m for their sports and para-disciplines with a range between EUR 36.000 and EUR 640.000. Members were also of the opinion that a large proportion of the resources spent for the sports were not counted as they were provided on a voluntary basis. (I)</p> <p>The Chair invited Tom Dielen (TD), Davit Hadfield (DH) and Eric Angstadt (EAT) to work together with HVL to propose amendments to the form for IPC Grant reports. (T)</p>
3.2	<p>2019</p> <p>The 2019 Budget was based on the one for 2018 and a reserve of CHF 3.250 was envisaged. HVA reported that not much of the funds were spent in 2019 as local organisations were supportive to APSO and did not invoice the association (i.e. for hosting meetings, etc.). (I)</p> <p>The Chair concluded that the Treasurer's report will be published on APSO website. (T)</p>
3.3	<p>Annual Subscription fee</p> <p>The General Assembly approved to maintain the annual subscription fee at CHF 300. (R)</p>

<p>4</p> <p>Update and clarification from WADA/IPC</p> <p>7.2</p>	<p>Sebastien Gillot (SG) presented the most recent developments of WADA Compliance Monitoring Program which was launched in 2017 by sending out Code Compliance Questionnaires (CCQ) to its signatories. As an outcome more than 11,000 corrective actions were identified with nearly 4,000 having been already implemented to date. It was acknowledged that several countries have amended their legislation in antidoping area and several signatories have entered into partnership with each other. In 2019 these measures were reinforced with the launch of Continuous Monitoring Program which featured a number of further doping control measures. (I)</p> <p>SG introduced 2021 WADA Code review Process and updated members on five existing International Standards' review and the creation of two new ones (Education and Result Management). Members took a note that all signatories should incorporate the revised Code and International Standards provisions into their own policies, statutes, legislation or rules and get them approved by WADA. (I)</p> <p>Eron Main (EM) asked a question on inclusion of opioids into "substances of abuse" category along with cocaine and marijuana. SG clarified that this was not planned by WADA at this stage. (I)</p> <p>Robert Fenton (RF) raised concern over lack of knowledge among Doping Control Officers (DCO) on how to work with athletes with disabilities. James Sclater (JSC) clarified that the IPC was working on DCO's special guidelines for various types of disabilities and proposed to share them with APSO members for their review by the end of the year. (T)</p> <p>Thomas Lund (TL) raised concern over unbalanced testing carried out by NADOs between different sports when certain sports were massively tested with minimal or no testing offered to other sports. Due to NADOs' autonomy from IFs there was no possibility to affect those testing programs which caused extra costs for IFs to filling the gaps. SG clarified that WADA could address those issues to the respective NADOs and encouraged Members to share their concerns with WADA as a group or individually. (R)</p> <p>JSC presented the IPC position over the situation with Russian Paralympic Committee (RPC) noting that both RPC and RUSADA were very cooperative and followed all the instructions thus no additional testing for Russian athletes were required ahead of Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games (PG). Regardless of that the final decision on Russian participation in PG depended on the outcome of the investigation and possible sanctions imposed by WADA. JSC also informed Members on the work the IPC were carrying on in regard to testing programs for NADOs and shared his observation that less than 2% of Paralympic athletes were tested. That percentage remained the same since several editions of PG while in the Olympic Games (OG) the number of tested athletes were growing from one edition of OG to another. (I)</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>TV Viewership research for Tokyo 2020 Paralympic Games</p> <p>Peter Weber (PW) presented the services IRIS offered to APSO in regard to viewership and social-demographic data collection at the PG 2020. This data would allow IFs to better understand the footprint and the fan base of their respective sports globally and more accurately target the sponsors and the audience. A workshop on potential use of the data was also offered. (I)</p> <p>Charmaine Hooper (CH) asked a question whether the sports that were not to be covered</p>

	<p>live in Tokyo would benefit from the research. PW clarified that highlight content was also included into the scope of the research thus all the sports would benefit from having information about their respective viewers. TD noted that no viewership data was provided by the IPC before. If the research were to be conducted each Member would have received viewership data exclusively for its respective sport. (I)</p> <p>The Members expressed their unanimous support for the project. (R)</p> <p><i>Note: Following the General Assembly, IPC approached APSO Executive Board to see whether rather than hiring IRIS' services APSO would consider using the services of Nielsen Sports as the latter in recent years had continuously monitored the media performance of IPC events as well as their distribution and there could be an interesting economies of scale. APSO membership will be updated in due course.</i></p>
6	IPC Classification Code
6.1	<p>Board of Appeal</p> <p>The Chair noted that feedback on the proposed Board of Appeal (BOA) was received from five APSO members. That feedback showed that there was not the same degree of interest in BOA among APSO members and that Elizabeth Riley from the IPC was to approach individually those IFs who indicated their particular interest. (I)</p>
6.2	<p>Classification jurisdiction</p> <p>The Chair noted that feedback on the revised Classification Code was received from five APSO members. It was commonly noted by the respondents that the IPC Classification Code should set standards that provide guidance in area of good governance; provide standards for processes and procedures; and provide consistency; but that every sport should have the appropriate level of flexibility to set up the best suited classification system. (I)</p> <p>Debra Alexander (DA) noted that she serves as Chair of the IPC Science and Research committee. The mission of the committee was to scrutinise the research carried out/presented, to prove their reliability for decision making process of the IPC and to disseminate those found appropriate. DA also encouraged APSO members to participate in VISTA conference and to engage with those people who are doing researches in classification, medicine and other sport related topics. (I)</p> <p>John Edwards (JE) recommended to engage with the IPC during the research process of the classification rules adaptation due to their vast knowledge of the subject across multiple sports and not to leave them to take the final decision only. EAT confirmed that the model of early engagement with the IPC proved to be beneficial for ITU as well. Especially when the representatives from the Classification committee could attend the ITU competitions and get a better understanding of their sport. (I)</p> <p>Alistair Williams (AW) shared the ITF position on Classification Code jurisdiction matters. With all its positive effects, application of the proposed Code throughout competitions would create barriers for and cause some exclusions from participation in wheelchair tennis – something what ITF was continuously wrestling with. The ongoing negotiations with the IPC over the subject have not succeeded</p>

