



## **IPC response to DCMS Select Committee hearing**

**Comments and clarifications regarding the first hearing on Paralympic classification**

28 November 2017

**International Paralympic Committee**

Adenauerallee 212-214 Tel. +49 228 2097-200  
53113 Bonn, Germany Fax +49 228 2097-209

[www.paralympic.org](http://www.paralympic.org)  
[info@paralympic.org](mailto:info@paralympic.org)



# 1 Response to oral and written evidence

- 1.1 The IPC would like to thank the DCMS Select Committee for its hearing on Paralympic classification. Although we did not attend the first hearing on 31 October, and will not be attending the second hearing on 6 December, we will again note the key learning points and actions for both the IPC and Paralympic Movement as a whole.
- 1.2 In our view the Paralympic classification system is fit for purpose. We do, however, acknowledge that improvements have, can and will be made by the IPC to continually make the system more robust for all athletes. We believe the first hearing did not particularly reveal any new issues to us or highlight areas for improvement that we were not already aware of or working on.
- 1.3 The Duty of Care in Sport report by Baroness Grey-Thompson was applauded by the IPC upon its publication in April 2017. It has been shared with different IPC Standing Committees, including the IPC Classification Committee, to take on board any recommendations that apply in a worldwide environment.
- 1.4 The IPC would have welcomed co-operation with Baroness Grey-Thompson with regards to the concerns she received about the duty of care of Para athletes. The IPC takes allegations of harassment of athletes extremely seriously and looks into every allegation that we receive. We are deeply concerned to hear that some athletes in Great Britain were threatened with a removal of national funding or deselection from the national team if they voiced concerns regarding classification.
- 1.5 It is clear from the evidence provided by Baroness Grey-Thompson that there needs to be a wider discussion about the intersection between athlete welfare and winning medals in Great Britain, and we are encouraged that UK Sport already has started addressing this subject. It should be emphasised that this issue is not unique to Great Britain. Instead, it is an issue that has been noted in several nations.
- 1.6 Like the DCMS, we believe that the duty of care of all athletes should be a number one priority for any organisation involved in sport. Admittedly, we were surprised and disappointed that the welfare of a number of Para athletes was not considered in the publication of written evidence submitted to the DCMS. We believe that for the classification (and integrity) of certain athletes to be questioned so publicly - with no regard for their rights or welfare - is well below the standards set by and for the DCMS Select Committee.



- 1.7 Due to the confidential nature of athlete medical diagnostic information, the IPC will not respond to each individual allegation made in written evidence against the classification of certain athletes. We will look into each allegation and take any appropriate action, where merited.
- 1.8 With regards to the evidence presented by Mr. Michael Breen, the IPC finds it grossly unacceptable and a cowardly act that he abused Parliamentary privileges to disclose the identity of athletes during the hearing. The IPC warned that this could happen in [point 25 of its initial submission](#) to the DCMS Select Committee. By naming athletes, Mr. Breen showed a blatant disregard for the welfare of Para athletes and has caused a significant amount of undue stress and anxiety to those individuals and their respective families. Furthermore, Mr. Breen's actions during the hearing completely contradicted his own claim that Para athletes "are (...) more vulnerable and need more safeguarding".
- 1.9 The athlete named by Mr. Breen in the hearing is one of the athletes whose classification the IPC investigated during the summer of 2016. After reviewing detailed medical diagnostic information and classifier reports, three independent experts verified that this athlete was (and is) in the correct class.
- 1.10 During his testimony, Mr. Breen further questioned the classification of a number of British athletes and described them in ways that clearly made them identifiable. Importantly, these same allegations had been made in 2016 and were investigated by the IPC. Once again, and following independent review by experts, none of the athletes were found to be erroneously classed. To continually question the classification of these athletes is, therefore, grossly unfair, unjust and unethical. (Please see Appendix A for the letter sent from the IPC to Mr. Breen regarding the classification of British athletes.)
- 1.11 We would like to emphasise that when the IPC investigates the classification of an athlete, additional and detailed medical diagnostic information is requested from the athlete, where applicable. In some cases, the IPC also may request an independent assessment of the athlete by a specialist. This evidence is then provided to three independent experts who are specialists in classification and to the medical condition that is central to the case. Before the experts receive such evidence, the name and nationality of the athlete are removed to ensure complete impartiality. The experts then work independently of each other before sending their conclusions to the IPC. Following its assessment of the three independent conclusions, the IPC then decides on the next steps.



