REGULATORY MOTIONS

Introduction — Regulatory Motions

This document presents the regulatory motions submitted for consideration by the IPCH Sport Congress. It includes both motions proposed by IPCH Standing Committees and motions submitted by Member Nations.

The purpose of this document is to provide Member Nations with the information necessary to understand the rationale behind each proposal, assess its potential implications and make informed decisions during the Sport Congress.

1. Explanatory Notes and Committee Comments

For motions submitted by IPCH Standing Committees, the Sport Executive Committee (SEC) has prepared a Rationale and Purpose section for each motion. These explanatory notes outline the reasons for the proposal, the issue it seeks to address and the intended outcome.

For motions submitted by Member Nations, comments have been prepared following an assessment by the Sport Executive Committee, as well as the relevant IPCH Standing Committees. Where considered appropriate, this assessment has also involved individuals with experience in the role of Technical Delegate.

These comments are intended to provide a comprehensive assessment of each proposal, highlighting its potential benefits, challenges, practical implications and any relevant considerations that Member Nations should take into account before voting. They are intended to support informed discussion and decision-making and should not be interpreted as replacing the decision of the Sport Congress.

2. Voting Procedure and Seconding of Motions

All votes on motions will be conducted during the Sport Congress using the voting tools available through Zoom.

A motion may be put to a vote only if it is seconded by at least one Member Nation other than the Nation or IPCH Standing Committee that submitted the motion.
Accordingly, a motion submitted by a Member Nation requires the support of at least one additional Member Nation to proceed to a vote. A motion submitted by an IPCH Standing Committee also requires the seconding of at least one Member Nation.

The seconding process will take place openly during the meeting, with Member Nations invited to indicate whether they wish to second each motion. This procedure is intended to ensure transparency and equal treatment of all proposals.

To facilitate the organisation of the Sport Congress and streamline the voting process, **Member Nations are welcome to indicate in advance whether they intend to second any of the motions included in this document. Any advance indication must be submitted in writing to office@powerchairhockey.org no later than 27 November.**

Advance indications will help the SEC prepare for the meeting and identify motions for which seconding has already been expressed. However, Member Nations may also choose to express their seconding during the Sport Congress itself, when the request will be made openly in front of all participating nations.

Submitting an advance indication does not replace the transparent seconding process during the meeting. All motions will remain subject to the applicable voting procedure, and only motions that meet the seconding requirement will proceed to a vote.

3. Decision-Making

Member Nations are encouraged to review the motions and the accompanying explanatory notes or committee comments in advance of the Sport Congress. This preparation will support constructive discussion, informed voting and an efficient decision-making process.

The final decision on each motion submitted for a vote rests with the Member Nations in accordance with the applicable IPCH governance procedures.

Motions Information Sessions

IPCH will host two informal information sessions ahead of the Sport Congress to discuss proposals submitted by IPCH and Member Nations, answer questions and clarify key points. Member Nations are encouraged to review the Congress package in advance and attend the relevant session to support focused discussions and informed decision-making during the Congress.

Information sessions

Date and time (CET)	Discussion focus
10 November 2026, 18:00–20:00	IPCH Name Change Proposal and Regulatory Adjustments
22 November 2026, 13:30–16:30	**Regulatory Motions**

For questions or further information, contact office@powerchairhockey.org.

Motion n.01:

Goalkeepers of the Same Team to Wear the Same Colour

KEY CHANGES:

- Consistent goalkeeper colours: Requires all goalkeepers belonging to the same team to wear jerseys of the same colour.
- Clear team identification: Supports immediate recognition of the goalkeeper's team, including when a goalkeeper substitution takes place.
- Improved visual clarity: Enhances identification for players, referees, spectators and broadcasters, particularly during live streaming.
- Complementary colour differentiation: Supports the broader objective of distinguishing goalkeepers from field players of both teams and from the opposing goalkeeper.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Game Rules — Rule 501, The Players' Clothing

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

With goalkeepers becoming increasingly active outside the goal area, **clear and immediate visual identification of players and their roles is becoming increasingly important**.
As addressed in the related proposal "Specification on the jersey colours", goalkeepers should be clearly distinguishable from field players of both teams and from the opposing goalkeeper throughout the match, regardless of their position on the field.

In addition to this sporting and officiating consideration, **consistency between goalkeepers of the same team is particularly important from a spectator and broadcasting perspective**. Powerchair Hockey is increasingly consumed through live streaming and digital media, where spectators may not always be familiar with the players or the teams. Using the same jersey colour for all goalkeepers of a team provides an immediate visual reference and makes it easier to recognise which team a goalkeeper belongs to.

This becomes particularly relevant when a goalkeeper substitution takes place. If the replacement goalkeeper wears a different colour, a spectator watching the match — particularly through a stream, where player identification may be more difficult — may not immediately recognise that the player belongs to the same team.

Requiring all goalkeepers of the same team to wear jerseys of the same colour would therefore provide **greater visual consistency throughout the match**, regardless of which goalkeeper is on the field.

The proposal is intended to complement the broader requirements for clear player identification and colour differentiation. It would establish a simple and consistent principle:

- **field players of the same team use the same field-player colour;**
- **goalkeepers of the same team use the same goalkeeper colour;**
- **goalkeeper colours remain clearly different from the field players of both teams and from the opposing goalkeeper.**

This would improve visual recognition for **players, referees, spectators and broadcasters**, while making team identification more immediate and consistent throughout the match.

Current Text:

Game rules: Rule 501 The players' clothing
The field players of a team shall wear the same type of shirts. Shirts must be in a different colour than the shirts of the opposing team.

All players need to be identifiable by a playing number on the front of their shirt. The number shall be clearly visible with a minimum height of 7 cm.

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 501 The players' clothing
The field players of a team shall wear the same type of shirts. Shirts must be in a different colour than the shirts of the opposing team.

All players need to be identifiable by a playing number on the front of their shirt. The number shall be clearly visible with a minimum height of 7 cm.

All the goalkeepers of the same team must wear jerseys of the same colour.

Motion n.02:

Changing how a referee ball is taken

KEY CHANGES:

- Opposite stick positioning: Requires the two players to position their stick blades on opposite sides of the ball, perpendicular to the relevant line and without touching the ball.
- First-choice procedure: When the referee ball is taken at the penalty line, the defending player chooses first. When it is taken at the centre spot, the player from the team listed second on the match form chooses first.
- Balanced starting position: Removes the current requirement for both players to position their sticks on the right side of the ball, addressing the structural advantage this may create for players using sticks on that side.
- Clear and consistent application: Establishes a predictable procedure for referees and players, inspired by the approach used in floorball.
- Purpose: Promotes a more neutral and balanced starting position for both teams when a referee ball is taken.

