The President welcomed all to the meeting

1. Welcome & Opening

1.1 Welcome by Dignitaries

Introduction of IWAS Executive Board members in attendance:
President Paul DePace, Vice President/Secretary General Karl Vilhelm Nielsen, Honorary Treasurer Bob Paterson, Members at Large: Pieter Badenhorst, Rudi Van Den Abbeele, Dina Sofiriadi, Tariq Sultan Ahmed Alkadim, Amir Seyed Hosseini.

The president highlighted the circulated document from IWAS Executive Board member Dr Oriol Martinez, confirming that, due to personal reasons, he had decided not to stand for re-election. PDP said that Dr Oriol had been a valued member of the team and would be missed. He then went on to introduce the members of staff from IWAS HQ who were in attendance.

Edwin Postma, Pagedal Resort Manager welcomed everyone.

1.2 Opening Address by IWAS President

The president reminded the attendees that IWAS was their organisation and that they needed to provide information and questions throughout the day in a cooperative effort to work towards solutions.

He went on to say how the London 2012 Paralympic Games had been a great success and had changed the world’s perception of Paralympic sport forever. Building on from that success the IWAS Games programme had been successful. With 15 countries and 200 participants taking part in the IWAS World Junior Games in Puerto Rico and 26 countries and 240 athletes in the IWAS World Games, Stadskanaal.

Therefore, concluding that this level of participation proved IWAS remains an important pathway, not just for athletes, but for coaches, team managers, classifiers technical officials and support staff. Providing a pathway for those involved to aim for the highest achievements, be it Paralympic Games or World Championships, or just learning to cope better with life.

The president informed the nations that IWAS had invited the IPC to host their IOSDs meeting, which had included delegates from IBSA, CPISRA, INAS and IWAS. The meeting which had also taken place at the Pagedal Resort during the previous day included talks of common issues amongst the organisations involved, with ideas and solutions then put forward to the IPC governing board.

In concluding his opening address the president advised the nations that they had a number of responsibilities at the assembly. These included the ratification of three new member nations offering a further indication of IWASs importance. Also hearing the various reports and being in there to witness to the presentation of the Juan Palau Award and Pursuit Trophy.

1.3 Roll Call of Member Nations present

Secretary General, Karl Vilhelm Nielsen (KVN) announced that with 60 countries in good standing at the date of General Assembly, the quorum would be need to be 31 (50% +1) He then carried out the roll call of nations.

Nations: Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgian, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chinese Taipei, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia*, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, IR of Iran, Iraq, Japan, Kazakhstan, Korea, Lithuania, Malaysia, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, UAE, Venezuela (35)

*New Member to be ratified
KVN confirmed that a quorum for official business had been reached.

1.4 Adoption of Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>PDP confirmed that the agenda had been published and all should have copies, asked if there was anything anyone would like added to the agenda? Nothing to be added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Decision(s) | Moved by Canada and seconded by Iran  
Motion carried unanimously  
Accept the agenda as presented and to work from the agenda. |

2. Minutes of the Previous General Assembly

2.1 Adoption of the Minutes of the IWAS General Assembly held in Sharjah, UAE 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>To approve minutes of previous General Assembly. No questions or amendments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Decision(s) | To receive the minutes as a true record  
Moved by Canada and seconded by Denmark  
Motion approved unanimously  
Minutes accepted |

2.2 Matters arising - None – item passed

3. Issues with membership

3.1 Ratification of new members

| Discussion | Motion for the following Countries Memberships to be ratified, subject to confirmed payment of annual full national membership fee.  
Estonia, Libya and Haiti  
All have completed the requirements |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Decision(s) | Estonia accepted – Moved by Iran, Seconded by Saudi Arabia, unanimous (Delegates in attendance accept membership certificate)  
Libya – moved to later in the agenda as were expected to attend.  
Haiti accepted – Moved by Iran, Seconded by Great Britain (one abstention) Motion approved |
| Action(s) | 1. Able to vote if present at this GA.  
2. Ratified by General Assembly – HQ to process  
Libya not ratified, will be discussed at next EB meeting |

