Meeting title	**APSO General Assembly**
Date	7 November 2018
Time	14:00-18:00 CET
Venue	HM King Hussein I Building, Lausanne
Chair	Sabrina Ibáñez, President
Minutes	Chloe Harty, FEI Projects Administrator

Participants			
APSO Representatives	Initial	Title	IF
☐ Ms Sabrina Ibáñez	SIB	APSO President	FEI
☐ Mr Tom Dielen	TD	APSO Vice President	WA
☐ Mr Henk van Aller	HVA	APSO Treasurer	IBSA
☐ Mr Colin Grahamslaw	CG	APSO Executive Board Member	WCF
☐ Mrs Maureen Orchard	MO	APSO Executive Board Member	
☐ David Hadfield	DH	President	BisFed
☐ Thomas Lund	TL	Secretary General	BWF
☐ Paul Kurzo	PK	Vice-President	BWF
☐ Bettina De Rham	BDR	Director, Para-Equestrian	FEI
☐ Malina Gueorguiev	MGU	Executive Assistant	FEI
☐ Colleen Orsmond	CO	Sports Director	FISA
☐ Liz Soutter	LS	Sports Manager	FISA
☐ Michel Alarcon	MA	Paracanoe Manager	ICF
☐ Jannie Hammershøi	JG	Chair	IOSD
☐ Kelly Fairweather	KF	Secretary General/COO	ITF
☐ Raul Calin	RC	Secretary General	ITTF
☐ Debra Alexander	DA	Executive Board Member	ITU
☐ Antonio Arimany	AA	Secretary General	ITU
☐ Norbert Kucera	NK	Secretary General	IWBF
☐ Richard Allcroft	RA	President	IWRF
☐ Siret Luik	SL	International Communications Manager	WA
☐ Laurent Torrecillas	LT	Sports Director	WParaVolley
☐ Olof Hansson	OH	Para Taekwondo Director	WTaekwondo
☐ Hyojin Eun	HE	Assistant Manager	WTaekwondo
☐ Piers Jones	PJ	Sports Director	UCI
☐ Gilles Peruzzi	GP	Head of Para Cycling	UCI
Invitees			
☐ Mr Andrew Parsons	AP	President	IPC
☐ Mr Xavier Gonzalez	XG	CEO	IPC
☐ Sergey Lyzhin	SL	ASOIF Project Coordinator	ASOIF

Agenda			Speaker	Annex
1	**Welcome**		Chair	
2	**Finances**		Treasurer	
	2.1	**2018**		
	2.2	**2019**		**x**
3	**Template for IPC Grants**		VP	**x**
4	**Affiliation**			
	4.1	**APSO Affiliate Membership**	Chair	**x**
	4.2	**GAISF**	VP	
5	**Classification**		All	
6	**Nationality Changes**		ITTF	
7	**Governance Review Working Group**		Chair	
8	**Agitos**		All	
	8.1	**Allocation of Funds**		
	8.2	**Call for candidates: Foundation Board of Trustees & Executive Committee**		
9	**Tokyo 2020**		IPC	
	9.1	**Scheduling & Broadcasting/Streaming Update**		
10	**Beijing 2022 / Paris 2024**		IPC	
	10.1	**Clarification on specific criteria required to be maintained in the Paralympics**		
11	**Presentation on International Organisation of Sports for the Disabled (IOSD)**		IWAS	
12	**IPC & APSO General Assembly 2019**		Chair	
13	**Any Other Business**		All	