- **Regulatory reference**:
  IPCH Game Rules — Rule 702, Referee Ball

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

Under the current rules, both players participating in a referee ball are required to position the blade of their stick on the **right side of the ball**. This positioning creates a structural advantage for players who use the stick on their right-hand side, as their stick is naturally positioned closer to the ball and allows them to make the first movement more naturally.

This means that the current procedure does not provide an equal starting position for players using the stick on different sides of their powerchair.

The proposed amendment aims to **remove this inherent advantage by allowing the two players to position their sticks on opposite sides of the ball**. One player chooses the side first, and the other player must then position their stick on the opposite side. This creates a symmetrical starting position and ensures that neither side is systematically favoured by the rules.

The proposed procedure is **based on the approach used in floorball**, where players are given the choice of which side of the ball to place their stick, with the opposing player then taking the other side.

The proposal also establishes which player has the first choice depending on where the referee ball is taken, ensuring that the procedure is **clear, predictable and consistently applied by referees**.

The purpose of the amendment is therefore to ensure that the referee ball starts from a **neutral and balanced position**, while maintaining a simple procedure that can be easily understood and applied during the match.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 702 Referee ball
The referee ball is taken:

- at the penalty line spot, if the referee ball is given inside the penalty area.
- at the centre line spot, if the referee ball is given inside the neutral area.

One player from each team takes part in the referee ball.

The two players taking part in the referee ball line up, as quickly as possible, with their powerchair in their own side of the penalty line / centre line. ~~The blades of the sticks shall be at the right angle (90 degrees) to the line on either right side of the ball, without touching it.~~

All the other players line up, as quickly as possible, at a distance of at least 2 m from the ball and the players taking the referee ball, until the ball is played.

The ball shall be put on the spot stationary. As soon as the referee whistles, both players may play the ball.

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 702 Referee ball
The referee ball is taken:

- at the penalty line spot, if the referee ball is given inside the penalty area.
- at the centre line spot, if the referee ball is given inside the neutral area.

One player from each team takes part in the referee ball.

The two players taking part in the referee ball line up, as quickly as possible, with their powerchair in their own side of the penalty line / centre line. **The blades of the sticks shall be perpendicular to the line on each side of the ball, without touching it. When the referee ball is taken from the spot on the penalty line the defending player chooses first on which side to place their stick, when the referee ball is taken from the centre spot the player from the team second mentioned on the match form chooses first, the opponent then places their stick to the other side of the ball.**

All the other players line up, as quickly as possible, at a distance of at least 2 m from the ball and the players taking the referee ball, until the ball is played.

The ball shall be put on the spot stationary. As soon as the referee whistles, both players may play the ball.

Motion n.03:

Starting the extra time with a referee ball instead of an opening ball

KEY CHANGES:

- Neutral start to extra time: Replaces the coin-toss procedure for awarding the opening ball with a referee ball from the centre-line spot.
- Equal opportunity to gain possession: Requires both teams to compete for the initial possession rather than automatically awarding it to one team.
- Golden-goal fairness: Ensures that the first possession in extra time, where the next goal decides the match, is determined through play rather than the restart procedure.
- Regulatory alignment: Adds the beginning of extra time as an event leading to a referee ball under Rule 703.
- Purpose: Establishes a neutral starting point for extra time while preserving the competitive importance of gaining possession.

- **Regulatory reference**:
  IPCH Game Rules — Rule 202, Extra Time; Rule 703, Events Leading to a Referee Ball.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

Extra time is decided by a **golden goal**, meaning that the first team to score wins the match. In this context, the way extra time begins is particularly significant, as the first possession may directly lead to the decisive goal.

Under the current procedure, one team is automatically awarded the opening ball at the start of extra time. This gives that team the first opportunity to establish possession and initiate an attacking phase without having to compete for that possession.

In a golden-goal situation, the first possession should be **gained through play, not automatically given**. Awarding the ball to one team creates an advantage that has not been earned during extra time and may directly influence the outcome of the match.

Starting extra time with a referee ball would provide a neutral starting point. Both teams would have the opportunity to compete for the ball, with the first possession determined by their ability to gain it rather than by the restart procedure.

The proposal does not seek to remove the advantage associated with gaining possession. Possession remains an important and legitimate part of the competition. The objective is to ensure that both teams have the opportunity to compete for that advantage, particularly when the next goal will decide the match.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 202 Extra time

If the match being played is one that cannot end in a tie and this is the result at the end of the regular time, then extra time will be played. If there is no winning team by the end of extra time, the match will be decided by a penalty shot series.

There will be a 5 minute intermission before the start of extra time.

The duration of extra time is 10 minutes and is played with the Golden Goal principle; as soon as one team scores a goal in extra time, the match is over. This goal will be added to the score of the scoring team, determining the result.

Please see below for additional circumstances of extra time:

- ~~Before the start of the extra time, captains shall report to the referees for the coin toss. The player who wins the toss decides who gets the opening ball.~~
- Upon return to the field of play, teams shall change ends.
- During extra time, substitutions are allowed.
- Allocated time-outs are not permitted during extra time.
- A time penalty remaining after regular playing time will continue during the extra time

(also affects Game rules: Rule 703 Events leading to a referee ball)

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 202 Extra time

If the match being played is one that cannot end in a tie and this is the result at the end of the regular time, then extra time will be played. If there is no winning team by the end of extra time, the match will be decided by a penalty shot series.

There will be a 5 minute intermission before the start of extra time. 00..

The duration of extra time is 10 minutes and is played with the Golden Goal principle; as soon as one team scores a goal in extra time, the match is over. This goal will be added to the score of the scoring team, determining the result.

- **The extra time is started with a referee ball from the centre line spot.**
- Upon return to the field of play, teams shall change ends.
- During extra time, substitutions are allowed.
- Allocated time-outs are not permitted during extra time.
- A time penalty remaining after regular playing time will continue during the extra time

Please see below for additional circumstances of extra time:

Game rules: Rule 703 Events leading to a referee ball

Add

- **At the beginning of an extra time**

Motion n.04:

Adding the possibility to award a penalty shot when a clear goal scoring situation is prevented by an offence

KEY CHANGES:

- Extension of penalty-shot criteria: Allows a penalty shot when a defending player prevents a goal or a clear goal-scoring situation through an intentional offence, regardless of where on the field the offence occurs.
- Intentional offences only: Limits the provision to offences that deliberately deny a goal or clear goal-scoring opportunity; it does not make every offence outside the penalty area punishable by a penalty shot.
- Consistent sanctioning: Addresses situations such as counter-attacks where a defending player deliberately stops an attacking opportunity before the attacker reaches the penalty area.
- Focus on sporting impact: Ensures that the restart reflects the significance of the offence rather than being determined solely by the location where it occurred.
- Purpose: Provides referees with a clear basis for sanctioning the deliberate prevention of a goal or clear scoring opportunity.

