



Paralympic Table Tennis Sports Assembly 2000

Present from ITTC:

Mr. Oivind Eriksen, Mr. Silas Chiang, Mr. Jiri Danek, Mr. Massimo Bernadoni, Mr. Aart Kruimer, Mr. Sergio Lujano, Mr. Vincent Boury, Mr. Gaël Marziou, Mr. Aksel Beckmann and Mrs. Margit Beckmann.

1. Opening Statements

The chairman Mr. Oivind Eriksen opened the Paralympic Table Tennis Sports Assembly 2000 October 23rd at 12:45 p.m. He welcomed and thanked all the nations, member of the IPC executive Committee Mr. Thomas Mohr, Mr. Jens Bromann from IPC Legal Committee and Mr. David Grevemberg from IPC.

He thanked the people that made this meeting possible.

We all showed our respect to Ms. Shelby Lookaboagh, ITTC Administrative assistant and to others from different areas of our sport that have passed away during the last 4 years.

2. Roll Call

Mr. David Grevemberg made the Roll Call

3. Adoption of the Agenda

Mr. Aksel Beckmann, Rules & Regulations Officer made a motion to change the Agenda so that item 9 Motions from Member Organisation and item 10 Motions from the SAEC be combined – to deal with the motions in a logical order.

The motion was carried and the Agenda was adopted.

He also stated that for the moment being, there were no issues at Item 12 Other Relevant Business.

4. Adoption of the Minutes from the Previous Assembly

In Atlanta the member nations received the minutes of the Quadrennial Meeting 1996 of Countries.

The Minutes from Atlanta was adopted.

5. Reports 1996 – 2000

At this meeting we used a power point presentation, which included highlights from each reports. The reports were handed out at the meeting. Please use the copy of the Power Point Presentation (enclosed) to see the wording of the reports highlights.

5.1. Chairman's report

The report was accepted.

5.2. Technical Delegate Development Officer's report

This is not a report, because Marianne Baertelsen was not present and a report was not made. These are some of the intentions we had and should do the years to come.

5.3. Far East Representative's report

The report was accepted.



Treasurer's report

The report was accepted.

5.4. Classification / Medical Officer's report

There came a question from Great Britain in the S.A. regarding whether accepting the report would mean adopting the ideas of a new classification system. The answer is that the S.A. does not adopt any new ideas from the report. Canada asked if there would be a new meeting for the classifiers – and this we would come back to during Item 6 – Goal for 2001 – 2004.

The report was accepted.

5.5. Tournament Officer's report

The report was accepted.

5.6. Selection Officer's report

Mr. Massimo Bernadoni had a translator to read his report for the S.A.

Slovakia and Ireland had made some protests regarding the selection process for the 2000 Paralympic Games, and had not received proper answers from ITTC.

The conclusion of these mistakes will be that in the future ITTC have to make an improved procedure regarding the communication about selection.

Christian Lillieross told that the first entrance to the ITTC is through IPC, Headquarter in Bonn.

Slovakia did not accept the report.

Germany abstained.

The report was accepted.

5.7. Athletes' Representative's report

The report was accepted.

5.8. Pan-Am Representative's report

The report was accepted.

5.9. Secretary's report

The report was accepted.

5.10. Rules & Regulations Officer's report

The report was accepted.

5.11. Ranking Officer's report

The report was accepted.

Webmaster's report

Mr. Gaël Marziou told us that the minutes from ITTC meetings and the Power Point Presentation will be on the website hopefully during the Paralympic Games.

The report was accepted.

6. ITTC Goals 2001 – 2004

The chairman Mr. Oivind Eriksen presented the ITTC Goals for 2001 – 2004. The ITTC Goals are made like a Wheel and if you take one part away from the wheel, then it would not run like a wheel is supposed to do. The ITTC main Goal is that

ITTC will be #1 Sport in IPC.

To be this, ITTC needs a lot of people to work and a lot of backup from the Nations. ITTC needs to establish Sub-committees in each area of the wheel.



Oivind Eriksen went through each part of “the Wheel”.
Aart Kruimler talked about how to “Improve the Classification System”.
We had a discussion of Strapping / Belt – It should be taken into thought of the Improved Classification System.