3.2 Report on any issues/suspensions in progress - PDP there are no issues or suspensions

3.3 Termination of membership - PDP there are no issues of termination

4. Annual Reports

4.1 President

| Discussion | PDP advised that his President’s report was published in the 2012 Annual Report, which was sent to all nations in the General Assembly package.  
One further point that was not included in the Annual Report is the successful bid from Sharjah, UAE to host a regional IWAS office which had been approved by the IWAS EB. PDP asked EB member Tariq Sultan Ahmed Alkadim (TSAA) to say a few words about the new office.  
TSAA took the opportunity to thank the EB for their approval and for agreeing to provide the opportunity for them to offer more assistance and greater connection to the Middle Eastern and African regions. He also confirmed that there would be no additional cost to IWAS for the new office as the UAE and Sharjah governments would be covering all of the cost.  
To finish, PDP thanked the member nations for giving him the opportunity to serve IWAS for the past 4 years. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision(s)</td>
<td>Report received by GA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 Vice President

**Discussion**

KVN advised that his vice-president’s report was published in the 2012 Annual Report, which was sent to all nations in the General Assembly package.

He added that a meeting had occurred that previous evening with CPISRA, with a further meeting arranged for Summer 2014. For some time IWAS and CPISRA have been in discussion regarding the amalgamation of the two organisations. He added that at this point, he felt IWAS was more interested in the objective than CPISRA, although it remains an on-going discussion and the member nations would be kept informed.

**Decision(s)**

Report received by GA

### 4.3 Secretary General

**Discussion**

PDP confirmed that as part of the Succession Plan, Karl Vilhelm Nielsen had been asked to become Secretary General until the election of the new Executive Board.

KVN confirmed he had nothing to add from what had been included in the Annual Report.

**Decision(s)**

Report received by GA

### 4.4 Amputee Football

**Discussion**

PDP confirmed that the discussions with Amputee Football and World Amputee Football Federation (WAFF) had continued. The proposal to WAFF is to help them develop their sport and then become independent, similar to Wheelchair Rugby, who were initially an exhibition sport, then an IWAS sport and when they had progressed sufficiently became independent. PDP confirmed the nations would be informed of any future updates.

### 4.5 Electric Wheelchair Hockey

**Discussion**

PDP advised that unfortunately there was not a representative from Electric Wheelchair Hockey in attendance, but their report had been published in the Annual Report. He also added that EWH were currently in the process of amending the name of the sport and would likely become ‘Powerchair Hockey’, which from a marketing view seemed better.

Sweden questioned which style of wheelchair and stick is used for the sport. They may have a venue in Stockholm that would like to host an EWH competition. CH confirmed that both hand held and t-sticks are used within the field of play.

KVN confirmed that there are two kind of Electric Wheelchair Hockey – one as most nations know and a second played in special designed small and lower chairs, which is well known in Scandinavia, but the assembly was not the place for it to be discussed. He suggested for any questions regarding a competition bid to be directed to the EWH committee.

### 4.6 Wheelchair Fencing

**Discussion**

Report by IWAS Wheelchair Fencing Chairman, Alberto Martinez Vassallo (AMV) (please see appendix 1)

**Action(s)**

MBH to publish report to General Assembly page on IWAS website.

CZE asked if there was any update regarding Wheelchair Floorball. Players from CZE had been told that the International Wheelchair Floorball Federation had been in contact with IWAS about the possibility of being included under the IWAS umbrella.

PDP confirmed communication had been received but due to the two major games schedules and staff adjustments this had not been addressed.

**Action(s)**

EB to continue communication with Wheelchair Floorball.

**Decision(s)**

Canada moved that the presented Annual and Sport Reports be received by the IWAS Member Nations. Seconded by Great Britain

Yes – unanimous

**Motion was approved**

PDP handed the chair over to KVN
## Finances presented by Honorary Treasurer

### 5.1 Financial Report 2011/2012

**Discussion**

Presented by Honorary Treasurer, Bob Paterson (BP) [please see appendix 2 for Accounts & Budgets].

**Decision(s)**

BP advised that due to a UK corporation requirement the figures for 2011 had already been filed and therefore requested that these figures are accepted and for the 2012 figures to be accepted.

