

## INTERNATIONAL WHEELCHAIR RUGBY FEDERATION

### MINUTES - 2014 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Odense, Denmark - August 3, 2014

**Present:**

*IWRF Board of Directors:*

John Bishop, President  
Ken Sowden, Vice President  
Cathy Cadieux, Treasurer  
Richard Allcroft, Member at Large  
Duncan Campbell, Member at Large  
Terry Vinyard, Member at Large  
Ross Morrison, Athlete Representative  
Eron Main, Secretary General

*National Members:*

<i>Country</i>	<i>Voting Delegate</i>	<i>Additional Delegate</i>
Australia	Jenni Cole	
Belgium	Tim Decleir	
Brazil	Luiz Pereira	Eduardo Mayr
Canada	Donald Royer	Gail Hamamoto
Colombia	Juan Pablo Salazar	
Denmark	Torben Nygaard	
Finland	Valtteri Lehtinen	Maria Pasanen
France	Michel Terrefond	
Germany	Dirk Wieschendorf	
Great Britain	David Pond	Andrew Flett
Israel	Baruch Massami	David Weinreb
Italy	Nicola Carabba	
Japan	Yasuo Shiozawa	Mayumi Shiozawa
Korea	Yoon Sewan	
Netherlands	Natasja Slood-Bosma	Johan Slood
Norway	Erik Baret	Gunhild Bottolfsen
South Africa	Victor Buitendag	
Sweden	Britt-Marie Mattsson	
Switzerland	Claudia Rota	
United States	Dave Mengyan	Mandy Goff

*Guests and observers:*

Christoph Werner, IWRF European Zone President  
George Hucks, IWRF Asia-Oceania Zone President  
Stan Battock, IWRF Technical Commissioner  
Kathy Newman, IWRF Competitions Commissioner