- **Regulatory reference**:

IPCH Game Rules — Rule 711, Events Leading to a Penalty Shot.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

Under the current rules, a penalty shot can generally only be awarded when the relevant offence occurs **inside the defending team's penalty area**. This can create a situation where an intentional offence that clearly prevents a goal or a clear goal-scoring opportunity can only result in a free hit when it occurs outside the penalty area.

This is particularly relevant in **counter-attack situations**, where a defending player may deliberately commit an offence in order to stop an attacking player before they reach the penalty area. In such circumstances, the location of the offence may determine how the game is restarted (a free hit or a penalty shot) even though the sporting effect of the offence is the same: **a clear goal or goal-scoring opportunity has been deliberately prevented**.

The proposed amendment introduces the possibility of awarding a penalty shot when a defending player **prevents a goal or a clear goal-scoring situation by committing an intentional offence, regardless of where on the field the offence occurs**.

The purpose is not to make every offence outside the penalty area punishable by a penalty shot. The provision would apply specifically where the offence is intentional and has prevented a goal or a clear goal-scoring situation. This provides referees with an appropriate sanction for situations where a player deliberately denies a significant scoring opportunity.

The proposed wording is based on the corresponding principle used in **floorball rules**, adapted to the specific terminology and playing conditions of Powerchair Hockey.

The amendment would therefore strengthen the principle that **the way the game is restarted should reflect the sporting impact of the offence**, rather than being determined solely by the location on the field where the offence took place.

Current Rule:

Game rules: Rule 711 Events leading to a penalty shot

- a player intentionally commits an offense inside their own penalty area,
- a field player plays the ball or intentionally touches the floor inside of their own goal area with the stick, powerchair or body (lines belong to goal area),
- a player moves the goal cage with the intent to prevent a goal from being scored (unless the goal is scored),
- a player plays with illegal equipment and it affects a goal scoring situation (e.g. defender's powerchair is too low and stops the ball)

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 711 Events leading to a penalty shot

- a player intentionally commits an offense inside their own penalty area,
- **a defending player prevents a goal or a clear goal scoring situation with an intentional offence anywhere on the field.**
- a field player plays the ball or intentionally touches the floor inside of their own goal area with the stick, powerchair or body (lines belong to goal area),
- a player moves the goal cage with the intent to prevent a goal from being scored (unless the goal is scored),
- a player plays with illegal equipment and it affects a goal scoring situation (e.g. defender's powerchair is too low and stops the ball)

Motion n.05:

Changes to misconduct rules about leaving and entering the field

KEY CHANGES:

- Graduated misconduct levels: Introduces a clearer distinction between mild, medium and severe misconduct based on the circumstances and impact of the unauthorised action.
- Mild misconduct: Includes repeatedly entering the referee area without obstructing referees, and leaving the team area without permission without entering the referee area or playing field.
- Medium misconduct: Covers leaving the field without permission, obstructing or hindering a referee in the referee area, unauthorised entry or exit during a dead moment, and entering the field during play without interfering with the game.
- Severe misconduct: Includes entering the field without permission and interfering with play, or physically interfering with the game from the team area while play is in progress.
- Referee discretion: Maintains the referees' authority to determine the appropriate misconduct level based on the circumstances of each incident.
- Proportionality and fair play: Aims to ensure that sanctions reflect the seriousness and actual impact of the behaviour, distinguishing minor breaches from deliberate interference with the match.

- Regulatory reference:

IPCH Game Rules — Rule 612, Misconduct
IPCH Game Rules — related penalties under Rules 803, 805 and 807.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The current rules provide a limited number of specific consequences for situations in which a person leaves or enters the field, referee area or team area without the permission of the referees. However, **these situations can vary significantly in their nature, circumstances and impact on the match**.

For example, entering the field during a dead moment without affecting the game is fundamentally different from entering the field while play is in progress and interfering with the game. Similarly, entering the referee area without affecting a referee's movement is different from deliberately obstructing or hindering a referee.

The current wording does not sufficiently distinguish between these situations and may therefore result in the same level of sanction being applied to situations with very different levels of seriousness.

The proposed amendment introduces a **graduated approach**, allowing the level of misconduct to reflect the circumstances of the specific incident:

- **Mild misconduct** for less serious situations that do not interfere with the match or the movement of officials;
- **Medium misconduct** for situations involving a greater level of interference or unauthorised movement during play or a dead moment; and
- **Severe misconduct** where the unauthorised action directly interferes with the game or deliberately affects the match from outside the playing area.

This approach gives referees the necessary discretion to **assess the actual circumstances and impact of each incident**, rather than applying a single predetermined sanction to every situation.

It also provides **greater protection for teams and their participants against disproportionate sanctions**. An accidental, technical or relatively minor breach should not automatically carry the same consequence as an action that deliberately interferes with play or gives a team an unfair advantage. At the same time, serious or deliberate interference remains clearly identified as severe misconduct and can be sanctioned accordingly.

The proposed amendment therefore provides a **clearer and more proportionate framework for referees**, while maintaining the authority of the referee to determine the appropriate level of misconduct in each individual situation.

The purpose is not to make the rules more lenient, but to ensure that the sanction is proportionate to the nature and impact of the behaviour, protecting both the integrity of the match and teams from unnecessarily harsh consequences.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 612 Misconduct
Misconduct is an intentional violation of the spirit of the game in word or gesture, in a severe way. Misconduct is not allowed. There are various levels of misconduct.

Mild misconduct:
- repeated or inappropriate, but not insulting protest against referees decision,
- intentionally delaying the match,
- arguing with other players or team members

Medium misconduct:
- loud protest or inappropriate, but not dangerous action (e.g. hitting the boundary with the stick, hitting a ball out of the field or moving the goal during a dead moment of play, ...),
- prolonged arguing with other players or referees,
- ~~leaving or entering the field without permission of the referee~~

Severe misconduct:
- approaching another person in a rude way by word and/or gesture. Swearing, abusing language, insulting, discriminating or racial remarks or rude gestures are not permitted (unsportsmanlike conduct),

- making rude remarks or gestures to the referee, timekeeper, scorekeeper, player or coach repeatedly (unsportsmanlike conduct),

- attacking or an attempting to attack with a stick, wheelchair or any part of the body another player, referee, member of the team staff or match table

Referees have the authority to decide on the level of misconduct in every situation.