- 1.12 Mr. Breen’s claim that Peter Eriksson “got his athlete reclassified from T54 down to T34” is incorrect. The athlete in question was internationally classified as a T34 athlete in July 2009, months before Peter Eriksson became the personal coach of the athlete or British head coach. The athlete in question has remained in this class ever since.
- 1.13 Due to a small T34 talent pool in Great Britain, the athlete also was given a *domestic* T53 classification, allowing her to compete against a larger pool of athletes. At smaller athletic meets, where the depth of athletes from each class is limited, the athlete may have competed as a T34 athlete against T53 or T54 athletes, but never has she been *internationally* classified as a T53 or T54. In its most recent Model of Best Practice for Classification, the IPC recommends that National Paralympic Committees avoid national systems (and sport class allocation) which are different from the international classification.
- 1.14 The IPC was shocked to learn that, following his testimony during the first DCMS hearing, Mr. Breen threatened legal action against anyone – including coaches, athletes and media – who dared to dispute his claims outlined in paragraph 1.12. His facts are simply wrong and such a tactic could be considered as bullying.
- 1.15 Mr. Breen claims that athletes are leaving Para athletics due to classification issues. He tried to justify this point during the hearing by pointing out that during the London 2012 Paralympic Games, there were heats in the women’s 100m T38 class, whereas at the London 2017 World Championships the women’s 100m T38 class event went straight to a final. He claimed this difference in competition structure was due to a decline in the number of athlete competing in the women’s 100m T38 class. To the contrary, the online [World Para Athletics World Rankings](#) indicate that in 2012, there were 21 athletes in the world rankings for the women’s 100m T38, including two Russian athletes. In 2017, there were 28 world ranked athletes, excluding Russian athletes (as a result of the IPC’s current suspension of the Russian Paralympic Committee). Therefore, there has been a 33 per cent increase in the number of athletes competing in the women’s 100m T38 during the last five years. Global participation, measured by the number of internationally licensed athletes, also has increased by 31 per cent during the same period. Such an increase in the overall number of athletes in the women’s 100m T38 indicates that athletes are in fact joining the sport.



- 1.16 Mr. Breen said that “it is unforgivable in 2017 that there is no governance in place in any of these sporting bodies”. Classification in the Paralympic Movement has been governed by the IPC Classification Code since 2007, with a most recent revised [IPC Athlete Classification Code](#) published in 2015. This Code is endorsed by the IPC General Assembly (comprised of 202 members – National Paralympic Committees, International Federations, Regional Organisations and International Organisations of Sport for the Disabled). This Code is binding on all parties involved in classification, including athletes, athlete support personnel, classifiers and sport governing bodies. The Code is complemented with International Standards that detail operational policies and procedures. (We refer to our initial submission for further detail.) In addition, a set of [Classification Model Rules for Para Sports](#) has been derived from the Code and the International Standards, which have been adopted by World Para Athletics and World Para Swimming.
- 1.17 Indicative for Mr. Breen’s lack of knowledge regarding classification is his continued claim of a broadening of the 30s classes. The Paralympic Movement does not categorise athletes by impairment ([see initial IPC submission](#)). Therefore, there is no specific class for athletes with cerebral palsy, a point highlighted to Mr. Breen in 2016 (See Appendix A). There has been no broadening of classes; what has changed is that following the success of London 2012, the number of athletes competing at the highest level has increased. This has led to a greater depth of quality in each class, and a dramatic improvement in performance. As a result, some athletes who were the top of the world rankings pre-London 2012 now find themselves lower down the rankings as a result of faster athletes. Para athletics is no different to any other sport where athletes are improving their performances each year.
- 1.18 Mr. Breen’s comments on the absence of protest procedures also are untrue. The International Standard for Protests and Appeals ([IPC Handbook, Section 2, Chapter 1.3.2.3](#)) details all applicable procedures.
- 1.19 When the IPC consulted with its Membership (and beyond) on the revisions of the 2015 Athlete Classification Code and International Standards in 2013, there was widespread support for winding down the ability of nations to protest the classification of an athlete from a rival nation. This change was made because it was found that countries were using a “free-for-all” tactic to disrupt the mental state of an athlete during competition, rather than legitimately questioning whether they were in the correct class. Today, a National Federation or National Paralympic Committee can make a request to its International Sport Federation for such a protest to be initiated ([International Standard for Protests and Appeals, art. 5.1](#)).