The S.A. accepted the ITTC Goals for 2001 – 2004.

7. Competition Program 2001 – 2004

A few days ago Jiri Danek talked to Nigeria and they will give their bid for the Regional Championships for Africa-Middle East 2001. During the meeting Jordan said that they too would give their bid for the Regional Championships for 2001 or 2003.

The Fespac Regional Championship is in June 2001.

It is very important for the development of Table Tennis in the whole world to have Regional Championships.

The intention is to have all the tournaments showed on the Competition Program 2001, but to do this ITTC needs organisers.

The S.A. accepted the intentions.

8. Budget 2001 – 2004

If the S.A. accepts the Budget 2001 – 2004, then the new ITTC have to work from this.

Australia compared the budget 2001 – 2004 with the Treasurer’s report. The Treasurer’s report does not include ITTC / IPC budget.

For the first time there is a budget for Paid staff (from 2002 – 2004).

The S.A. accepted the Budget.

9. Motions from Member Organisation and

10. Motions from the SAEC are combined in a logical way.

TT2-1 The ranking system can be reviewed every 2 years

Our regulations say that rules can be changed only every 4 years during the Nations meeting in Paralympic Games. We feel that the ranking system is a very sensitive point which can have a big impact on development of our sport, as such we must be able to adapt it to new situation, improve it more often. However, there must be some stability over time and the changes must be voted by all countries, so the proposition is:

The ranking system can be reviewed and changed at the Paralympic Games and World Championships during the Nations meeting.

3 delegates voted against the motion

The S.A. carried the motion

TT2-2 30 months of inactivity

The current rule says:

All points of a player are lost and the player is removed from the ranking list if this player has not won any ranking point during last 30 months.



Why change?

The spirit of the current rule is to encourage players to participate in tournaments and to prevent high ranked players to live on their past glory. However, players in lower classes where there are few players, can have difficulties to win matches especially in small tournaments where their classes are combined with higher classes.

The current rule could make such players to disappear from ranking list if they were not able to participate to regional championships. Due to this, we prefer to change the rule to:

All points of a player are lost and the player is removed from the ranking list after 30 months of inactivity that means 30 months without any participation to a tournament sanctioned by ITTC.

There was questions regarding how to deal with sickness ? There is no special part of the Rules & Regulations that will show how to react on this part.

The S.A. carried the motion

Australia NPC:

Change the ITTC World Ranking System - Place a limit on the number of tournaments from which an athlete can gain world ranking points. Athletes should only gain points for a maximum of 5 tournaments per year (their best 5 tournaments)

Australia NPC has withdrawn the motion.

Belgium NPC:

Each player can take part on all tournaments but only the best results from a number of tournaments (30-20-10 point tournaments) shall be retained (Number of tournaments to be defined by ITTC Rules). Rationale: Too large a difference of possibilities between players who are not working and have money and those who are working and do not have money. The ranking list is more a free time and money ranking list than a players ranking

Belgium NPC has withdrawn the motion.

TT2-3 Limiting the number of tournaments counted into ranking list

1999 was the year before selection to Paralympic Games; it was also the year where the most tournaments were organized. While having a lot of tournaments is globally a good thing to develop our sport, we are concerned by the fact that the ability to participate to tournaments could become a selection criteria. We do not want that players that are able to travel because they have enough money or time to do so get selected instead of better players with less resources. Also, the current system is not balanced between Europe, where most of tournaments are organized, and other regions of the world.

Men in wheelchair

Number of tournaments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Number of players	140	68	40	32	21	18	15	10	12	5	8	5	2	2	0	0	1

Women in wheelchair

Number of tournaments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----



Number of players	49	18	11	13	7	11	8	10	7	0	1	1
--------------------------	----	----	----	----	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---

Standing men

Number of tournaments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number of players	124	43	28	17	21	18	13	11	7

Standing women

Number of tournaments	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of players	16	16	8	6	4	5	6	1

The motion is to limit the number of tournaments that can be counted in ranking list to a maximum number N that must be decided between 6, 7 or 8.

If a player has participated to more tournaments than the N limit, then only his N best tournaments are retained into ranking list, as we keep the best tournaments, a player can always improve his ranking by participating to tournaments where he gets better results than older tournaments.

