



WPNS Working Group. "Coaches Advisory Group"

MEETING DATE. 16 April 2020

MEETING MINUTES.

1. Flour ban

1. *Opinion on topic shared by Andrey Nesterenko (UKR) by email is included at the end of meeting minutes
2. RR: shared information from contact at the research institute developing the detection technology. Plan now will be to be used only at the highest level (FIS and IBU WCs) and to be tested during the 2020-21 season
3. BK: Norwegian Flour testing with Norwegian junior company. Using a special tape to test skis and then using analysis after the races. This was a problem last year because the results were coming late. This new tape will get the results immediately. They are not currently using it to DSQ athletes, just to discover if there is fair play.
4. SA: Can WPNS afford it? This is a problem that we need to address
5. RM: plan for detection equipment is to use an infrared system to test the surface level of the ski. This doesn't test the flour of the base. Machines are expensive. Agrees with Andrey. Test is easy to beat at this point.
6. BK: we can appeal to teams to play fair. We would save a lot of money.
7. RM: wax companies will find more waxes that are expensive to replace and in the end we won't save money.
8. BK: agrees but we should be considering environmental concern
9. SA: wax guy from GBR is a rep for Start and doing a lot of testing. Companies are acting on it so it is coming.
10. RM: as of last week FIS said they will ban and IBU to follow



11. RR: Agree with Bjorn to ban but not in the short term. As long as we cannot control this it will make a huge difference in performance. Hard to have it run without control. German team is not allowed to buy more waxes anymore. We do need to address this but we also need to make sure we can do it with fair competition.
12. EC: biggest concern is that this would impact start positions for Games. If we are asking teams to play fair, and most teams do, but others don't comply and we have no way to monitor, the winners could be so far ahead if they are racing on fluors when others are not. This will impact that race but it will also make it harder for athletes to hit a Games standard of 180. This will have a negative impact on how many spots nations are able to earn for the Games. So it will have an impact bigger than just next season if we fail to regulate cheating.
13. RM: agree with EC. Biggest issue overall there is so much uncertainty in general and this adds to it. The fairest way to go about it is WPNS should say that we should say that we will ban after Beijing 2022 Games. We will have no control if we do this. There is a lot of money on the line for some athletes at WCH and PWG and we have to have a way to test this. We don't even have very good controls for doping.
14. RR: as a group we need to come up with a proposal. We cannot have a fluor ban without testing as the other associations [IBU and FIS].
15. BK: I just spoke with head of Norwegian federation about new testing method and he says it is done before they race. It costs 150E/test and double that if the company has to do the test. When it comes to FIS they would delay one more year because there are so many problems with federation....with testing, it is good
16. BK: it has to be fair if we are going to risk medals.
17. RM: there are many issues with implementation. We don't have enough knowledgeable people in the system to run the tests
18. EC: It is clear that we will need to do this so this is a challenge we 100% have to work through. I think we need to focus on how we do it and maintain fair competition.



19. RR: [during meeting talked with researcher at the Institute developing test] he says that next week they will make the contract to they can't tell exact price now but it will be less than 10,000 euro. It will be like a pistol that you shoot on base of ski that has a red or green light. This will make it possible to buy on the market in the fall. WPNS can be included in this. It works very well in the lab but he expects there will be some learnings and modifications needed once it is used in the field. But it will be a step by step development. There will be problems coming up in the field when they test. Maybe next winter is not 100% effective but then after that it should be.
20. HA: we need some test term....we should do the test but we don't ban until after Beijing. Purpose of doing the test to see if system works.
21. RM: supports Hideki's proposal. We don't have any direct influence over this process. I am not sure we are going to have a racing season next winter yet. I think we might not be able to test. This adds to the complications of it all.
22. EC: if we test it is going to make it more expensive because we are going to invest 10,000 euro next season to test, and then have to invest again in the season after to get the equipment that works more effectively. The financial piece will already be difficult and this will make it even more difficult. We should be clear that we will ban, but we should do it after there is a clear way we can ensure fair competition.
23. HA: we need to let the current coaches learn and study about why we need to ban and we need to keep them training. It is the same as anti-doping.
24. RR: we are small, we may not be able to do what we want.
25. RM: There 3 options that have been proposed for our recommendation. We should choose one:
1. Follow FIS and IBU: if they implement, we implement
 2. Test but impose a ban after Beijing
1. VD, HA



3. Implement 1 year after FIS and IBU have good testing and reliable equipment

1. RR, EC, BK, SA

RM abstain

CAG Recommendation: WPNS institutes a fluor ban in the season after it is clear that IBU and FIS have a clear test that we can use to ensure fair competition.