- 1.20 Also relevant to the claims advanced by Mr. Breen is the existence and operation of the IPC Board of Appeal of Classification (BAC), which is the body that handles any “formal objection to how Athlete Evaluation and/or Classification procedures have been conducted”. The BAC is comprised of individuals who are entirely independent from the classification personnel involved in any previous decision-making about an athlete’s classification. For further details about the BAC, we refer interested parties to the IPC Board of Appeal of Classification Bylaws in the IPC Handbook ([Section 1, Chapter 2.8](#)).
- 1.21 Equally, and perhaps for the sake of his own convenience, Mr. Breen failed to properly identify the initial stage of classification, which is the review of medical diagnostic information. This stage of the process rests squarely in the hands of medical experts. Mr. Breen wrongly states that medical doctors have been removed from classification. In effect, the most recent International Standard on Eligible Impairments stipulates very clearly a process that requires medical expertise to assess medical diagnostic information (“experts with appropriate medical qualifications”, [International Standard on Eligible Impairments, art. 5.4.3](#)). For information to the Committee, the current register of International Classifiers for World Para Athletics includes 11 medical doctors (on a total of 40 medical classifiers). Furthermore, physiotherapists and occupational therapists (which comprise the remaining portion of medical classifiers) have diagnostic entitlements in certain countries of the world.
- 1.22 Being a lawyer by profession, Mr. Breen certainly should recognise that his recommendation to “have a portal just for say coaches to access, that certain medical documentation is posted on so people know that they have gone through the right processes and rigours” cannot be supported by any Data Protection and Personal Privacy Standards.
- 1.23 In 2011, the then UK Athletics Chairperson Mr. Ed Warner OBE was appointed by the IPC as Chairperson of the [IPC Athletics Sport Technical Committee](#). In this role, which Warner still holds today, he is responsible for overseeing the technical aspects of the sport, together with six other committee members. South African Miss Hilary Beeton is responsible for classification matters on the committee, not Mr. Warner. In his role, Mr. Warner does not have the authority or the capacity to halt classification investigations. The IPC strongly refutes Mr. Breen’s allegation that Mr. Warner brought to a close or had any influence on the IPC investigations into athlete classification. As stated on multiple occasions, all grievances brought by Mr. Breen to the IPC were fully considered and the conclusion in each instance was that the athlete was verifiably in the correct class.