		<p>to date. (I)</p> <p>TL agreed to the mentioned earlier and noted that standardisation of classification processes should not go too far (i.e. the IPC's recent initiative of creation a worldwide centralized classification center was found non-viable). (I)</p> <p>TL also expressed an idea of establishing a journal in partnership with accredited university that would accumulate internal researches on para-classification matters and that would attract external researchers to share their researches as well. AW agreed that such a central repository of Paralympic classification knowledge would be something of a great interest for the ITF. (I)</p> <p>It was agreed to continue discussion over the knowledge sharing format among APSO members and the IPC. (I)</p>
7	Tokyo 2020	
	7.1	<p>Broadcasting</p> <p>Alexis Schaefer (ASC) presented IPC's TV Production Plan for Tokyo 2020 PG which was considered to be the largest TV coverage of PG ever with 19 sports broadcasted live. These sports were defined due to research carried out in partnership with Host Broadcasters. Fencing, Powerlifting and Taekwondo were planned to be covered with ENG (news-gathering with video cameras) only. (I)</p> <p>ASC informed the Members on the IPC's investments in 2 new services that would allow smaller broadcasters to stream the PG content at a lower cost. One of them were to be shorter clips and highlights content accessible via FTP (downloadable). The second technology was Paralympic video player that would allow to integrate PG content into existing websites and applications. (I)</p> <p>Barry Couzner (BC) asked a question whether there were clear guidelines for IFs in regard to allowed/not allowed ways of promotion of the PG on social media and other IFs' platforms. ASC clarified that such guidelines were to be shared with the IFs in due course and reminded that media staff of APSO Members can also rely on the IPC Communication team and use the content they provide for sharing. As in previous PG video streaming from mobile devices were not permitted. (I)</p>
	7.2	<p>Pre-Tokyo 2020 update on Antidoping matters</p> <p>Please refer to item 4 of the Minutes</p>
8	<p>IPC & APSO General Assembly 2020</p> <p>In was agreed to arrange APSO General Assembly in the 2nd half of October in Lausanne. (R)</p>	
9	<p>Other Business</p> <p>Logistics at Tokyo 2020 PG</p> <p>DH shared his concern over logistic matters related to Tokyo 2020 PG. It was proposed by TOCOG that athletes were to be transferred in 2-wheelchair vehicles from the village to the venue. In a situation when BISFed athletes are entirely wheelchair based that solution</p>	

	<p>would not work. (I)</p> <p>The other issue highlighted by DH was that proposed solution for arriving ITOs to take the public transport from airport to their hotels upon their arrival was neither respectful nor acceptable. TD and TL clarified that the same approach was proposed for Tokyo 2020 OG and that arriving ITO's were to be guided to their respective public buses which proved to be an efficient means of transportation in Tokyo in past years. (I)</p> <p>EM shared his experience of Tokyo taxis not being ready to take on board wheelchair passengers even though the vehicles were fitted with necessary equipment. The appropriate training for taxi drivers needs to be provided. (I)</p> <p>It was agreed to approach these issues collectively and to request clarification from the IPC and Tokyo 2020. (T)</p> <p>ITU Motion for IPC GA</p> <p>EAT presented to the members the motion of ITU for the IPC General Assembly 2019 that was declined and which was related to combined sport class events and interval start system for those. The named system has been used in Paratriathlon for the past 6 years and proved to be fair and efficient both in visually impaired and wheelchair classes. That allowed para athletes to compete alongside each other and able body athletes which consequently ensured that all athletes have the same exposure and overall event experience at the same venue and with the same audience. EAT invited members to get in touch with ITU if they would be interested to see the full rationale of the motion. (I)</p> <p>Bid process framework for Para sport federations</p> <p>Dimitrije Lazarovski (DL) presented the outcomes of the research carried out within winter para snow sports department of the IPC in regard to establishing of sustainable bid process for hosting major parasport events. It was discovered that in very few federations there was standardised documentation on event bidding process (unlike able body competitions). The key objectives for federation were identified as: setting a fair time frames for bidders (i.e. 12 months planning cycle); involvement of local and national politicians to bidding process; clear legacy planning for host city; find opportunities to change broadcasting from "expenses" to "revenue" of the event. DL also recommended that once standards were introduced there should remain some space for flexibility. In conclusion DL encouraged members to share their feedback and questions on the subject. (I)</p>
	<p>Closing</p> <p>The Chair thanked everyone for the productive discussions, the meeting was formally closed.</p>

Place and date of Approval

Signature