This gives another chance to player to compensate a bad result due to illness or injury in a past tournament, also this gives a chance to a player that gets better to get a better ranking.

In order to choose the N limit, a study has been made to determine how this rule would have impacted the Sydney selection if it has been applied in January 2000 ranking list.

There have been 2 impacts studied:

- The number of players that would have been ranked differently
- The players that would have been not selected.

Tournaments counted	Players ranked differently	Players ranked lower	Players not selected
5	188	75	8
6	125	50	4
7	83	35	1
8	51	20	0
9	25	12	0

Two values have been discarded:

1. 5 was seen as too restrictive and could prevent players to enter tournaments.
2. 9 was seen as not efficient and could not be applied to all 4 groups.

There was a discussion regarding the numbers of tournaments.

Several appointed, just remember that the player can attend as many tournaments as he / she wants to, but just a certain number to count on the ranking list.

There were 32 in favour of the number of 6 tournaments

There was 1 in favour of the number of 7 tournaments

There were 3 in favour of the number of 8 tournaments

The S.A. carried the motion for 6 tournaments to count on the ranking list.



USA TT1-9 Ranking points for Double Matches in the team event and in the Open doubles

Doubles matches in the team event and in the Open doubles count for half of the ranking points in the same way as for singles for each player. The players ranking points are added then split in two and then the winning players gets half of the points each added to their overall ranking.

Rationale: The doubles matches right now has no value for ranking points and because of that many players do not want to play doubles. Doubles and singles are different types of games but to start a doubles ranking is not reasonable and interesting enough right now. We have too few doubles event. Doubles is close enough to add value to an overall ranking and it would make the doubles matches count for something again.

Achim, Germany said that the S.A. could think of a ranking list for the doubles.

There were 6 in favour for the motion

There were 17 against the motion

There was 1 abstention

The S.A. rejected the motion

The S.A. asked the ITTC take it into considering when they are improving the ranking system.

TT2-4 Include doubles matches into ranking points

ITTC withdraw the motion

USA TT1-7 The bonus points for the Open singles should be the same as for the highest singles class.

Rationale: Currently the bonus is double that of the highest class singles and when Open singles is not part of the Paralympic games the Open singles has too high of a weight in the bonus system. The class singles should be equal or more important than the Open singles.

There were 37 in favour of the motion

There was 1 against

TT2-5 Reduce bonus points for open medallists

ITTC withdraw the motion

TT2-6 Change definition of W/O matches

In current ranking system, W/O matches are counted. The current definition of what is a W/O match is not fair and causes a lot of trouble to tournaments organizers and ranking officer, it says that a match is considered as W/O if one player does not show up or does not finish the match.

In first place, this was intended to protect players from other players that prefer to not enter the open event, this happened sometimes with lower classes players. As a result, some lower classes players did get a lot of points just because some higher classes players did not show up at the open.

For organizers, it was not easy sometimes to decide from results sheets whether a match should be considered W/O or BYE.



So, the new proposed definition is:

A match should be considered as W/O and counted into ranking list only if it has been started (at least one point must have been played) and then stopped before it is normal end due to an injury or for any other reason that prevented one player to continue. If a player does not show up, then the match is considered as BYE and should not be counted into ranking list.

There were 37 in favour of the motion

There was 1 against

There was 1 abstention

The S.A. carried the motion.

USA TT1-8

By January 1st 2001 the ranking is based on the losing players ranking in their category and not the class of the winning player. 5 groups of ranked athletes are made up by the ranking officer and if a player wins over a player in the highest group that player wins 5 points and so on. A win over an unranked player gives the winning player 1 point. A win on default is always 1 point no matter who the win was against.

Rationale: This creates a fairer ranking system where it matters who you win over. Currently if a player wins over a beginner or the world champion it has the same value in terms of ranking points. Now participation is more important than quality and this rule will increase the value of quality. A good player in a low class always has a hard time collecting point just because of his/her class but with this change they will have a fair chance to prove his/her ability. The current ranking program that Dr Wu did can handle that change with no additions to the program. The ranking for the team matches will also increase in value. A singles win in the team matches has the same value as in a singles event.

There were 5 in favour of the motion

There were 20 against

The S.A. rejected the motion.