- 1.24 From his oral evidence, it is perfectly clear that Mr. Breen - who has no expertise, qualification or training in the area of athlete classification - does not have a proper understanding of the subject. It is greatly concerning for all involved that his testimony contained so many factual inaccuracies that did nothing but serve his own objectives. The serious question that must be posed to the DCMS Select Committee is whether Mr. Breen can be considered a credible witness on Paralympic classification.
- 1.25 Moving to Mr. Ian Jones' written evidence, the IPC confirms that Mr. Jones was moved from the T44 class to T38. This decision was made following verification of medical diagnostic information that was deemed to be more consistent with a co-ordination impairment. If Mr. Jones disagreed with his move to the T38 class, he was within his rights, under the rules of the sport, to appeal the decision. However, he chose not to appeal the decision.
- 1.26 The 400m race Mr. Jones mentions at the US Trials in June 2012 was a mixed class race for T36/37/38 athletes (See Appendix B). As the only T38 athlete in the field, he finished first in 56.41 seconds, which notably is a time that is more than seven seconds slower than the current 400m T38 world record. His competitors in the race were competing in the T36 and T37 class, athletes who are considered to have a more severe impairment. This rationally explains why Mr. Jones felt more able and finished well ahead of the field. The T37 athletes, who finished third to fifth in the race, were juniors aged between 15 and 19 years (and who finished towards the bottom of the world rankings in 2012). Jones won the race ahead of a T36 athlete by six seconds. This suggests that his claim of a 150m winning margin is either greatly exaggerated or that the Paralympic Movement boasts athletes significantly faster than Usain Bolt.
- 1.27 The written evidence provided by Mr. Jones is an example of how some allegations can be blown out of all perspective when not put into their correct context.
- 1.28 The IPC regrets that Ms. Bethany Woodward has not accepted our invitation for direct dialogue and submission of factual evidence in support of the allegations made towards her former teammates in the BBC File on 4 programme. Upon notification of her intention to hand back her relay medal, the IPC sent her the following email:



**RE: BBC File on 4**

Peter Van de Vliet

You forwarded this message on 04/10/2017 16:44.

Sent: Wed 04/10/2017 14:15

To:  'Bethany Woodward'

Cc:  Mike Peters

---

Dear Bethy

Thanks for allowing me a few extra days to get back to you on your below communication.

The IPC welcomes an opportunity to listen to any person that voices evidence-based concerns about classification, in particular when this allows the IPC to act upon any potential abuse. Should you hold such evidence, we would kindly invite you to meet with myself and Mike Peters, IPC Chief of Staff and head of the legal department (copied).

If your questions or concerns are more generic in nature, and contribute to improve classification within the T35-38 classes, we kindly would suggest that you instead seek a meeting with the representative of the British Paralympic Association, as our member organisation.

We will not, however, agree to set a meeting for the purpose of returning your medal. Instead, there is a process in place for doing so through the British Paralympic Association.

Kind regards

Peter

1.29 Four days later, Miss. Woodward e-mailed the IPC claiming we had “failed to get back in touch” despite the fact we had (See 1.28).

**From:** Bethany Woodward  
**Sent:** 08 October 2017 21:37  
**To:** Peter Van de Vliet  
**Subject:** Reply

Dear Peter,

You responded to my email to reassure me you were taking my communication seriously but you have failed to get back in touch.

There appears to be a pattern to your approach. Micheal Breen, who represented me in raising concerns in 2016 -despite the IPC having no procedure- was treated in a similar fashion. Mike Townley on this occasion entered into communication, gave certain assurances and then ended it abruptly with no explanation. The concerns were never addressed.

I have testimony from other families and athletes who have attempted to raise concerns that you have treated them in the same way

You can only conduct yourself in this manner because of the lack of a documented procedure.

This is a failure in the governance of your organisation.

As both the person delegated responsibility for running the IPC as a value based organisation and as a medical professional you are negligent in this respect.





This conscious, stonewalling approach is both disempowering and aggressive and does not afford me the respect I deserve as an international Paralympic athlete. I am of the opinion that this is a conscious approach and as such I believe I am being discriminated against. It is an ordinary expectation in any organisation that there are a set procedures for raising concerns, having them responded to in a timely manner and being able to have the right of appeal if they are not upheld.

Due to your lack of transparency in dealing with my first complaint I wish to take now take the matter into my own hands by returning my 2014 European relay medal.

I wish to do this in person and before the select committee evidence gathering session on the 31st October.

I await your response.