Moved by BP, seconded by Canada  
Yes – unanimous  
**Motion was approved**

### 5.2 Income & Expenditure 2013

**Discussion**

BP advised that due to the Paralympic Games in 2012 there had been a loss of capitation fees combined with additional expenses which had resulted in an expected recorded loss for IWAS of £40,000 for that year.

He went on to confirm that the profit and loss figures up to June 2013 were proceeding as planned. However he sounded a word of warning regarding an additional cost of the current World Games. Due to the late withdrawal of Alicante, the current LOC in Stadskanaal accepted the opportunity at short notice to host the WG13. This resulted in a lower than expected number of entries and a significant loss to the LOC. Recognising that it was important to maintain the games programme IWAS agreed to share the loss. BP confirmed that this would not set a precedent for other organising committees and IWAS could not afford for it to happen again.

**Decision(s)**

BP confirmed no motion required as a report of facts but asked if there were any questions.  
No questions.

### 5.3 Budgets for 2014 to 2015

**Discussion**

BP confirmed that it is only a considered budget for 2014 which is shown in two different tiers. Unfortunately the budget for 2015 had not been completed.

**Decision(s)**

To accept the budget for 2014  
Moved by Canada, seconded by Netherlands  
Yes – unanimous  
**Motion was approved**

### 5.4 Approve Independent Accountants

**Discussion**

BP confirmed that UK financial regulations no longer require IWAS to have a financial audit but instead are only required to employ a reporting accountant. Since the annual report was published, Rachael Andrews, who had completed this task for the previous 4 years, has retired. Therefore IWAS has now appointed the accountancy firm, Hillier Hopkins to complete this task. BP added that he would also like formally to thank the IWAS HQ staff for their continuing hard work.

**Decision(s)**

Moved by Iran, seconded by Denmark  
Yes – unanimous  
**Motion was approved**

## IWAS Games Programme

### 6.1 Update to Nations regarding Junior & World Games

**Discussion**

Dina Sotiriadi (DS) confirmed that the Games committee (GC) was established in April 2012 and she had been appointed chairperson. The committee provides overall management of the Games operations and technical issues. DS advised that there are three sub committees within the GC. The first being the Evaluation committee that deals with future LOCs, host cities and budgets. The second committee being for the Sport, dealing with all technical issues and finally the Operations committee dealing with all of the services.

DS confirmed that during the first year of the committee they had dealt with the IWAS WJG and WG in 2013. The WJG13 had taken place in the Mayaguez, Puerto Rico and had included athletics, swimming, archery and for the first time at an IWAS event, Para triathlon. Overall DS concluded there had been good cooperation with the WJG13 LOC and IWAS was very satisfied with the service they had provided. Adding despite some challenges during the
event they were always dealt with by the following day. The GC had also within its first year dealt with the WG13 taking place at the same location of the General Assembly in Stadskanaal, Netherlands. This event was hosted only a month after the end of the WJG. DS confirmed again there had been good cooperation and communication with the LOC and the sports included were Athletics, Swimming and Archery.

In response to questions from the Member Nations, DS confirmed that a minimum of three sports are required for each of the Games, and the maximum is dependent on the infrastructure of the host city and venue. DS added that the IWAS games remain an opportunity for both the elite and development level athletes. For example in Puerto Rico, 15% of the athletes had travelled directly from the IPC athletics event in Lyon. But also several of the athletes were classified for the first time.

And in regards to swimming being included for the IWAS WJG14 that will take place at Stoke Mandeville Stadium (SMS), Aylesbury, UK it is hoped this will be possible but an alternative local pool would be required at the one at SMS is not the correct size.

PDP added that the number of entries for both these games were lower than expected. It had been thought that this may be in part due to the success of the Paralympic Movement now providing more competition and competitive opportunities, for example in athletics and swimming. Advising that larger games are financially better for IWAS and the member nations, to provide more opportunity to showcase their athletes and to absorb more information. It has therefore become a consideration for IWAS to include more sports and therefore not rely on the larger number of athletes from athletics and swimming alone. PDP asked the nations to provide suggestions for these sports and communicate with HQ.

SAH added that it is important that the nations help promote the IWAS brand, by communicating with IWAS HQ and updating them of any changes and sharing their own news for the IWAS website.