For misconduct, the referee may wait to punish until the next dead moment of the match. The match continues according to the reason for which it was stopped. If the referee stops the game immediately, the match continues with a free ball for the opposing team.

For penalties related to misconduct, see 803, 805 and 807.

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 612 Misconduct
Misconduct is an intentional violation of the spirit of the game in word or gesture, in a severe way. Misconduct is not allowed. There are various levels of misconduct.

Mild misconduct:
- repeated or inappropriate, but not insulting protest against referees decision,
- intentionally delaying the match,
- arguing with other players or team members
- **repeatedly entering the referee area without obstructing or hindering the movement of a referee.**
- **leaving the team-area without permission from the referees and without entering into the referee area and/or the playing field.**

Medium misconduct:
- loud protest or inappropriate, but not dangerous action (e.g. hitting the boundary with the stick, hitting a ball out of the field or moving the goal during a dead moment of play, ...),
- prolonged arguing with other players or referees,
- **leaving the field without permission of the referee**
- **entering the referee area and obstructing or hindering the movement of a referee.**
- **leaving or entering the field without permission of the referees during a dead moment of play**
- **entering the field without permission of the referees while the game is on without interfering with the game.**

Severe misconduct:
- approaching another person in a rude way by word and/or gesture. Swearing, abusing language, insulting, discriminating or racial remarks or rude gestures are not permitted (unsportsmanlike conduct),
- making rude remarks or gestures to the referee, timekeeper, scorekeeper, player or coach repeatedly (unsportsmanlike conduct),
- attacking or an attempting to attack with a stick, wheelchair or any part of the body another player, referee, member of the team staff or match table
- **entering the field without permission of the referees and interfering with the game**
- **physically interfering with the game in any way from the team-area when the game is on (e.g. throwing something onto the playing field).**

Referees have the authority to decide on the level of misconduct in every situation.

For misconduct, the referee may wait to punish until the next dead moment of the match. The match continues according to the reason for which it was stopped. If the referee stops the game immediately, the match continues with a free ball for the opposing team.

For penalties related to misconduct, see 803, 805 and 807.

Motion n.06:

Prohibiting the Ball from Being Made Unplayable to an Opponent

KEY CHANGES:

- New offence: Prohibits holding or blocking the ball against the floor, boundary or another powerchair using a handstick or powerchair in a way that prevents other players from legally playing or intercepting it.
- Active opponent requirement: The offence applies only when an opponent is actively attempting to play the ball.
- Clarification of legal ball control: Maintains the right to control the ball with the handstick, prohibiting only situations where the ball is made effectively unplayable to an opponent.
- Consistent enforcement: Provides referees with a specific basis for penalising this behaviour, supporting active and contestable play.
- Purpose: Prevents players from using their stick or powerchair to unfairly shield the ball and restrict an opponent's legitimate opportunity to challenge for possession.

- **Regulatory reference**:

IPCH Game Rules — Rule 609, Playing the Ball;
IPCH Game Rules —Rule 709, Events Leading to a Free Hit.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The current rules allow players to use the blade of a handstick to control and protect the ball. However, a practice has emerged in which players hold the ball firmly between the blade and the playing surface, boundary or another powerchair, effectively preventing an opponent from playing or intercepting it.

While ball control is an essential part of the game, this situation can create an artificial form of ball protection in which an opponent has no realistic possibility of playing the ball legally. This may reduce active contest for possession and result in prolonged situations where the ball is effectively unavailable to the opposing player.

The proposed amendment introduces a specific offence for deliberately holding or blocking the ball in such a way that no other player can legally play or intercept it, provided that an opponent is actively attempting to play the ball. The proposal does not prohibit legitimate ball control or the use of the handstick blade to protect possession where no opponent is actively attempting to reach the ball.

The distinction between legitimate ball control and making the ball unplayable is illustrated by the accompanying video clips:

Clip 1 — Ball effectively held in place: The player holds the ball so firmly under the blade that even a clear hit from the opponent does not dislodge it. This illustrates the specific situation the proposal aims to address. Under the current rules, the opponent's attempt to play the ball could itself be penalised, depending on the circumstances, even though the situation results from the way the ball is being held. Whether the opponent's hit independently constitutes an offence is a separate consideration. - https://youtu.be/q3RZup75ric

Clip 2 — Legitimate ball control: The player holds the ball under the blade while actively seeking a way to continue playing. The opponent is not actively attempting to reach or play the ball. This remains legal and would not constitute an offence under the proposed amendment. - https://youtu.be/2ptRo4M5lWs

Clip 3 — Ball made unplayable despite an opponent's attempt: The player holds the ball under the blade and presses it against the playing surface in a way that effectively prevents the opponent from playing it legally. The opponent is actively attempting to gain possession but cannot do so without potentially committing an offence. This is the type of situation the proposed amendment is intended to address. - https://youtu.be/HZEUxuRa9mo

The third example highlights the underlying issue: the manner in which the ball is controlled can make it effectively unplayable to an opponent, while an attempt to challenge for possession may expose that opponent to a sanction. In a goal-scoring situation, this may discourage the opponent from pursuing the ball more actively because of the potential consequences, including a penalty shot or a significant disciplinary sanction.

The proposal seeks to address this imbalance by providing referees with a clearer basis for determining when ball control becomes an offence. It aims to ensure that legitimate possession remains permitted while preventing a player from gaining an advantage by making the ball inaccessible to an opponent who is actively attempting to play it.

The issue is particularly relevant because this form of ball control may depend on individual physical characteristics, functional abilities and the player's capacity to manipulate the ball in a particular way. A clear and consistently applied rule would help ensure that the opportunity to contest possession is not unfairly restricted by a technique that makes the ball effectively unplayable.

The amendment is intended to establish the **principle that the ball must remain legally playable by an opponent who is actively attempting to play it**, rather than to prohibit particular techniques of ball control indiscriminately.

The proposed wording provides the regulatory basis for addressing this principle. Its interpretation and practical application may be further refined through consultation with the Refereeing Observer Committee (ROC), the Athletes Committee, the Coaches Committee and other relevant stakeholders. This process would allow the principle to be translated into consistent refereeing practice, incorporating both technical expertise and athletes' perspectives.