Yours sincerely,

Bethany Woodward

- 1.30 Following this email, we resent our original reply to Miss. Woodward inviting her to provide evidence to support her allegations. We also sent the same request to UK Athletics asking them to pass our invitation on to Ms. Woodward. As of today, there has been no reply from Ms. Woodward. The IPC is very committed to transparent decision-making in classification and therefore respectfully refuses to accept any allegation of having “no interest” in the matter.
- 1.31 Some of the procedural allegations presented in written evidence are historical and occurred prior to the introduction of the 2007 Classification Code or the 2015 IPC Athlete Classification Code. During the process of updating the Code, measures were taken to improve the systems and rules. Consequently, what may have been true in the past regarding specific shortcomings certainly are no longer true today.
- 1.32 We openly acknowledge that the processes whereby people can raise issues about classification on a domestic and international level do need to be improved, and work is already underway in this area.
- 1.33 To support the National Paralympic Committees in their roles and responsibilities with classification, the IPC – in consultation with different National Paralympic Committees, including the British Paralympic Association – has developed a Model of Best Practice on National Classification to provide recommended provisions for a National Classification Programme. This model includes athlete classification opportunities, classifier training and certification, and monitoring Code compliance at the national level. This document is available from <https://www.paralympic.org/classification/2015-athlete-classification-code>.
- 1.34 For the last several months, the IPC has been advancing the development of a whistle blower policy and procedure. The IPC is working with other sporting bodies who either have expertise in this area, or who had a head-start on the process of developing whistle blower policy and procedure.



- 1.35 At the same time we seek to improve the processes whereby classification concerns can be heard and voiced without fear, it needs to be noted that those who make complaints to the IPC also have a certain responsibility to accept merited results of an investigation. We are bitterly disappointed at what appears to have become a witch hunt of certain athletes by people, most usually parents of other athletes, who have had their grievances investigated and answered by the IPC but who continue nonetheless to recycle the same allegations.
- 1.36 All communications received by the IPC with concerns regarding the classification of athletes are investigated by the IPC Medical and Scientific team.
- 1.37 The IPC has on occasion appointed an independent investigator to examine a number of allegations that have made against athletes and determine whether sufficient evidence exists that warrants the filing of a “case to answer” charge by the IPC against an athlete. The IPC does not broadcast these types of investigations because of its main objective to protect the identity of those who have made the allegations and the identity of those who have had the allegations made against them.
- 1.38 As stated in our first written submission, prior to Rio 2016, the IPC investigated the classification of 80 athletes from 24 countries across six sports. This followed the receipt of hundreds of communications from National Paralympic Committees, parents, peer athletes and spectators. These investigations, which involved independent experts analysing all the evidence at hand, resulted in zero athletes undergoing reclassification. A number of classification procedures were not followed however and action was taken with the relevant international federations.
- 1.39 During the first hearing of the DCMS Select Committee, the subject of intentional misrepresentation (IM) was discussed and whether IM had been operationalised in a way that makes it too difficult to prove. In response, the IPC would emphasise to the committee that a finding of IM results in a sanction lasting up to two years. Given the gravity of sanction, therefore, any case brought against an athlete or coach must be appropriately conclusive.
- 1.40 With the increase in TV coverage of Paralympic sport around the world and the increase of spectator numbers, the IPC believes it is harder than ever for an athlete to cheat the classification system. We are fully aware of the rumours surrounding some of the activities athletes undertake ahead of classification. However, with multiple camera angles to review footage now available at most major events, Classification Panels have more opportunities than ever before to be able to spot athletes who are displaying different functional abilities to what they showed during their classification.



- 1.41 The IPC is aware that some individuals believe they have uncovered some type of conspiracy operating within the world of athlete classification, which involves large numbers of volunteers and executives across the Paralympic Movement. This conspiracy belief is, at best, based on an insufficient understanding of athlete classification. At worst, it may be based on disingenuous motivations. In addition, the IPC's silence on any ongoing investigations (despite well-known confidentiality regulations) seems only to embolden these views. As the DCMS Select Committee continues in its efforts to draw conclusions about the many complexities of athlete classification, we trust that the committee will do so by relying on fact over fiction and with a genuine and demonstrated concern for athlete privacy and well-being.
- 1.42 Once again, the IPC thanks the DCMS Select Committee for its support of Para sport and for its careful consideration of the matters addressed herein.