**Apologies:**

Argentina  
Austria  
Czech Republic  
Ireland  
New Zealand  
Poland

ITEM	DISCUSSION
1.0	<p><b>Welcome and Call to Order</b></p> <p>John Bishop called the meeting to order at 10:05. He welcomed all to the 2014 World Championship and the General Assembly, and expressed appreciation that so many were able to take the time to attend the meeting.</p> <p>John recognized Israel and Italy, IWRF's newest full members, who were both attending their first General Assembly. He offered congratulations to the Brazilian Wheelchair Rugby Association, which has just taken on governance of the sport in Brazil from the Brazilian Paralympic Committee.</p> <p>John also thanked DHIF and the Odense 2014 Organizing Committee for all their work on the World Championship and their support for the General Assembly.</p>
2.0	<p><b>Roll Call</b></p> <p>Eron Main conducted the roll call of voting members. At the time of the meeting there were 26 IWRF member countries. Quorum is 50% plus one, or 14 countries. At the time of the roll call, representatives from 19 member countries were present in the room. Eron noted that a quorum was present.</p> <p><i>Note to the minutes: Delegates from Germany arrived subsequent to the Roll Call, during the Zone reports. From that time there were 20 members present.</i></p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
3.0	<p><b>Approval of the Agenda</b></p> <p>Colombia moved that the Agenda for the 2014 IWRF General Assembly be adopted as presented. Canada seconded.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p>
4.0	<p><b>Minutes of the 2012 IWRF General Assembly</b></p> <p>The minutes of the 2012 IWRF General Assembly were presented to the General Assembly.</p> <p>Colombia moved that the Minutes of the 2012 IWRF General Assembly be approved as presented. Belgium seconded.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p>
5.0	<p><b>Reports</b></p> <p><b>5.1 President's Report</b></p> <p>John presented the President's Report and the IWRF Activity Report, as included in the meeting documents. He noted that the last two years have seen tremendous growth in the sport, particularly in South America and Europe.</p> <p><b>5.2 Financial Statements</b></p> <p>Cathy Cadieux presented the IWRF Financial statements for 2012 and 2013, as included in the meeting documents.</p> <p><b>5.3 Zones</b></p> <p>The report of the America Zone was included in the meeting package.</p> <p>John acknowledged the new President of the IWRF European Zone, Christoph Werner of Germany, and the new President of the Asia-Oceania Zone, George Hucks of Australia. The Presidents of the European and Asia-Oceania Zones made brief verbal reports on the status of their Zones.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Juan Pablo Salazar of Colombia made a presentation to the members on the Maximus Project, which has developed the sport of wheelchair rugby in South America. A copy of the presentation has been added to the package of meeting documents.</p> <p>David Pond of Great Britain made a presentation on the Wheelchair Rugby World Challenge 2015. This is an eight team tournament that will take place in conjunction with the 2015 IRB Rugby World Cup. A copy of the presentation was included in the meeting documents.</p> <p><b>5.4 Standing Committees</b></p> <p>The reports of the Antidoping Committee, Classification Committee, Competitions Committee, Development Committee, and Technical Committee were presented as included in the meeting documents.</p> <p>South Africa moved that the Reports to the General Assembly be accepted as presented. Germany seconded.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p> <p>Australia moved that the financial reports for 2012 and 2013 be accepted as presented. Colombia seconded.</p> <p>Canada requested that the motion be amended to approve rather than accept the statements. This would indicate that the members approve the financial management of IWRF as reported. The mover and seconder accepted the amendment.</p> <p>The amended motion is that that the financial reports for 2012 and 2013 be approved as presented.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p> <p>Cathy recommended the appointment of McKay Duff as auditors. Mackay Duff has conducted the financial reviews for IWRF since 2010; they are based in Ottawa where our bank accounts are; and they are familiar with audit practices for sport organizations.</p> <p>Canada moved that the firm of Mackay Duff be appointed as auditors for IWRF for the financial years 2014 and 2015. South Africa seconded.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
6.0	<p data-bbox="334 310 821 346"><b>Motions to the General Assembly</b></p> <p data-bbox="334 384 740 420"><b>6.1 Motions from the Board</b></p> <p data-bbox="334 457 459 493"><i>Motion 6</i></p> <p data-bbox="334 531 1349 604">The Board of Directors moved that IWRF adopt the attached IWRF Rule Change Procedure with effect from 1 January 2015. Belgium seconded.</p> <p data-bbox="334 642 1419 898">Canada asked if the Athletes Council would make independent recommendations on rules changes. John stated that the Athletes Council and Technical Committee should work together to make a recommendation to the Board. He noted that new rules will have to be trialled in several countries. Ross advised that the Athlete Representative on the Technical Committee will have role to coordinate liaison between the Committee and the Council.</p> <p data-bbox="334 936 1393 1083">Cathy noted that the Board cannot change a rules proposal from the Technical Committee or Athletes Council - the Board either accepts or refuses the rule change, and can return the proposal to the Committee or Council for further review or for revision.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1121 695 1157">John called the question.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1194 1179 1230"><b>18 in favour, 0 opposed, 1 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p data-bbox="334 1306 971 1341"><b>6.2 Motions from the Standing Committees</b></p> <p data-bbox="334 1379 459 1415"><i>Motion 7</i></p> <p data-bbox="334 1453 1360 1562">The IWRF Antidoping Committee moved that IWRF revise the IWRF Anti-Doping Rules to be compliant with the updated World Anti-Doping Code with effect from 1 January 2015. Australia seconded.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1600 1300 1673">Eron advised that these changes were necessary for IWRF to remain compliant with the WADA Code.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1711 1166 1747">There was no further discussion. John called the question.