2. WCH vs WC in Ostersund, December 2020

1. Andrey: *see email below-is in favor of WCH
2. RM: most of athletes were in favor of WC but not WCH
3. All CAG supportive of WC but not WCH in Ostersund. Decision is clear and no discussion was needed on this point

3. Race distances

1. EC: Main purpose to have same distances between men and women to gather data but also to have same courses used for men and women on a race day. We should keep both in mind for discussion.
2. Andrey email opinion from below: supportive of same distances for men and women in CC sprint, short, middle, long
3. RM: a race is a race. To get data, we need to do test with same distances on World Cup and in WCH for next season. We should choose the "old" distances for the PWG. We need to take opportunity to test same distances for men and women and get data.
4. EC: is there a spot in between? Do we need to choose all one or the other? How about we find a way to test some distances the same between men and women and also address some of the criticism about the change?
5. RM: we need more data between men and women



6. RR: Eileen had idea of doing the different races on the same day (men do CC short and women do CC middle so they are doing the same distance and we still get the data). In general I am in favor of different race distances. This makes the race time similar. We could try having same distances each day buy call them something different
7. EC: why do we have to call races by a name rather than a distance? Why can't we just do what we do in FIS and call distances? Do we have to say this is a CC "short" or can we just say it is a 5k/10k. This would allow us to have some days when the distances are the same between men and women and we could get data and the distances on the next race day could be different. This would allow for having data and having some different distances or longer race times for men if that is the goal. Then we could enter a World Cup with intention: women will race a sprint, 5km, and 10km and Men might race a sprint, 10km, and 15km. Women and men could do the 10km and sprints on the same day. On the other day, women would do 5km and men a 15km. This is just an example.
8. HA: distances should be shorter for women. Women take longer to race. It is a long day. Better for audience.
9. RR: like Eileen's idea. This is a good way to go so we can get data and make distances

Conclusion: we will continue this conversation by email over the next few weeks before the next meeting to come up with some options to discuss and propose.

4. Cancellation policy per WPNS Rule 213

1. Should be in the invitation as it is in the rules
2. WPNS is not in a good position with the OC
3. RM: we are looking into that in Canada. We are asking the OCs in Canada how their insurance policies work. We should be able to get some of our money back.



Items to be discussed in next meeting. Time will be determined based on other Working groups meeting schedules so we can discuss issues included in those groups:

5. Race formats
6. Race Director job description
7. WC Accomodations: accessibility, pricing
8. Additional items

*Email from Andrey Nesterenko sent to committee and included for consideration:

Dear colleagues.

I hope that you are healthy and will be ready to compete next season at a high level.

Regarding agenda questions my point of view:

1. Fluor ski wax prohibition is a very difficult question (possibly much complicate that doping in sport) therefore the way (rules) to detect this kind of violation not exist till now. FIS Council (November 2019 and February 2020) following the decision of FIS to ban use of fluorinated ski waxes in all FIS disciplines from the 2020/21 competition season approved following steps:
 - Confirmation of the collaboration with the company to develop the hand-held detector for fluorinated waxes, which will be ready for testing prior to the 2020/2021 season.
 - Establish the agreement for certification of the detectors with the Fraunhof Institute.
 - Delegate the Legal Committee to propose harmonised regulations for all disciplines.

Task the FIS Discipline Committees to prepare the specific competition and equipment regulations and to establish the procedures for testing at the competitions.



This means that we must wait until the FIS CC committee presents the rules and procedure for testing the skis and it will be tested in the competition season 2020-2021 on WC level. After that we can use all FIS experience on IPC level but little bit later (possibly in next season)

2. UKR team totally support the idea to move Ostersund BT WCH with WCH status and CC races with WC status to Ostersund (SWE) in December 2020
3. UKR team will prefer compete in next season on the same distances on WC level:
 - CC sprint
 - CC short
 - CC middle
 - CC long

But gender equality with regard to distance is still highly questionable!!!!