6.2 Presentation by future LOCs

7. IWAS Development Committee

Discussion Chair of the Development Committee, Pieter Badenhorst (PB) thanked those that attended the Development Summit hosted the day before. He summarised the main points and presented the ‘Summit Declaration’ (please see Appendix 3)

8. Motions submitted by the IWAS Executive Board and by IWAS Member Organisations None – item passed

8.2 Ordinary

Discussion Motion from Russia – The Russian Sports Federation for People with Physical Impairment proposes IWAS to come with the initiative to the IPC regarding an organisation of a forum or working group for revision of the athletic programme of the Summer Paralympic Games 2016 in Rio. The rationale being that the IPC technical authorities had cut and eliminated disability classes within athletics. Adding that they were aware of several countries that had written to the IPC. Russia asked IWAS to write a letter from the member nations who wanted to sign to ask that the IPC hold a forum to revise the athletic programme for Rio. Adding that they, Russia, had sent a motion to the IPC for the General Assembly but it had not been accepted.

Belarus added that they had also written to the IPC. They offered IWAS their analyses of changes before the letter is created.

Hong Kong confirmed they had also written to the IPC but suggested that the letter should collectively be from IWAS rather than individual IWAS member nations.

UAE advised that although they had participated in the IPC Forum in Frankfurt there had been few countries participating. They also suggested that before writing the letter IWAS should arrange their own forum and then provide the opinions to the IPC.

NED advised of their hesitance of signing a letter before knowing exact contents although appreciated the IPC process has been frustrating for nations.
KVN confirmed no one would be expected to sign or agree without knowing contents.

CAN suggested that the letter/motion is accepted in principle to allow the process to move forward. Then if member nations are not happy with the contents they don’t need to sign.

KVN confirmed that IWAS would draft the letter and add to the mail boxes, those who wanted to sign could pass back their signed copies to the IWAS Secretariat.

NED asked to confirm the content and what was hoped to be achieved by the letter. Agreed nations must be frustrated by the process but it was obvious the mission of IPC was to get rid of the combined events and was a strategic decision for single class events. Confirming that they had also sent a letter to the IPC and attended the forum, and were aware that the final proposal had been sent to the IPC Governing Board. NED asked the assembly what they hoped to achieve, for the whole procedure to start again. If this was the aim there would not be a programme for a further 12 to 18 months, which may cause other problems.

FRA advised that the discussion during the World Championships in Lyon was that the IPC had been asked by the nations to have only single classes. The fact being the IPC had to make a selection of events, which may have been achieved by looking at the ranking lists of the more attractive events. But were there enough athletes in these events? FRA went on to state that the decision made from the forum had not been done democratically or the feedback from the nations acknowledged. FRA advised that he had disagreed with the argument of IPCs Ryan Montgomery when he had stated athletes could change from Shotput to Discuss. At this Paralympic level athletes are not able to switch from a good Shotput thrower to a good Discuss thrower within two years.

GRE confirmed that they also participated in the Athletics Forum in Frankfurt and the whole process. Their question is what criteria were used by the IPC to justify an event to be included in the Paralympic Games? Confirmed that despite asking the IPC for an answer to this point they had not received a clear answer. GRE acknowledged that if once they knew the criteria and the Greek athletes were not in favour, this would be accepted. If the criteria is ‘because an event is more attractive’ but only has four or five athletes worldwide, then it is not acceptable. GRE added that during the Frankfurt Forum, 21 out of 23 countries did not agree, so what was the mechanism with the Sport Technical Committee of Athletics? There are events that have never been included in World Championship that are now included in the Rio program, so it is unknown how many athletes there are. To summarise GRE confirmed that the IPC should be asked to confirm the criteria they used. If logical and advised to the nations they would be able to accept.

KVN confirmed that the letter will only be regarding athletics.

**Decision(s)**

Moved by Russia, seconded by Belarus

Yes - 28

No - 3

Abstentions - 4

Motion approved

**Action(s)**

A letter to be send to IPC

9 **Strategic Plan**

9.1 Presentation of the IWAS Strategic Plan

**Discussion**

PB presented the Strategic Plan Summary – see appendix 4

PB explained that the Strategic Plan was achieved during an EB session in 2012 and was to discuss the position of IWAS and clarify its role for its future. He highlighted that many of the same items were discussed by the attendees of the Developments Summit so felt assured that the EB and member nations have similar ideas.