R: Resolution T: Task I: Information		
1	**Welcome** The Chair welcomed everyone to the first APSO General Assembly following the creation of the Association in 2017. All members except IWAS were represented at the meeting. The Chair explained that the first half of the meeting would be conducted with only APSO members, and that from 16.00 the IPC invitees would join the meeting. Each member was invited to introduce themselves to the group. **(I)**	
2	**Finances**	
	2.1	**2018** HVA explained that the main income was from the IPC Grant and from Membership Fees. He asked that for 2019 members should make sure to take care of the bank costs for transfers. Expenditure was lower than expected as members have helped with certain costs (website, meetings). In 2019 there will be an audited financial statement. The firm to conduct the audit will be decided by postal vote as no firm had been found in time for this meeting. TD noted that the APSO bank account was set up with TD and HVA as signatories. **(I)**
	2.2	**2019** The 2019 Budget was distributed as an annex. The Reservation fund was added to be able to build up assets for the association. The Projects fund is to be able to develop services for members, such as education tools, safety in sport and Classification tools. SIB explained the projects that have already taken place were to set up the website, two in person meetings, two conference calls, finalizing the agreement with the IPC and harmonizing the distribution of the IPC grants to members. Some suggestions for future projects were: • Information exchange amongst members, e.g. a code of ethics template which all members can use; • Sharing of issues (especially with IPC) so that members can work out unified solutions; • Developing an argument for the value and contribution that IFs bring to the Paralympic movement, e.g. numbers for publicity and media; • Attendance at IPC meetings, especially at the IPC GA. TL and MO noted that the core reasons for APSO needed to be remembered, to give a voice for the IFs and to encourage IPC to divest itself of the governance of sport. **(I)** The budget was approved unanimously. **(R)**
3	**Template for IPC Grants** A simple template was developed for the distribution of IPC grant. The IPC requires that IFs prove that more money is being spent on Para Sport than is being received by the Grant, without having to show exact projects expenses. As APSO now distribute the funds the IFs can be relieved of some administration. The Board will discuss how to find a common system for extracting this information especially for IFs without Para-specific account codes. The form might not show all expenses for Para sport, but showing that expenditure is much higher than IPC income would be an initiative to increase the IPC grant. APSO agreed to trial this form and to learn from any issues that arise. The data collected will be formulated as an argument to increase the contribution from the IPC, and the IPC should be asked to show the reasoning behind the amount that is provided. **(I)**	
4	**Affiliation**	
	4.1	**APSO Affiliate Membership**

		The APSO statutes allow for non-IPC sports to become members of APSO although specific criteria to be met for membership has not yet been defined. Federations can approach APSO, and APSO can also send invitations for membership. Primarily the same information should be asked as is determined for members of Federations (numbers of Athletes, worldwide participation etc.). More concrete criteria can then be developed following trial. All members agreed that federations that are not recognized by the IPC should, at this stage, not be considered as the IPC needs to evaluate first if there is any path for development. **(R)**
	4.2	**GAISF – Global Association of International Sports Federations** TD explained that GAISF is the body which governs all International Sports Federations, and that to be an associate member (no voting rights but recognition as an association and accreditation to SportAccord) would provide legitimacy to APSO and can be advantageous for non-Olympic APSO members. Unanimous approval for the Board to apply for GAISF membership. This was then announced to the IPC invitees when they joined. **(R)**
5	**Classification** The outcomes of the IPC Membership Gathering workshops were received and included a theme of the Future of Classification – "what are the Challenges, Opportunities and role of IPC in the future of Classification". The outcomes showed very different issues brought up by the different groups of membership (which were split into four groups – IFs, small NPCs, medium NPCs, and large NPCs). APSO members were concerned by the differences of opinions, especially by the NPC groups. The limits of the jurisdiction of the IPC over Classification need to be clarified. **(T)** The IPC Classification Code now clarifies the position of the IPC in terms of approving Classification systems. However, the IPC do not have jurisdiction over sport other than at the Paralympic Games and should not impose rules or systems on IFs. MO noted that Classification is a sport rule, and that IFs have a signed agreement that the IPC would not interfere with the sport. It was also noted that the IPC do not have the capacity to deliver the role that might be taken on by centralizing Classification. **(I)** The response from the IPC to the self-audit was very delayed, past the start of a Paralympic cycle. The IFs, not the IPC, are the experts of the sport and should have full governance over sport rules, especially at all levels below the Paralympic Games (including qualification stages). The IPC should be able to suggest that Classification systems have specific limits for the Games, but not to have control over the full system. This was discussed with IPC.	
6	**Nationality Changes** RC raised the issue of when IPC nationality changes rules are more lenient than IFs rules, when the IPC/NPC would allow an Athlete to compete in a timeline shorter than the IF would allow. This then affects qualification competitions, which are governed by the IF and not the IPC. To be brought up as a governance issue with the IPC. **(T)**	
7	**Governance Review Working Group** SIB was invited, as a representative of APSO, to be a member of the IPC's Governance Review Working Group. The timeline had been set for 2019 but has been pushed back to 2020 for any changes, with two meetings of the Group being cancelled. All members were on board that all sports must be independent from the IPC, and can then be equal members. Discussed in full with IPC. **(I)**	
8	**Agitos**	
	8.1	**Allocation of Funds** Of the applications for Agitos Grants, 3 out of 10 successful applications were from