TT2-7 Change the ranking system into a rating system.

The word rating is not correct in this sentence.

ITTC withdraw the motion, but will investigate and make a new motion for 2002.

USA TT1-1

On the classification cards there should be a section indicating what limitations if any a player has in making a legal serve.

Rationale: For some umpires a statement from a medical doctor has been considered enough to justify an illegal serve. Only an Internationally Certified ITTC classifier can approve that a physical limitation stops a player from doing a legal serve.

There were a discussion regarding this motion that the referee / umpire and classifier each has a problem in seeing if either it is a legal serve or a classification matter. It is a need both for the classifier and the referee / umpire to have "education" in each of the areas.

There were 19 in favour of the motion

There were 8 against the motion

The S.A. carried the motion.



USA TT1-2, TT1-3 and TT1-5

The motions were withdrawn by the USA OC.

TT2-12 and TT2-13

The motions were withdrawn from ITTC

The contents of the last 5 motions regarding classification has to be taken into the investigation that ITTC will make in the future.

USA TT1-4

The standing classification system should be a progressive system where current class 7 players should be more severe disabled than class 8. Also class 7 players should be able to be borderline cases in-between class 7 and 8 and not like now class 7 and 10. The current class 7 needs to be changed to follow the progressive system.

Rationale: All ITTC rules follow the principle that classes need to be progressively linked, like the ranking system and when classes are combined. If class 6 and 7 are combined many times the class 6 players have less chance against a class 7 player than against a class 8. Class 7 has the least players in it and still it covers the widest area of playing strength.

This is not a motion but an Intention. The S.A. made a vote on the Intention. 35 were in favour of the Intention.

TT2-9 Change of 1 Membership, 1.1 – Bylaws ITTC

The ITTC shall consist of the following executive members:

Chairperson.

Vice-chairperson.

Medical Officer.

Technical Officer.

Selection Officer.

Four regional representatives (Far East and South Pacific, Africa and Middle East, Europe and Americas).

Athletes' representatives, elected by the athletes.

There were 34 in favour of the motion

The S.A. carried the motion

USA Structure TT1-2

The regional representative should be voted for at the regional championships starting the year after the Sydney Paralympic Games for a 4 year term. Those positions should be voted for by that region's national members and not by the whole World. The two new positions Africa/Middle east and Europe will be voted for at the next year's respective regional championship. The regional representatives from the Americas and FESPIC are voted for in Sydney and will be voted for again in 2001 the same way.

Example: For the Americas representative only the nations from the Americas vote for their representative and not the other nations.



Rationale: It is only a concern of the specific region who their elected representative should be. If not, the strongest region controls who will be the regional representative in all regions and not the region themselves. All regions will also have the right to vote for their regional representative. In the regional championships more nations will be present than at the Paralympic Games that can vote.

There were 32 in favour of the motion.

The S.A. carried the motion

ISMWSF has withdrawn the motion regarding Integration Commission.

The legal committee member told the S.A. that it could only be a kind of recommendation.

USA Structure TT1-1

The motion is withdrawn by USA OC.

USA TT1-11

In the selection rules change the quota to have it 45% selection from the world ranking and 45% from the results of the regional championships and 10% for wild card/team target players.

Rationale: All regions now have quality regional championships and it is fairer to have qualification tournaments rather than base the selection too much on ranking. If a player or nation has financial difficulties they still have a reasonable chance to qualify if they have good players by just attending one tournament and performing good results. In the Olympics most of the slots are selected based on regional qualification tournaments and a minor part is selected with the world ranking. We have the reverse but with this change it would even it out more.

There were 2 in favour of the motion

There were 23 against the motion.

The S.A. rejected the motion, but it is to be taken into investigation.

TT2-14 Rules & regulations can be changed at the Nations Meeting in World Championships as well as at the Table Tennis Assembly at the Paralympic Games.

The IPC executive Committee Mr. Thomas Mohr told us that this already was in IPC handbook. Oivind Eriksen replied and told that it was not stated like this in the ITTC Rules & Regulations handbook – it is just to bring it to IPC level.

There were 34 in favour of the motion.