</p> <p data-bbox="334 1785 1179 1820"><b>20 in favour, 0 opposed, 0 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p data-bbox="331 268 461 304"><i>Motion 9</i></p> <p data-bbox="331 342 1385 451">Motion 9 was addressed prior to Motion 8 as the Classification Committee representative presenting on Motion 8 was not available due to commitments in player classification.</p> <p data-bbox="331 489 1401 598">The IWRG Competitions Committee moved that IWRG adopt changes to the IWRG competitions system as detailed in the proposal accompanying the motion. Colombia seconded.</p> <p data-bbox="331 636 1417 821">Germany noted that the cost of events is high and there is concern that countries cannot afford to go to two events in one year. The divisional events could be split over two years. Christoph agreed that attending three events in one year would be impossible for most countries. Eron advised that we have flexibility to move events in this way.</p> <p data-bbox="331 858 1406 1005">Australia asked regarding the ranking system if teams could be advantaged if they had the opportunity to attend more ranking tournaments. Eron advised that the system would limit the number of ranking tournaments a team could gain points from per year.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1043 1430 1152">Canada moved that the motion be amended to remove the draw system to a separate motion. Netherlands seconded the amendment. The Board and Colombia agreed to amend the motion.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1190 1414 1299">Sweden moved that the motion be amended to remove the qualification system to a separate motion. Finland seconded the amendment. The Board and Colombia agreed to amend the motion.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1337 1409 1522">South Africa asked what the purpose of the revised ranking system is. John noted that there are issues with the current ranking system. Richard said there are few tournaments that provide opportunities to move in the rankings and the current system does not reflect the current strength of countries. There is a need for more cross-zone events that affect rankings.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1560 1395 1669">Denmark asked how far back points will go. Eron advised points would be time limited and would expire after a few years; this will be developed in the new system.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1707 1403 1780">John advised this will take time to implement and there would be consultation and review by the Board. The time frame is one or two years.</p> <p data-bbox="331 1818 1369 1892">Eron stated that the aim of the motion is to give the Board authority to implement the changes as they are developed and when they are ready.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Ross noted that the motions requires IWRF to make the changes. Eron agreed but said that timelines to implement are not given.</p> <p>Duncan stated that lower ranked countries have told IWRF they did not see a pathway to improve their rankings; this is what has prompted changes to the system</p> <p>Belgium asked what would happen next year if the changes are not approved. Eron said this would need to be discussed with the Zone and the bid countries; there are three good bids for Divisional events in Europe.</p> <p>Great Britain asked if the Competitions Committee can manage implementation of the motion as amended. IWRF and the GA need to empower the Board and Committees to work flexibly and come up with the best solutions.</p> <p>Eron read the amended motion, that IWRF adopt changes to the IWRF competitions system as detailed in the proposal accompanying the motion with the exception of the draw system and the qualification system. John called the question.</p> <p><b>18 in favour, 1 opposed, 0 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p><i>Motion 9a</i></p> <p>Eron read the new Motion 9a, moved by the Competitions Committee that IWRF adopt changes to the IWRF competitions system to implement the draw system. Colombia seconded.</p> <p>Canada asked for an explanation of the reasons for the draw. Eron explained that under the current system pools were very static, with the same teams competing against each other over a period of time. The draw allows changes and opportunities to play different matchups. The draw also creates a marketing and promotion opportunity ahead of events.</p> <p>Canada asked if a quarter final round could be added to World Championships and Paralympic Games. Eron said this could be looked at but it was too late for the 2014 event when the draw proposal was made.</p> <p>Denmark said they thought the draw was a good idea and over time would be more fair for everybody. Germany and Denmark stated that the draw should take place earlier so countries know their pools and opponents well in advance of events.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>15 in favour, 1 opposed, 1 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p><i>Motion 9b</i></p> <p>Eron read the new Motion 9b, moved by the Competitions Committee that IWRF adopt changes to the IWRF competitions system to implement the qualification system. Colombia seconded.</p> <p>Colombia asked if the host country and previous champion would count against the Zone allocation of positions. Eron said they would not.</p> <p>Germany stated that it would be hard for countries to predict in advance if they would have to attend the qualification and it could be difficult for some to attend, depending on the location. John acknowledged the additional expense but it is hoped that with a revised competition calendar countries will have a clear view of the full quadrennial to allow planning ahead.</p> <p>South Africa noted that this creates an opportunity for teams that are lower ranked to qualify; this will allow more cross-zone events rather than teams getting spots automatically.</p> <p>Denmark said that this was a good proposal; the problem is the timing of the event and the need to prepare to attend a qualification tournament on short notice. IWRF should consider the timing and possible move the Zonals earlier.</p> <p>Eron explained the current Rio qualification rules, which include a qualification tournament. The tournament will be for six to eight teams and will probably take place in February 2016.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>9 in favour, 8 opposed, 1 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p><i>Motion 8</i></p> <p>The IWRF Classification Committee moved that the IWRF Classification Manual be revised to reflect changes to the assessment of hand function as detailed in the proposal accompanying the motion, with changes to take effect 1 January 2015. Netherlands seconded.</p>



ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Viola Altmann from the Classification Committee made a presentation detailing the rationale for the motion and the supporting research.</p> <p>USA commented that the changes to trunk classification bringing in the 1.5 trunk affected more people than expected. Will this be the same?</p> <p>Viola stated the IWRF knows exactly how many athletes will have to be retested. There are approximately 20 in the database with a 4.0 hand. Some are Permanent status, some are inactive. The same analysis was done for the trunk changes and the numbers of athletes impacted was as predicted. There may be an impression that more were affected but that is not what happened.</p> <p>Australia asked if any ineligible athletes who could come back with this change. Viola advised that the minimum eligibility test were not changing and those athletes would still not pass the test.</p> <p>John asked what would happen to Permanent status athletes who were re-evaluated under this rule. Viola stated that if their sport class did not change they would remain P status. If their class changed they would revert to I1 status.</p> <p>Ken asked about implications for this change on our compliance with the IPC Classification Code. Viola stated that this was intended to help us align with the code.</p> <p>Canada asked if there was consideration to adding a 3.5 increment for hand assessment instead of eliminating the 4.0 hand. This is in consideration of the stopping power with a 4.0 hand. Viola stated that test showed the difference between the 3.0 and 4.0 hands are too minimal to allow room for an intermediate 3.5. The difference between 3.0 and 4.0 hands only affects one-handed ball skills. Stopping power is considered in differentiating between 2.0 and 2.5 hands to 3.0.</p> <p>Canada asked if the committee considered quadruple amputees in this proposal. Under the current system going from a 3.0 to 4.0 hand requires the presence of fingers. Viola stated that this proposal was not intended to address quadruple amputees. The proposal is about the balance between trunk and hand function in spinal cord injured athletes. Getting evidence-based classification is difficult. We need to ensure we are testing the appropriate thing and assess the impact of function on sport performance. IWRF has limited resources to address this. The Committee will continue to look at classification of quadruple amputees in the future.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Canada asked about elimination of observation of the claw hand and hand wasting; there is concern that there will be too much reliance on the athlete to simply say they can't do something. Viola stated that looking at hand wasting is part of the whole assessment. If there is muscle atrophy then there will be a loss of function that affects the points assigned for the hand. The claw hand assessment tests extrinsics and mobility, but does not test what we need to test to assess hand function.</p> <p>Canada asked about the position of hand assessment in relation to the rest of the upper extremity. Viola stated they are not separate; hands are assessed after the arms so both 3.0 and 4.0 hands have the same arm function.</p> <p>Canada asked if only the hands will be assessed when athletes are re-evaluated or if there will be a full reclassification. Viola stated that an athlete moving from a 4.0 to 3.5 hand could end up with a half-class, so a full reclassification will be necessary. If the sport class changes there will be two more opportunities to protest</p> <p>Australia congratulated the Committee on their work and acknowledged how much work goes into these proposals. They asked how the changes would be implemented. Viola stated this will take effect 1 January 2015. The Committee has a list of affected athletes and will advise the countries so the athletes will know in advance that they will be re-evaluated at the next event. For P status athletes, they will be evaluated under a Chief Classifier Protest. For R status athletes, they will be assessed at their next appearance as part of the normal classification process.</p> <p>Denmark stated they agreed with the proposal and it makes sense as the hand function is not what changes games at this class level.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>17 in favour, 0 opposed, 3 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p><b>6.3 Motions from the Members</b></p> <p><i>Motion 10</i></p> <p>Moved by Great Britain that the 2018 World Championships comprises of a qualification tournament leading to an eight or ten team World Championships. This should be done with full consultation of the IWRF membership including those areas highlighted in the accompanying rationale. Sweden seconded</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Eron reported that based on 2012 General Assembly motion we have two intents to bid for a 16-team event.</p> <p>Great Britain explained that there is concern that the 2012 motion passed with little consideration of the implications of how the World Championship is developing and which nations will be in a position to host a large tournament. The purpose of the motion is to provoke discussion on the future of the World Championship.</p> <p>Canada stated that they had discussed at length in Canada the advantages and challenges of a 16 team event. They concluded that the standard of event they hosted in 2010 would not have been possible with 16 teams. For example, the opening ceremony venue would have been too small, team services would have suffered, and the transportation plan would have had to be different. They felt the quality of the tournament would diminish.