



WPNS Working Group. "Coaches Advisory Group"

MEETING DATE. 6 May 2020

MEETING MINUTES.

### 1. Race distances

- a. EC: 2 main ideas are to go back to a similar system with race distances as in the past or to do cross country races like in FIS and only talk about the distances (so a 5k/10k instead of CC Middle). Second idea allows for data collecting since we can use common distances for some races, using best courses at each venue, and still give longer distances for men if that is a wish
- b. RM for biathlon makes sense to have names like in IBU. Wants to make sure there is possibility of longer "loppet style" distances. JPN goes back to the way things were previously (pre 2010)
- c. EC there is rumor that FIS will change for men and women to do the same distances. Does anyone know about this?
- d. BK for the coming year this is not changing. IOC wants CC to be shorter distances and same for men and women
- e. RM going back to common distances to men and women to WPNS was to try to get more data
- f. EC I don't think we need to have the same distances in biathlon but in cross country it is helpful to have some races that we can compare
- g. RM do distances even matter? When you have a short middle long...a race is a race. If all the athletes are doing the same distances, the best person wins. Are we spending too much time talking about what the distances are?
- h. Games program: does it matter for Games program?
- i. RR it comes down to how many competition kilometers are you willing to do each week?
- j. BK follow Japan's proposals
- k. RR agree on Japan proposal
- l. RM long distance races effective in some races, especially WC Finals, Loppet style race, nice to have this



**Conclusion:** recommend proposal from Japan and make sure it is possible to continue to be able to do long races in the program when it is a good situation

2. **2020-21 Race season:** what are plan B options/considerations if some or all of the WC calendar is cancelled due to COVID?
  - a. EC how do we make sure we can assign nations slot allocations for the Games?
  - b. RM we can utilize racing we have already done if there is no season next year, or we can race in the Games season and include that information
  - c. RR we could have nationals/CoC races count
  - d. EC problem is with exiting CoC rules and penalties. It would be hard for many classes in certain places to achieve the 180 standard, even if they would achieve it on a World Cup.
  - e. RM big advantage for larger nations who have many more people in each class. It would be a big challenge for Asia, North America and South America
  - f. RR we should optimize the rules for CoC
  - g. EC there are rules that exist that might help but we need to make some changes to these to make it possible for achieving 180 reliably
    1. Combine men's and women's classes always
    2. Combine VI and standing always
    3. Have low or no penalty (then we have opposite problem that this is advantage for nations with small fields)
    4. Take only best 2 points for penalty calculation
  - h. BK what about the possibility of having qualification period extended into later in spring of 2021 or summer/fall of 2021? You have possibility to host 1-2 World Cups at a later date
  - i. RM do we really need to have the slot allocations decided so far ahead of time [currently 9 months]
  - j. RR maybe we cannot bring a solution yet, but we should point out this is important and STC should find a solution



### 3. VI Classification

- a. RR sent by email research about a possible VI technology that is better and more accurate than what we use currently. We should talk about instituting this technology.
- b. RR There is a proposal to make only 2 B groups in the future. Alpine wants to have 4 groups. 2 groups is not fair enough. It will end up in the situation that real B1s will disappear because it is too hard to get them to the point that they are competitive. This is against IPC idea to make it difficult for most disabled to enter the sport. There is a lot of mistrust in VI system because it is a weak classification system. We need to have a better system.
- c. EC what is the result of the research that has been conducted over the last few years? I think we will have a result from researchers in the coming weeks
- d. RR we should have more classes....when I asked Christine about training with goggles, she said it needs to be in the rules
- e. RM agree with Ralf....the system needs to have better classification....one option is to make the B3 class standard lower than it is, keep 2%, lower everything down so B2s are very low vision
- f. EC has this information been shared with the classification Working Group?
- g. RR not yet, there are only LW classifiers. Should be a classification group working issue but they are not working on this

**Conclusions** We need to find better classification mechanisms for B classes using modern technology. We need to have B1 class that is totally blind. We should have more classes (4) than we currently have, not fewer. This is the way we can ensure fair competitions in B classes.

### 4. World Cup financials

- a. EC there were many proposals and conversation on survey about WC accommodations and fees. This is being discussed on STC level and they are aware of the issues we had with this. Dimitrije is also working on a system with WPAS that they may test this coming season. We will get more information about this to share with CAG



#### Items to discuss in the next meeting

- World Cup financials (invite Dimitrije to present plan)
- Race Director job description
- Race formats
- Classification on continental cup level