**Decision(s)**

Canada moved that the presented Strategic Plan be received by the IWAS Member Nations.

Seconded by Iran

Yes – unanimous

Motion approved
## Presentation of Juan Palau Award

**Discussion**
RvdA introduced the IWAS Juan Palau Award – see appendix 5
The widow of Juan Palau, Mercedes Sole Tinto presented the award to Jakub Nowicki who accepted it on behalf of the recipient Radoslaw Stanczuk who was unable to attend.

## Presentation of Pursuit Trophy

**Discussion**
BP provided a short speech in recognition of the achievements of the Pursuit Trophy recipient, Maura Strange.
Maura Strange accepting the award said she had been privileged to have worked with everyone there and together achieved goals and was also pleased how others shared the same aims and hopes.

## Elections of the IWAS Executive Board 2013 – 2014

**Discussion**
KVN confirmed that each candidate had the opportunity to give a 2 minutes presentation before the nations voted. Tellers for counting votes were Bob Paterson and Maura Strange.

Election of IWAS Executive Board **President**
Only one nomination
Mr Paul DePace

**Decision(s)**
KVN confirmed that sixteen votes were required to be re-elected.
27 yes
Mr Paul DePace re-elected

Election of IWAS Executive Board **Vice President**
KVN hands chair to BP
Only one nomination
Mr Karl Vilhelm Nielsen

**Decision(s)**
BP confirmed that sixteen votes were required to be re-elected.
29 yes
Mr Karl Vilhelm Nielsen re-elected

Elections of IWAS Executive Board **Member at Large**
BP hands chair back to KVN
Presentations by nominees, Tariq Sultan Almansouri (UAE), Pieter Badenhorst (RSA), Seyed Amir Hosseini (IRI), Dina Sotiriadi (GRE), Radka Kucirkova (CZE), Jose Pavoeiro (POR), Pavel Rozhkov (RUS), Rudi van Abbeele (FRA).

**Decision(s)**
BP confirmed that sixteen votes were required to be elected.
Tariq Sultan Almansouri received 27 votes
Dina Sotiriadi received 26 votes
Rudi van Abbeele received 26 votes
Pavel Rozhkov received 24 votes
Pieter Badenhorst received 23 votes
Radka Kucirkova received 17 votes.

## Closing remarks and any other business

**Discussion**
Motion from Canada for the General Assembly of Nations to thank Dr Oriol Martinez officially for his outstanding contribution to IWAS and the Paralympic Movement.
Seconded by Iran, passed unanimously.

KVN concluded that the first task of the new EB would be to review the current constitution and bylaws of IWAS with fresh eyes and would bring any suggestions of change to the next General Assembly.

Summarising KVN explained that a General Assembly is both about the past and the future. The past is the reports and accounts, the future budgets, motions and elections. He was pleased to conclude that all of these had been successful achieved during the assembly.

KVN concluded by thanking the nations for their support after he had been thrown into the position of chairing the assembly following the president Mr Paul DePace being taken ill.

**Action(s)**
EB to review the current constitution and bylaws of IWAS and would bring to the next GA.
KVN officially closed the IWAS General Assembly 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym*</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDP</td>
<td>Paul DePace – IWAS President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KVN</td>
<td>Karl Vilhelm Nielsen – IWAS Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Bob Paterson – IWAS Honorary Treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Pieter Badenhorst – IWAS Member at Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RvdA</td>
<td>Rudi van den Abbeele – IWAS Member at Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Dina Sotiriadi – IWAS Member at Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAA</td>
<td>Tariq Sultan Ahmed Alkadim – IWAS Member at Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Charmaine Hooper – IWAS Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCF</td>
<td>Wheelchair Fencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWH</td>
<td>Electric Wheelchair Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>International Paralympic Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Executive Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Executive Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPISRA</td>
<td>Cerebral Palsy International Sports &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>IWAS Head Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Local Organising Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>IWAS World Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJG</td>
<td>IWAS World Junior Games</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>