		independent IFs. A total of 63 applications were submitted to the Agitos Foundation this year. Of the 30 recipients, 17 come from NPCs, 10 from IFs, two from Regional Organisations and one from an International Organisation of Sport for the Disabled (IOSD). Independent IFs are consistently unsuccessful in applications and require feedback from the Agitos foundation. Clearer guidelines need to be requested with more realistic timelines. The requirements set out by Agitos are not being considered in the same way for all membership types. Discussed with IPC invitees. **(T)**
	8.2	**Call for candidates: Foundation Board of Trustees & Executive Committee** Although criteria was sent with the request for candidates, the members of the Board and Committee are not clearly published. APSO want to put forward a member and would ideally endorse one candidate (deadline 15 November 2018). **(I)**
9	**Tokyo 2020**	
	9.1	**Scheduling & Broadcasting/Streaming Update** To be discussed with IPC invitees. **(I)**
10	**Beijing 2022 / Paris 2024**	
	10.1	**Clarification on specific criteria required to be maintained in the Paralympics** Clarification is needed from IPC for the specific criteria to remain in the Games. **(T)**
11	**Presentation on International Organisation of Sports for the Disabled (IOSD)** Charmaine Hooper was not present so this was postponed. **(I)**	
12	**IPC & APSO General Assembly 2019** In 2019 the GA will be in conjunction with the IPC's. Every other year the GA will be hosted in Lausanne. The Members unanimously agreed to the proposed way forward. **(R)**	
13	**Any Other Business** **ASOIF Consultative Group on Para Sport** – this group have been discussing whether the group is necessary in the future, with the successful creation of APSO. TD noted that until the group is dissolved (decision to be taken by ASOIF) it should be aligned with APSO. For this reason it was suggested that SIB take over as Chair of the group. APSO agreed to this unanimously. **(R)** This was announced to the IPC invitees when they joined.	
IPC Invitees joined		
1	**Welcome** The Chair welcomed XG and AP to the APSO General Assembly. She explained that there had been constructive discussion in the first half of the meeting which had brought up several points to be brought to the attention of the IPC in the anticipation to help the IPC deliver the best Paralympic Games possible. **(I)** AP thanked APSO and the FEI for inviting himself and XG to the meeting. The IPC want to strengthen relationships with IFs and understand that there is a perception of conflict of interest with the IPC governing their own sports, but want to ensure that there is no priority over independent IFs. **(I)** The new agreement with the IOC has an influence on the IPC strategy and Paralympic movement as a whole. With the New Norm 2020 neither the Olympic nor Paralympic Games	

		will see growth in numbers, and must aim to reduce costs. Much of the partnership is based outside of the Games, in areas such as Sponsorship, Commercial, and Broadcast. Although there are some restrictions in the partnership, it will provide opportunities for all of the membership and will aim to strengthen the programmes outside of the Games. **(I)**
5		**Classification** SIB explained the issues raised above to IPC invitees. XG noted that the membership had asked for everything to be sent out, not to have a smaller report made. Internally the IPC are working on what was reported back from the Gathering, with priorities and larger areas of interest being captured. It is clear that very different issues were brought up from the different membership groups. These suggestions are not going to be implemented immediately, would need a lot of work first. **(I)** The issue with the jurisdiction of Classification and Nationality where the IPC can be involved needs to be clear. The sports federations are the experts in the sport, and the Classification systems are under sports rules. **(I)** In regards to Classification IPC are going to look very critically at the issues that were brought up, but believe that Classification as it is now is not Athlete-centred enough and will need to be looked into properly and thoroughly. **(I)** *<u>IPC follow-up</u>: IPC replied that via email that the classification roles and responsibilities are set in the IPC Athlete Classification Code approved at the 2015 IPC General Assembly. The discussions at the Gathering were on the Future of Athlete Classification. The outcomes of those discussions will be considered by the IPC Classification Committee and further discussed with all stakeholders in the next few years. Any future recommendations that modify the Code will require GA approval. The focus for 2019 and 2020 is the full implementation of the Code by all IFs.*
7		**Governance Review Working Group** The IPC Governance Review and Strategy reviews are being run at the same time. The Governance review is aimed to be finished in 2020 or 2021 which will be determined by need for GA approval in 2021 or whether to hold an Extraordinary GA in 2020. 2021 is an election year, which often dominates the GA. **(I)** XG noted that there is a meeting in December which will look at the Membership Gathering outcomes of the Governance Review. They will then present an action plan to the Board in January and then review which topics are to be discussed. Some issues are Constitutional, others can be worked on directly without too much consultation. **(I)**
8		**Agitos**
	8.1	**Allocation of Funds** The Chair explained to AP and XG that APSO members need to be in a position where they can be more successful in applications as the numbers show they are consistently being rejected while IPC sports are being approved for similar projects. **(I)** XG explained that there have not been any statistical analysis of how the Agitos funds are allocated, but that it can be seen that independent IFs have a much lower success rate. The IPC will need to analyse if there is a bias in the selection committee, and will have the information available by the end of the year. He suggested that the IPC sports more readily ask for help in the application process as they have closer contact with Agitos. One reason for lack of success could be that Agitos fund participants for projects, rather than IF staffing of projects. XG suggested that if IFs are going to