The purpose is therefore to promote active and contestable play, reduce inconsistent interpretations and provide referees with a clear tool for addressing situations in which the ball is deliberately made unplayable, without unnecessarily restricting legitimate ball control.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 709 Events leading to a free hit

- a player hits an opponent's stick with their stick, without intention to play the ball,
- a player blocks or lifts an opponent's stick,
- a player plays with a stick at such height or in a way that it might be intimidating or dangerous to another player (high stick),
- a player throws or drops their stick,
- a player places their stick under another player's powerchair,
- a player makes contact with an opponent's body with their stick without trying to play the ball,
- a player plays the ball in a way that is dangerous to an opponent,
- a player holds another player's body or powerchair with their own hands, feet or stick in an attempt to impede the progress of an opponent,
- a player drives over another player's stick,
- a player hits another player's powerchair with their own powerchair (see 608, Rule of the moving lines),
- a player hinders another player's movement using a powerchair (see 608, Driving the powerchair)
- a player pushes another player's powerchair with their own
- a player causes a collision using a powerchair (see 608, Driving the powerchair)
- a goalkeeper obstructs the ball outside of their own penalty area for longer than 3 seconds with the powerchair and/or stick; the referee shall draw the player's attention to the fact that the player is obstructing the ball, indicating the enforcement of the 3-seconds rule; the referee counts the 3 seconds audible and visible,
- a player plays or touches the ball, or touches the floor with the stick or powerchair in the opponents goal area (lines belong to goal area),
- a player plays the ball with a hand, head or body,
- the ball is played to a height of more than 20cm,
- player moves the goal cage to gain advantage over an opponent (not during a goal scoring situation),
- a player intentionally moves the boundary in order to obtain advantage,
- team is delaying the game,
- misconduct, unless during a dead moment of play,
- after a penalty shot has been missed during regular game time,
- a player plays with illegal equipment and it affects the running situation (e.g. powerchair is too low and stops a ball during the match).

also affected Game rules: Rule 609 Playing the ball

The ball may be played with the blade of the stick and the powerchair. The ball may be played in any direction.

The ball shall not be played higher than 20 cm above the playing field. If the ball hits a powerchair, the boundary, a goal cage or a referee and that causes it to rise above 20 cm off the ground, this should be considered accidental and is no reason to halt the match. If such a situation leads to a goal, the goal shall be declared invalid. The match resumed with a goalkeeper ball.

A player may not:

- damage the ball by intentionally driving over it,
- intentionally play the ball with any part of the body in any way,
- play the ball in a way that is dangerous to other players,
- touch or play the ball in the goal area with the exception of the goalkeeper.

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 709 Events leading to a free hit

- a player hits an opponent's stick with their stick, without intention to play the ball,
- a player blocks or lifts an opponent's stick,
- a player plays with a stick at such height or in a way that it might be intimidating or dangerous to another player (high stick),
- a player throws or drops their stick,
- a player places their stick under another player's powerchair,
- a player makes contact with an opponent's body with their stick without trying to play the ball,
- a player plays the ball in a way that is dangerous to an opponent,
- a player holds another player's body or powerchair with their own hands, feet or stick in an attempt to impede the progress of an opponent,
- a player drives over another player's stick,
- a player hits another player's powerchair with their own powerchair (see 608, Rule of the moving lines),
- a player hinders another player's movement using a powerchair (see 608, Driving the powerchair)
- a player pushes another player's powerchair with their own
- a player causes a collision using a powerchair (see 608, Driving the powerchair)
- a goalkeeper obstructs the ball outside of their own penalty area for longer than 3 seconds with the powerchair and/or stick; the referee shall draw the player's attention to the fact that the player is obstructing the ball, indicating the enforcement of the 3-seconds rule; the referee counts the 3 seconds audible and visible,
- a player plays or touches the ball, or touches the floor with the stick or powerchair in the opponents goal area (lines belong to goal area),
- a player plays the ball with a hand, head or body,
- the ball is played to a height of more than 20cm,
- player moves the goal cage to gain advantage over an opponent (not during a goal scoring situation),
- a player intentionally moves the boundary in order to obtain advantage,
- team is delaying the game,
- misconduct, unless during a dead moment of play,
- after a penalty shot has been missed during regular game time,
- a player plays with illegal equipment and it affects the running situation (e.g. powerchair is too low and stops a ball during the match).
- **a player plays/blocks the ball with a powerchair and/or a stick in such a way against the floor, the boundary or a powerchair that no other player has the possibility to play/intercept the ball in a legal way. This is only an offence if the opponent is actively trying to play the ball.**

Game rules: Rule 609 Playing the ball

The ball may be played with the blade of the stick and the powerchair. The ball may be played in any direction.

The ball shall not be played higher than 20 cm above the playing field. If the ball hits a powerchair, the boundary, a goal cage or a referee and that causes it to rise above 20 cm off the ground, this should be considered accidental and is no reason to halt the match. If such a situation leads to a goal, the goal shall be declared invalid. The match resumed with a goalkeeper ball.

A player may not:

- damage the ball by intentionally driving over it,
- intentionally play the ball with any part of the body in any way,
- play the ball in a way that is dangerous to other players,
- touch or play the ball in the goal area with the exception of the goalkeeper.
- **Hold the ball under the blade of a handstick in a way that no other player has a possibility to play the ball without committing an offence.**

Motion n.07:

Introducing a New Procedure for Delayed Cards

KEY CHANGES:

- Visible referee signal: Requires referees to raise one hand when awarding advantage for an offence leading to a yellow or red card and keep it raised until play is stopped.
- Stopping play when the offending team gains possession: Requires play to stop as soon as the team that committed the offence gains possession, preventing it from benefiting from continued play after the offence.
- Goal scored during advantage: If the non-offending team scores, the card is still shown; however, the associated two-minute time penalty is cancelled when the sanction is a yellow card.
- Green card procedure unchanged: Green cards continue to be shown at the next dead moment when advantage is awarded.
- Restart procedure: After play is stopped, the necessary cards are issued and play resumes with a referee ball.
- Purpose: Clarifies the management of delayed cards, improves communication with teams and spectators, and prevents the offending team from gaining an unintended tactical advantage.

- **Regulatory reference**:

IPCH Game Rules — Rule 801, General Regulations for Penalties; ;
IPCH Game Rules — Rule 610, Advantage Rule.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

Under the current rules, when referees apply the advantage rule for an offence that would normally result in a card, the card is given at the next dead moment of the game. While this allows the advantage to be maintained, the current wording does not clearly define how a delayed card should be communicated to the teams and spectators. In addition, the next dead moment may occur only after a goal, or even at the end of the match, which can create situations where the team that committed the offence may benefit from the continuation of play.

The proposed amendment introduces a specific procedure for offences leading to a yellow or red card when advantage is awarded. The referees signal that a card is pending by raising one hand and keeping it raised until play is stopped. This provides an immediate and visible indication to the teams, officials and spectators that a card will be issued.

For offences leading to a yellow or red card, play is then stopped as soon as the team that committed the offence gains possession of the ball. This prevents that team from benefiting from the continuation of play after committing a sanctionable offence, while still allowing the non-offending team to retain the advantage created by the initial situation.