</p> <p>Germany asked why was 16 teams was called for when the 2012 motion stated only more than 12. Eron advised that the Competitions Committee felt that for a tournament larger than 12, 16 was the most practical option that allowed for a fair draw.</p> <p>Australia asked what the rationale was behind the 2012 motion. Eron stated that the motion was to provide countries more opportunities to compete and advance in world rankings.</p> <p>Australia asked why the motion was scaling the World Championship back to eight or ten teams instead of 12. Eron noted there have been issues getting competing bids even for 12 teams; not all countries have the capacity to host and event of that size.</p> <p>Colombia stated they were in favour in 2012 and still see this as providing more opportunities for new countries to get to the World Championship with more opportunities to leave a legacy. Countries have time to prepare.</p> <p>Ross noted that IWRF has 26 ranked countries and 38 total playing wheelchair rugby. There is a question of if IWRF wants a high performance event or an inclusive event with half our members attending. Richard agreed that IWRF needs to know what members want from the World Championship.</p> <p>Canada asked if there were other events that provide ranking opportunities. Eron said the with the division structure and qualification tournament there would be. The aim of the overall competition system review was to increase opportunities.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>South Africa would like to see best teams competing at the World Championship, but does not want to take away from a sport that is growing. There need to be competitions for new teams. They suggested consideration of providing two to four spots at the World Championship for qualifying teams. John stated that this would be done with a qualification tournament starting in 2018.</p> <p>Terry stated that there was lot of discussion on the motion in 2012. There is interest in hosting 16 teams, and we will get hosts.</p> <p>Duncan asked if moving to 16 teams to increase participation in competitions was throwing all the eggs in one basket. Will there be a desire for more events if we go to 16 teams at the World Championship.</p> <p>Canada asked who would decide on eight vs. ten teams. Eron said the Board would decide with advice from the Competitions Committee. While it would be good to parallel Paralympic Games, we would not want to reduce the World Championship to eight teams as this would affect our case to increase to ten at Paralympic Games.</p> <p>Belgium said that eight teams would be too few, there would be more chances for mobility with ten teams.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>4 in favour, 11 opposed, 4 abstention. MOTION FAILED.</b></p> <p><i>Motion 11</i></p> <p>Moved by Ireland to amend Article 28 of the International Rules to require two wheels on anti-tips. Netherlands seconded.</p> <p>Stan advised that the Technical Committee had no position on the motion and it would not affect the officiating of the game.</p> <p>Finland asked if this would impact player safety. Eron stated that the rationale for the motion was to make wheelchairs more stable. Stan noted that the Technical Committee has observed that most players using one caster on the anti-tip are high pointers with better stability.</p> <p>Ross stated that one area of concern is that players can lean back and fall more easily with one caster; this is based on observation.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Canada stated that falling over was an issue with player centre of gravity and involves seat height and the back rest, not just the casters.</p> <p>Denmark said it was easier for single caster wheelchairs to tip backwards when hit from behind, resulting in more fouls called for hits on them versus wheelchairs with two casters. The single caster also gives an advantage to lean on one wheel</p> <p>Belgium stated that they believe the single caster provides a mechanical advantage.</p> <p>Canada asked if the bumper contacted the floor when players lean the wheelchair - this would be a foul. Stan stated that this happens but can be very fast and difficult for a referee to observe in competition.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>15 in favour, 4 opposed, 0 abstention. MOTION CARRIED.</b></p> <p>Eron advised that the Board would discuss implementation of this change with the Technical Committee; the date will probably be 1 January 2015.</p> <p><i>Motion 12</i></p> <p>Moved by Japan to amend Article 14 of the International Rules to change the description of the ball. Denmark seconded.</p> <p>Japan stated that the revised rule would allow more colours than white on the ball.</p> <p>Stan reported that the view of the Technical Committee is that the motion would change the description of the ball for non-sanctioned events only, but that the rules only apply for sanctioned events.</p> <p>Eron stated that the rules including the ball description should not reference another sports rule. He confirmed that organizers can use any ball in any colour at a non-sanctioned tournament.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>2 in favour, 10 opposed, 7 abstention. MOTION FAILED.</b></p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p><i>Motion 13</i></p> <p>Moved by Japan that the Technical Delegate of a Zone Championship should be appointed from other Zones. Colombia seconded.</p> <p>Japan explained that this is to avoid any situation of conflict of interest and ensure impartiality.</p> <p>Kathy stated that the Competitions Committee does not support this motion. IWRG needs the freedom to appoint the best person for the job.