The S.A. carried the motion

ISMWSF

For the IPC Table Tennis SAEC to address the issue of women in sport with the formulation of strategies which will: a) maintain and increase participation levels for women in Table Tennis b) encourage and empower women in all aspects of the sport's management



The Legal committee member Jens Bromann told the S.A. that the IPC is beginning a work with this after the 1st of January

This is an intention and by looking at the numbers from 1997 to 1999 there is an increase from 19,3 % to 21,3% Women on the World ranking list. It is possible to see that ITTC is on the right course.

The Intention was put to voting.

34 were in favour of the intention.

USA TT1-6 A concrete floor is approved for play with wheelchair.

One comments from the S.A. it has to be smooth. Always remember that it is the referee who decides if it a proper floor.

Rationale: In ITTF rules a concrete floor is not legal but in ITTC it is a good floor for wheelchairs. In the World Championships 1998 wheelchair matches were played on a concrete looking floor as an exception but it is still not officially legal.

There were 34 in favour of the motion

There was 1 against

There were 1 abstained

The S.A. carried the motion

USA TT1-10

The motion was withdrawn from the USA OC.

USA TT1-12 In 30 point tournaments or higher Open doubles is not a mandatory event.

Rationale: It is too many events in an official tournament. It will be too long to have two open events in singles and doubles. It adds another day, which adds to the costs for the organizers and the teams.

There were 25 in favour of the motion

There were 5 against

The S.A. carried the motion

TT2-8 Compete with 40 mm table tennis balls in ITTC sanctioned tournaments, starting January 1st 2001

It does not mean the rest of the tournaments this year has to compete with 40 mm table tennis balls. The 38 mm table tennis balls will not be made in the future. The organisers in tournaments October – December 2000 may choose between 38 mm and 40 mm balls.

There were 34 in favour of the motion

The S.A. carried the motion.



TT2-10 New 4 .16 – Bylaws ITTC

Any change in the bylaws will be effective immediately, or from a date the Table Tennis Assembly decides.

The S.A. carried the motion, with the correction of the wording to be made in co-operation with IPC-legal committee.

TT2-11 Team event will be included for class 11 in all 30 – 80 points tournaments.

Correction to 100 points tournaments.

The S.A. carried the motion.

3. Bids for Future Championships

Please see the enclosed copy of the power point presentation.

Jim Thorpe Association presented by
Lon Huff, Brian Thomas, Jerried Fourh

The representatives from Oklahoma City bid Committee told the S.A. that they would come back in 2002 and give the bid for The World Championships 2006. They presented a video and told the S.A. about Oklahoma City and a new kind of tournament – The World Team Cup 2002. It will be a tournament with prize money.

After the presentation Mr. Jens Bromann told the S.A. that this kind of tournament has to be discussed with IPC.

4. Other Relevant Business

There were no items to other relevant business.

5. Elections

Mr. Ian Brittain and Mr. Erl-M Wu, Chinese Taipei (Taiwan) had withdrawn their nominations.

Each of the candidates were invited to present themselves to the S.A.

Christian Lillieross said that if he elected as chairman, he could not be the representative from Pan-am, because ITTC decided in October 1999, that there are too many tasks as Chairman and Regional Representative.

The other nominees presented themselves to the S.A.

Mr. Christian Lillieross, USA was elected as chairperson.

Mr. Silas Chiang, Hong Kong, Mr. Jiri Danek, Czech Republic, Mr. Oivind Eriksen, Norway and Mr. Nico Veerspeelt, Belgium was elected as members at Large

Thank you to all the nominated persons who offered their work as nominees for ITTC.



6. Closing

When the S.A. was waiting for the results of the election, Mr. Oivind Eriksen gave presents to the members of the ITTC from 1996 – 2000.

The women received an IPC scarf, a pen and an IPC pin.

The men received an IPC tie, a pen and IPC pin.

Then the picture of the venue of Table Tennis in the Paralympic Games 2000 in Sydney showed on the screen – with the wording –

Back to what it really is about – Table Tennis.

Sports Assembly closed at 7.15 p.m.

Sydney 25th October 2000

Minutes by Margit Beckmann, Secretary ITTC

Approved by Oivind Eriksen, Chairman of the Sports Assembly

Enclosed: Copy of Power Point Presentation