## 2 Appendix A - IPC Letter to Michael Breen regarding the classification of British athletes



Mr Michael Breen  
Via email

Bonn, 11 August 2016

### Classification of British Athletes

Dear Mr Breen,

Firstly I would like to apologise for our delayed response from your earlier emails, forwarded to me from our legal counsel and we would like to thank you for raising your concerns regarding the classification of a number of British track and field Para athletes.

The International Paralympic Committee (IPC) is a membership based organisation and our duty is to report to our 170+ members, rather than to members of the public or parents who have a concern on a certain issue however, in this case we will make exception in order to inform you of our actions.

As I am sure you are aware, the IPC has a duty to each individual athlete not to disclose their confidential medical diagnostic records. Therefore, we are unable to share any information of this nature with you.

What we can tell you however, is that following concerns from parties including yourself regarding a handful of British Para athletes, IPC Athletics contacted British Athletics to ask for further certain medical evidence to support the classification of each relevant athlete.

British Athletics did not just provide us with the medical diagnosis materials that we required for each athlete, but they provided additional evidence to support each case and in the event that we were not satisfied based on the additional evidence provided, British Athletics offered their full cooperation should IPC Athletics feel the need for any further action.

Following receipt of all additional data and with all the relevant information to hand a thorough review of the athlete's data took place led by the IPC Medical and Scientific Director and the IPC Athletics Head of Classification and any relevant actions that were deemed necessary took place.

International Paralympic Committee  
Adenauerallee 212-214 Tel. +49 228 2097-115  
53113 Bonn, Germany Fax +49 228 2097-209

[www.paralympic.org](http://www.paralympic.org)  
[ryan.montgomery@paralympic.org](mailto:ryan.montgomery@paralympic.org)



It is at this point we would like to advise that the 30s class in Para athletics is not, and never has been, solely for athletes with cerebral palsy (CP), but athletes with co-ordination impairments. The main change in recent years is that the population of athletes competing in the 30s classes, who do not have CP, but have a brain trauma injury or another impairment that is linked to co-ordination impairment has increased. We have seen this across all sports, not just Para athletics.

In reference to the above, as a membership based organisation please can you direct any further correspondence in relation to this matter direct to British Athletics and/or the British Paralympic Committee.

We would like to thank you again for bringing your concerns to our attention and trust that IPC Athletics has taken all necessary steps to ensure that the athletes in question are in the correct class in accordance with the IPC Classification Code and IPC Athletics Classification system.

Kind regards

Ryan Montgomery  
IPC Summer Sports Director  
International Paralympic Committee

CC

Dr Peter Van de Vliet

IPC Medical and Scientific Director.

Mr Niels De Vos

CEO, UK Athletics

Mr Tim Hollingsworth

CEO, British Paralympic Committee



### 3 Appendix B

#### Officials results from the US Paralympic Trials – 29 June to 1 July 2012

Half-Mile Timing - Contractor License

Hy-Tek's MEET MANAGER 11:48 AM 7/1/2012 Page 6

US Paralympic Championship Trials - 6/29/2012 to 7/1/2012

Track & Field Meet  
IUPUI: Indianapolis, IN

Results

#### Event 53 Women 400 Meter Dash 54

Name	Age	Team	Prelims
------	-----	------	---------

##### Preliminaries

1	229	McFadden, Tatyana	T54	54.10Q
2	193	Jones, Jade	T54	56.58Q
3	283	SchÄr, Manuela	T54	56.65Q
4	284	Schwab, Christina	T54	57.10Q
5	321	Weber, Amberlynn	T54	59.13Q
6	228	McFadden, Hannah	T54	1:00.06Q
7	210	LeFevour, Kelsey	T54	1:02.49q
8	282	Scaroni, Susannah	T54	1:03.34q
9	320	Watson, Melanie	T54	1:08.03
10	280	Salazar, Mikila	T54	1:08.89
11	208	Larsen, Jessica	T54	1:14.44
12	286	Sesser, Kanya	T54	1:16.00