If the non-offending team scores a goal during the advantage, the card is still shown. However, where the sanction is a yellow card, the associated two-minute time penalty is cancelled. This ensures that the team benefiting from the advantage is not disadvantaged by the subsequent application of the card, while the disciplinary sanction itself remains recorded.

For green cards, the existing procedure remains unchanged: when advantage is awarded, the card is shown at the next dead moment.

The proposed procedure is based on established approaches used in other sports, including floorball and ice hockey, while being adapted to the specific penalty structure of IPCH. It provides a clear and visible mechanism for delayed cards, reduces ambiguity for referees and teams, and prevents the offending team from gaining an unintended tactical advantage from the application of the advantage rule.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 801 General regulations for penalties
Referees decide on all penalties during the match.

~~When an offence leading to a penalty is committed, the offender shall be penalized. If referees award advantage, penalties are imposed when the game is stopped (see 610 Advantage rule).~~

Players and members of the team staff can be penalized by Green Card (Official Warning), (Yellow Card (2-minute Time Penalty), or Red Card (Match Penalty) depending on the severity of offence. Player or a team member who is penalized will be shown the appropriate card by the referee.

After a penalty has been awarded, the game shall resume based on the reason for which it was stopped.

When players from both teams commit offences simultaneously, both players shall be penalized. Game shall continue with a referee ball.

The scorekeeper registers the match time of the penalty and the number of the player on the match form.

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 801 General regulations for penalties
Referees decide on all penalties during the match.

When an offence leading to a penalty is committed, the offender shall be penalized.

Players and members of the team staff can be penalized by Green Card (Official Warning), (Yellow Card (2-minute Time Penalty), or Red Card (Match Penalty) depending on the severity of offence. Player or a team member who is penalized will be shown the appropriate card by the referee.

After a penalty has been awarded, the game shall resume based on the reason for which it was stopped.

When an offence leading to a green card is committed and the referees decide to award advantage, the green card is given at the next dead moment of the game (see 610 Advantage rule).

When an offence leading to a yellow or red card is committed and the referees decide to award advantage, the game shall be stopped as soon as the team who has committed the offence gains possession of the ball. In this case referees raise one hand straight up when the advantage is given and keep it up until the game is stopped.
If the team who did not commit the offence scores a goal, the card is still given but in the case of a yellow card the 2-minutes time penalty is cancelled.
After stopping the game the necessary cards are given and the game continues with a referee ball."

When players from both teams commit offences simultaneously, both players shall be penalized. Game shall continue with a referee ball.

The scorekeeper registers the match time of the penalty and the number of the player on the match form.

Motion n.08:

Specifying the Rules About Cards During a Penalty Shot Series

KEY CHANGES:

- Cards may be issued during penalty shot series: Establishes that green, yellow and red cards can be given during a series.
- Accumulated cards carry over: Cards received during the match continue to count towards subsequent green and yellow card sanctions.
- No time penalties during the series: A person receiving a yellow or red card must leave the playing area and cannot participate in the following penalty shot series.
- Replacement of penalised participants: A penalised player or goalkeeper taking part in the series may be replaced by another eligible player, subject to the applicable class-point requirements for the first series.
- Equal numbers in subsequent series: If a player who has not yet taken a shot receives a yellow or red card during the second series and no eligible replacement is available, the opposing team must also remove one player from its list for that series. The removed player may be reinstated for a subsequent series.

- **Regulatory reference**:
  IPCH Game Rules — Rule 203, Penalty Shots After Extra Time.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

Under the current rules, there is no specific and comprehensive provision governing the application of cards during a penalty shot series. The existing rule only addresses the situation in which a player or goalkeeper incurs a match penalty during the series, without specifying how other cards should be handled or how cards received during the match affect disciplinary sanctions during the series.

The proposed amendment establishes a clear framework for the application of cards during a penalty shot series. It confirms that cards may be issued during the series and that cards received during the match continue to count towards subsequent green and yellow card sanctions.

As no time penalties are served during a penalty shot series, the proposal also clarifies that a person receiving a yellow or red card must leave the playing area and cannot participate in the following penalty shot series. Where the sanctioned person is one of the players or the goalkeeper participating in the series, they may be replaced by another eligible player, subject to the applicable class-point requirements.

The proposal further addresses the specific situation in which a player receives a yellow or red card during the second series and there is no eligible replacement available. In this case, the opposing team must also remove one player from its list for that series, ensuring that both teams have the same number of players available to take penalty shots. The removed player may be added again for a subsequent series if required.

The amendment therefore provides a clear and consistent procedure for disciplinary situations during penalty shot series, while maintaining continuity with the card sanctions accumulated during the match and ensuring equal conditions for both teams.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 203 Penalty shots after extra time

If the score after the extra-time is still equal, the match shall be decided by a penalty shot series.

Referees decide which goal to use.

To determine the team that starts the penalty shot series, referees perform a coin toss between the captains. The winner of the toss decides which team shall go first.

If one of the noted players or goalkeeper incurs a match penalty during the penalty shot series, the coach is allowed to choose another player/goalkeeper, who is not already in play as a substitute.

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 203 Penalty shots after extra time

If the score after the extra-time is still equal, the match shall be decided by a penalty shot series.

Referees decide which goal to use.

To determine the team that starts the penalty shot series, referees perform a coin toss between the captains. The winner of the toss decides which team shall go first.

Penalties during a penalty shot series
All cards can be given also during a penalty shot series.

Cards already given during the match still count towards the second green and/or yellow.

There are no time penalties during the penalty shot series. A person receiving a yellow or red card needs to leave the playing area and can not participate in the following penalty shot series. If the person was one of the players participating in the penalty shot series (including the goalkeeper), they can be replaced by another player (taking the rules about classpoints for the first series into account).

If a player who has not yet taken a penalty shot in the second series receives a yellow or a red card during the second series, and the team does not have a player to substitute, also the other team needs to remove one player from the list for that series in order to have the same number of players taking the penalty shots (the player removed from the list can be added to the following series if needed).

Motion n.09:

Change to how controls are requested during a match

KEY CHANGES:

- Team-initiated control requests: Allows coaches or team managers to request a control of an opponent's powerchair, stick or powerchair speed through the match table, provided their team still has the possibility to request a time-out.
- Request management: Limits teams to one outstanding request at a time. If both teams submit requests, they are handled at separate dead moments in the order received.
- Control procedure: The scorekeeper informs the referees, who conduct the control at the next dead moment of play. The Jury performs speed controls. Coaching is not permitted during the control.
- Illegal equipment: If the equipment does not comply with the rules, the player concerned receives a red card, with no consequences for the requesting team.
- Compliant equipment: If the equipment complies with the rules, the requesting team loses its time-out and the right to request further controls during that half.
- Existing authority preserved: The procedure complements, rather than replaces, the existing authority of referees and the Jury to conduct controls independently.