</p> <p>Brazil noted that they are trying to develop more officials within the country and Zone, bringing them from other Zones is expensive.</p> <p>Australia stated that they understand the concerns, but the issue also affects Head Referees and Chief Classifiers. This becomes cost prohibitive and is not supportive of the development of officials in the Zone.</p> <p>Japan stated that if a Technical Delegate is from the host country and gave the most comments regarding protest it is difficult to claim they are fair and impartial. Eron stated that it is expected that the Technical Delegate as the senior official will have comments to make on protests.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>1 in favour, 16 opposed, 2 abstention. MOTION FAILED.</b></p> <p><i>Motion 14</i></p> <p>Moved by Korea that IWRG establish two separate categories for wheelchair rugby, one for persons with cervical spine injuries and one for persons who have other disabilities.</p> <p>No second was received and the motion was not brought for discussion or vote.</p> <p><i>Motion 15</i></p> <p>Moved by Korea to amend Article 76 of the International Rules to change the rules regarding reset of the 12-second count in the backcourt. Netherlands seconded.</p> <p>Stan reported that the Technical Committee had no position on this amendment.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Ross asked how the mechanics would work. Stan stated that the referee would hold the count, and would advise teams of the time remaining if requested.</p> <p>Stan noted that his personal view is that the change would reward teams for good defence.</p> <p>Denmark did not support the proposal and stated that it would force the defence to swipe at the ball or try to cause an offensive equipment time-out. This would lead to more fouls and equipment time outs and kill the momentum of the game.</p> <p>John called the question.</p> <p><b>2 in favour, 14 opposed, 2 abstention. MOTION FAILED.</b></p>
7.0	<p><b>Elections</b></p> <p>Prior to the elections, John recognized Ross Morrison, who was stepping down from the Board after nine years as the Athlete Representative. John thanked Ross for his numerous contributions to IWRF over the years.</p> <p>John advised that Eron as the IWRF Nominations Chair would manage the election process.</p> <p>Eron advised that there were four positions open for election: one position for the IWRF President, one for the IWRF Vice President, one for Member at Large, and one for Athlete Representative.</p> <p>In accordance with the IWRF Elections Bylaw, positions are filled when one candidate receives a majority of the ballots cast. Where there is the same number of candidates as there are positions available, a vote is still held to confirm the nominees. If no candidate receives a majority of votes on a ballot, the candidate receiving the least number of votes is dropped and a new ballot is conducted. This continues until a candidate receives a majority of votes cast.</p> <p>Eron asked for a motion to appoint Stan Battock and Kathy Newman as tellers for the election. Their role will be to distribute and collect the ballots and count the votes.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>Canada moved that Stan Battock and Kathy Newman be appointed as tellers for the election. Australia seconded.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p> <p><i>Election of President</i></p> <p>For the position of President, one nomination was received for John Bishop of the United States. The ballots for President were distributed, marked, and returned.</p> <p>Eron reported that John Bishop had been confirmed in the position of President.</p> <p><i>Election of Vice President</i></p> <p>For the position of President, one nomination was received for Ken Sowden of New Zealand. The ballots for Vice President were distributed, marked, and returned.</p> <p>Eron reported that Ken Sowden had been confirmed in the position of Vice President.</p> <p><i>Election of Member at Large</i></p> <p>For the position of Member at Large, nominations were received for Duncan Campbell of Canada and Naomi O'Reilly of Ireland. The ballots for Member at Large were distributed, marked, and returned.</p> <p>Eron reported that Duncan Campbell had been elected to the position of Member at Large.</p> <p><i>Election of Athlete Representative</i></p> <p>For the position of Athlete Representative, nominations were received for Joseph Delagrave of the United States, Fabien Lavoie of Canada, Alan Lynch of Ireland, and Jens Sauerbier of Germany. Eron reminded the members that a candidate needed a majority of votes cast to be elected.</p> <p>The ballots for Athlete Representative were distributed. Eron reported that no candidate had achieved a majority. The candidate with the lowest number of votes was Fabien Lavoie, who would be dropped from the next ballot.</p>



ITEM	DISCUSSION
	<p>The second ballots for Athlete Representative were distributed. Eron reported that no candidate had achieved a majority. The candidate with the lowest number of votes was Alan Lynch, who would be dropped from the next ballot.</p> <p>The third ballots for Athlete Representative were distributed. Eron reported that Jens Sauerbier had been elected to the position of Athlete Representative.</p> <p>Eron asked for a motion to destroy the ballots.</p> <p>Canada moved that the ballots be destroyed. Australia seconded.</p> <p><b>ALL IN FAVOUR. MOTION PASSED.</b></p> <p>Eron thanked the members and returned the meeting to John.</p>
8.0	<p><b>Closing</b></p> <p>John thanked the members for their contributions to the meeting.</p>