		submit an application they should contact the Agitos foundation for help in completing the application. **(I)** AP explained that Agitos fund more universal sports, and that the IPC sports are the larger and more universal sports. Projects in the nations which the IPC want to develop will help success of projects. AP suggested that APSO could try to put forward a nominee for the next selection committee. **(I)** SIB noted that the unsuccessful applicants have all requested more information from Agitos and want to work with the IPC to be more successful. **(I)**
	8.2	**Call for candidates: Foundation Board of Trustees & Executive Committee** The Chair asked for more information on who is currently on the Agitos Board of Trustees and Executive Committee as it is difficult to put forward a candidate when the skills already on the committees are not known. **(I)** The IPC are looking for two members of the Executive committee and four members for the Board of Trustees. The criteria for candidates was submitted with the call for candidates. They are looking for candidates who understand the foundation, and have skills in communications and fundraising. CG suggested that when there is a call for nominations the existing members should be published. **(I)** *IPC follow-up: Further information was provided to APSO membership on 13 November 2018*
9		**Tokyo 2020**
	9.1	**Scheduling & Broadcasting/Streaming Update** XG presented the Broadcast update for Tokyo2020. At Tokyo, the IPC will be responsible for the broadcasting of the Games. IPC have appointed OBS as broadcaster of the Games. They have been able to announce a 12 + 4 coverage of the Games, which is the 12 sports from Rio which had live broadcast plus 4 new events. These are Badminton, Boccia, Cycling (Road and Track), Goalball, Triathlon, Athletics (including Marathon), Football 5-a-side, Judo, Sitting Volleyball, Swimming, Table Tennis, Wheelchair Basketball, Wheelchair Rugby and Wheelchair Tennis. The sports are decided by asking the rights holders the level of interest in each sport and the costs involved. **(I)** The remaining sports will have highlights but not live coverage. If available, more sports will be covered or may have other services such as short form, social media clips, back of house etc. This information will be concluded in Q1 2019 at the latest. **(I)** TD asked on behalf of sports without live coverage, how the IFs could help. XG noted that two main factors are cost and interest. Suggests that the IFs find ways to reduce costs and to put forward ways to make the coverage more interesting to broadcasters and viewers. **(I)** After Tokyo2020 OBS will be the host broadcaster until 2032, with the OC having the responsibility for the costs. The IPC will remain the selling agent. Any suggestions for Broadcast should go to OBS. **(I)**
10	**Beijing 2022 / Paris 2024**	

	10.1	**Clarification on specific criteria required to be maintained in the Paralympics** There are four fundamental elements in the criteria to remain in the Games – compliance to WADA, compliance to the IPC Classification Code, a regular competition programme (including World Championships and qualification stages for PG) and worldwide reach. The application process also asks for information in areas such as finance, governance, and media to have a better understanding of the sport. Each area is given a green, amber or red rating. Further information on a plan to improve is requested for amber and red rated subjects. **(I)** The IOC ask that the there is no increase to budget, no additional quota and that each sport presented has a commercial and strategic value. SIB noted that the colour coded system was not clearly explained and that the IFs did not receive a full report on all areas, this was only provided to sports not taken into the programme. This is necessary for improving applications in the future. XG was unaware that the full reports were not given out, but that areas that were not highlighted did not have issues. **(I)** It was noted by the APSO members that staffing and resources aid should be given to Jürgen Padberg. The final sports will be announced in January 2019. Quota and Events will be announced at a later date, but numbers should remain similar. **(I)** APSO members asked that they be engaged in the process to help in decreasing organising costs, specifically in terms of Paris 2024 and further, in the same way that ASOIF help the IOC in organising. It was noted that venue decisions are out of Para sport control, and it would be useful to have input, thus an APSO member on the Coordination Committee for 2024 would be extremely useful. SIB noted that APSO could also coordinate figures from hosting Championships and will try to make a proposal to IPC. **(T)** *<u>IPC follow-up</u>: XG confirmed that he would talk internally and with the IOC regarding inclusion of an APSO representative on the Coordination Committee and get back to APSO asap.*
13	**AOB**	**APSO member as Ad Hoc Member of IPC Board** There has not been any discussion on this because the governance review may change how the board is composed and elected. **(I)** **Closing** AP and SIB thanked everyone for the productive discussions and asked for communication to remain active between the two groups. **(I)**

Bonn (GER), 24/10/2019

Place and date of Approval **Signature**