- **Regulatory reference**:
  IPCH Game Rules — Rule 203, Penalty Shots After Extra Time.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The current rules allow referees to check players' equipment at any time during the match or an intermission. In addition, the Jury can perform speed controls whenever they consider them necessary.

However, there is currently no formal procedure allowing a team to request a control of an opponent's equipment.

The proposed amendment introduces a challenge procedure for teams, allowing the coaches or team managers to request a control of an opponent's powerchair, stick or speed. This procedure is intended to complement, and not replace, the existing authority of Referees and Jury to carry out controls at their discretion.

The amendment also establishes a clear process for making and handling requests, including when the control takes place, who performs it and what happens depending on the result.

To prevent the challenge procedure from being used unnecessarily, a team can make only one request at a time. If the equipment is found to comply with the rules, the team loses its time-out and its possibility to request another control during that half. If the equipment is found to be illegal, the appropriate sanction is applied to the player concerned, with no consequence for the team that made the request.

The proposal therefore provides teams with a clear way to raise concerns about an opponent's equipment, while maintaining the existing right of referees and Jury to conduct controls independently whenever required.

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 506 Control of equipment

~~Referees can check any players equipment at any time during the match or an intermission.~~

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 506 Control of equipment

If the team still has the possibility to request a time-out, the coach(es) or the team manager can request a control of an opponent's equipment from the match table, specifying the player and equipment (powerchair, stick or the speed of the powerchair) they want to be controlled.

A team can only make one request at a time, and can not request another one before the first one is handled. If both teams request controls they are handled during two separate dead moments of play in the order they were requested.

The scorekeeper shall signal to the referees that an equipment control has been requested.

The referees (or jury in case of speed control) will perform the control at the next dead moment of play.

Coaching is not allowed during the control.

If the equipment is found to be against the rules the player concerned receives a red card and there are no consequences for the team that made the request.

If the equipment is within the rules the team loses their time-out and the possibility to request controls for that half.

Motion n.10:

Change to how yellow cards given to goalkeepers are handled

KEY CHANGES:

- Alternative player serves the penalty: When a goalkeeper receives a yellow card, the team captain selects another player on the field to serve the associated two-minute time penalty.
- Disciplinary responsibility remains with the goalkeeper: The yellow card is recorded against the goalkeeper on the match form, even though another player serves the penalty.
- Simplified substitution procedure: Removes the need to replace the penalised goalkeeper with another T-stick player solely to serve the penalty, reducing jersey changes and unnecessary delays.
- Two-minute penalty maintained: Preserves the duration of the team's numerical disadvantage without extending the effective power play or delaying the goalkeeper's return.

- **Regulatory reference**:
  IPCH Game Rules — Rule 804, Yellow Card (2-minute Time Penalty)

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The current rule requires a goalkeeper who receives a yellow card to serve the resulting 2-minute time penalty. The goalkeeper may then be replaced by another T-stick player who was active on the playing field when the penalty was awarded. In practice, this creates difficulties because the replacement player must temporarily become goalkeeper, while the penalised goalkeeper must be able to return directly to the playing field when the time penalty ends. With the requirement for goalkeepers to wear a different coloured shirt, this can require multiple jersey changes and cause unnecessary delays.

See clip: https://youtu.be/b4VmguxUDxs

Several alternative solutions have been considered, including delaying the goalkeeper's return until the next stoppage and having another player enter when the two-minute penalty expires. These alternatives can create other problems, such as extending the effective power play beyond two minutes or creating additional complications regarding substitutions and classification points.

The proposal therefore keeps the yellow card and disciplinary responsibility with the goalkeeper, while allowing another player to serve the associated 2-minute time penalty. This provides a practical procedure without delaying the game or extending the duration of the team's numerical disadvantage

Current Text

Game rules: Rule 804 Yellow Card (2-minute Time Penalty)

~~A goaltender with a 2-minute time penalty may be replaced by the other T-stick player who was active in the playing field when the time penalty was awarded. If the concerned team has no other T-stick player in the playing field, a hand stick player may be replaced by a T-stick player who will function as goaltender.~~

Proposed Text

Game rules: Rule 804 Yellow Card (2-minute Time Penalty)

If a goaltender receives a yellow card the captain chooses another player on the field to serve the 2-minute time penalty.

On the match form the yellow card is marked to the goalkeeper.

Motion n.11:

Team Assistant Swaps

KEY CHANGES:

- Replacement after the official arrival day: Allows a registered Team Assistant to be replaced during a competition, subject to prior approval from the IPCH Technical Delegate, IPCH Jury and Local Organising Committee (LOC).
- Registration and accreditation requirements: Replacement assistants must complete all required registration and Document Control procedures, including signing the applicable IPCH Code of Conduct, before accreditation is activated.
- Delegation limits maintained: The maximum number of Team Assistants permitted within the delegation must not be exceeded at any time. The overall maximum delegation size of 26 participants remains unchanged.
- Advance declaration and approval: Planned Team Assistant rotations must be declared during registration. Subsequent changes require prior IPCH approval; requests without prior notice are considered only in cases of emergency or force majeure.
- Participation fees: Every individual accredited as a Team Assistant during the competition is subject to the applicable Participation Fee and Capitation Fee, regardless of the duration of accreditation. No reduced or pro-rata fee applies.
- Coordination of changes: Replacement procedures require coordination between IPCH and the LOC, including deactivation of the outgoing assistant's accreditation before the replacement accreditation becomes valid.

- **Regulatory reference**:
  IPCH Game Rules — Rule 804, Yellow Card (2-minute Time Penalty)

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

In recent years, IPCH Technical Delegates and Local Organising Committees (LOCs) have received an increasing number of requests from participating teams to replace Team Assistants during longer competitions while maintaining the same delegation size. These requests are primarily driven by the growing number of athletes who rely on professional Personal Assistants or employed support staff. Employment contracts and national labour legislation—which vary between countries—often make it impractical or legally challenging for the same assistant to remain continuously available throughout an entire tournament.

The current regulations require Team Assistants to remain fixed for the duration of the competition. In practice, however, exceptions have been granted on a case-by-case basis. This has resulted in inconsistent decision-making, unequal treatment between teams, and uncertainty for both organisers and delegations.

This proposal does **not** increase the maximum delegation size or the number of Team Assistants permitted at any one time. It simply establishes a transparent and consistent procedure allowing one registered Team Assistant to be replaced by another during a competition, subject to IPCH approval and all applicable registration and accreditation requirements.