#### Event 53 Women 400 Meter Dash 54

Name	Age	Team	Finals
------	-----	------	--------

##### Finals

1	229	McFadden, Tatyana	T54	54.18
2	193	Jones, Jade	T54	55.91
3	283	SchÄr, Manuela	T54	56.21
4	284	Schwab, Christina	T54	57.14
5	321	Weber, Amberlynn	T54	58.99
6	228	McFadden, Hannah	T54	59.48
7	210	LeFevour, Kelsey	T54	1:03.19
8	282	Scaroni, Susannah	T54	1:03.66

#### Event 54 Men 400 Meter Dash 11/12

Name	Age	Team	Finals
------	-----	------	--------

##### Finals

1	327	Gonzalez, Benjamin	T12	51.02
2	226	McCormick, Charles	T12	56.46
3	203	Solaris, Bryan	T11	DNF

#### Event 55 Men 400 Meter Dash 36/37/38

Name	Age	Team	Finals
------	-----	------	--------

##### Finals

1	192	Jones, Ian	T38	56.41
2	127	Chasanoff, Thomas	T36	1:02.64
3	152	Ferra, Justin	T37	1:11.39
4	314	Villanueva, Benjamin	T37/F37	1:15.82
5	236	Miles, Mitchell	T37/F37	1:20.63

#### Event 56 Men 400 Meter Dash 42/43/44

Name	Age	Team	Finals
------	-----	------	--------

7	301	Tainer, Peter	T43	1:00.25
---	110	Bizzell, Jim Bob	T44	DNF

#### Event 57 Men 400 Meter Dash 51/52

Name	Age	Team	Prelims
------	-----	------	---------

##### Preliminaries

1	222	Martin, Raymond	T52	57.80Q
2	248	Nitz, Paul	T52	1:04.33Q
3	272	Roberts, Joshua	T52	1:02.73Q
4	311	Toyaji, Steven	T52	1:04.73Q
5	275	Roux, Aaron	T52	1:03.35Q
6	186	Iannotta, Gianfranco	T52	1:05.71Q
7	308	Torres, Cristian	T52	1:05.90q
8	221	Marcos, Castillo	T52	1:06.66q
9	227	McCoy, Nicholas	T52	1:08.08
10	252	Patel, Nishan	T52	1:19.31
---	260	Price, James	T52	DNF
---	163	Gallegos, Joel	T52	DNF

#### Event 57 Men 400 Meter Dash 51/52

Name	Age	Team	Finals
------	-----	------	--------

##### Finals

1	222	Martin, Raymond	T52	57.84
2	272	Roberts, Joshua	T52	1:02.58
3	248	Nitz, Paul	T52	1:03.82
4	186	Iannotta, Gianfranco	T52	1:05.03
5	311	Toyaji, Steven	T52	1:05.09
6	275	Roux, Aaron	T52	1:08.21
7	308	Torres, Cristian	T52	1:08.26
8	221	Marcos, Castillo	T52	1:09.46

#### Event 58 Men 400 Meter Dash 53

Name	Age	Team	Prelims
------	-----	------	---------

##### Preliminaries

1	167	George, Josh	T53	48.60Q
2	289	Siemann, Brian	T53	49.11Q
3	122	Bushell, Michael	T53	50.38Q
4	189	Jesus, Aguilar	T53	50.57Q
5	100	Abbott, Zachary	T53	53.59Q
6	137	Cuevas, Jim	T53	57.28Q
7	185	Hunt, Robert	T53	54.16q
8	307	Torres, Arturo	T53	58.41q
9	120	Burns, Sean	T53	1:00.43
10	108	Binning, Stephen	T53	1:00.66
11	319	Warren, Gavin	T53	1:01.40
12	157	Followay, Casey	T53	1:02.40