All replacement Team Assistants must complete the required registration and Document Control procedures before accreditation is activated. Furthermore, **every individual accredited as a Team Assistant during the competition shall be subject to the applicable Participation Fee (capitation fee),**

irrespective of the duration of their accreditation. Any additional logistical or financial implications arising from such replacements shall remain the responsibility of the participating team.

By formalising an existing practice, this amendment promotes fairness, supports compliance with employment obligations and national labour legislation, and provides a consistent framework for all participating teams.

The maximum delegation size of **26 participants** remains unchanged under this proposal. No additional delegation places are introduced.

Teams may replace Team Assistants during a competition under controlled conditions, provided that the maximum delegation size is not exceeded at any time.

Replacement Team Assistants must be registered and approved through the existing Document Control process before their accreditation is activated. Accreditation changes shall be coordinated between the IPCH Jury and the Local Organising Committee (LOC), with the outgoing accreditation deactivated before the replacement accreditation becomes valid.

All individuals accredited as Team Assistants during the competition, regardless of the duration of their accreditation, shall be considered members of the Team Delegation and shall be subject to the applicable Participation Fee (capitation fee). No reduced or pro-rata Participation Fee shall apply.

Any logistical, administrative, or financial implications arising from the replacement of Team Assistants shall remain the responsibility of the participating team.

Current Text

COMPETITION REGULATIONS: B.3. Changes in Team Delegations

7. Any changes to the Team Delegation made after submission of the Registration Form have to be communicated to the LOC and to the IPCH Technical Delegate as soon as possible. Team Managers will still have to hand over the Final List to the IPCH Jury upon arrival.

8. Changes to the team delegations are possible only until the official arrival day for team delegation of each competition.

9. If a registered member of a Team Delegation withdraws from the competition and is not replaced less than 2 months before the first day of the event or during the IPCH competition concerned, shall pay the Participation Fee to the Organising Committee.

Proposed Text

COMPETITION REGULATIONS: B.3. Changes in Team Delegations

7. Any changes to the Team Delegation made after submission of the Registration Form have to be communicated to the LOC and to the IPCH Technical Delegate as soon as possible. Team Managers will still have to hand over the Final List to the IPCH Jury upon arrival.

8. Changes to the Team Delegation are possible until the official arrival day for team delegation of each competition, **except for the replacement of registered Team Assistants in accordance with Article B.3.9.**

9. After the official arrival day, a registered **Team Assistant** may be replaced by another Team Assistant with the prior approval of the IPCH Technical Delegate, IPCH Jury and the Local Organising Committee (LOC), provided that:

- the replacement has completed all required registration and Document Control procedures;
- the replacement has signed the applicable IPCH Code of Conduct as part of the Document Control process, the maximum number of Team Assistants permitted within the delegation is not exceeded at any time;
- planned Team Assistant rotations shall be declared during the registration process. Any subsequent change to a declared rotation shall require prior approval from IPCH;
- requests submitted without prior notice will only be considered in cases of emergency or force majeure;
- all individuals accredited as Team Assistants remain subject to the applicable Participation Fee and Capitation Fee.

10. If a registered member of a Team Delegation withdraws from the competition and is not replaced less than 2 months before the first day of the event or during the IPCH competition concerned, shall pay the Participation Fee to the Organising Committee.

Motion n.12:

Introducing Pre-declared Reserve Players

KEY CHANGES:

- Reserve player allocation: Allows each participating nation to nominate up to two Reserve Players in addition to its registered player roster.
- Advance documentation and eligibility checks: Requires Reserve Players to submit all registration, eligibility and classification documentation within the same deadlines as registered players, including the Medical Diagnostic Form and supporting medical documentation required under the IPCH Classification Manual.
- Replacement deadline: Permits a Reserve Player to replace a registered player only before or on the official arrival day of the competition. No player replacements are permitted after that date.
- Delegation status and fees: Reserve Players are not considered members of the Team Delegation, are not accredited and incur no Participation or Capitation Fees unless they officially replace a registered player before the official arrival day.
- Registration and accreditation preparation: Requires the LOC registration process to include Reserve Player nominations, eligibility and classification information, and passport-style photographs to facilitate advance preparation.
- Delegation limits unchanged: Does not increase the maximum Team Delegation size or the number of players permitted to participate in the competition.

- **Regulatory reference**: Proposed new IPCH Competition Regulations — Section B.4, Reserve Players; consequential amendments to Organisers Regulations — Section 2.4.3, Registrations. Current Section B.4, Player Eligibility, would be renumbered B.5, Player Nationality Eligibility.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The new IPCH Classification Manual, developed in accordance with the IPC Classification Code and International Standards, introduces the mandatory **Underlying Health Condition Assessment (UHCA)** that needs to be conducted by external medical experts before an athlete's eligibility can be confirmed.

As these assessments may require consultation with independent specialists and cannot always be completed during the competition period, sufficient time must be available before the event to complete the eligibility process. This is particularly relevant where a nation wishes to replace a player before the official arrival day with an athlete who has not previously completed all required classification procedures.

This proposal preserves the current flexibility allowing nations to amend their final player roster before the competition while ensuring that all potential replacement athletes have submitted the required Medical Diagnostic Form, supporting medical documentation, and registration information within the established deadlines. This enables the Classification Committee to complete any necessary eligibility review or Underlying Health Condition Assessment before the competition begins.

Each nation may therefore nominate up to **two pre-declared Reserve Players**. Reserve Players are **not** members of the Team Delegation, are **not accredited**, and do **not** incur any Participation or Capitation Fees unless they officially replace a registered player before the competition. In that case, they become members of the Team Delegation under the same conditions as any other registered athlete.

The submission of reserve players also allows the LOC and IPCH to prepare the necessary registration data, photographs and accreditation information in advance, significantly simplifying the administrative process should a replacement become necessary before the competition.

Current Text

No current text available as this would be a new article

Proposed Text

B.4 Reserve Players

Each participating nation may nominate up to two (2) Reserve Players in addition to the registered player roster.

Reserve Players shall submit all registration, eligibility and classification documentation within the same deadlines applicable to registered players, including any Medical Diagnostic Form and supporting medical documentation required under the IPCH Classification Manual.

A Reserve Player shall not be considered a member of the Team Delegation, shall not receive accreditation, and shall not be subject to Participation or Capitation Fees unless officially replacing a registered player before the official arrival day of the competition.

Replacement of a registered player by a Reserve Player shall only be permitted before or on the official arrival day of the competition and in accordance with the Competition Regulations. After the official arrival day, no player replacements shall be permitted.

As a consequence the current rule **B.4 Player Eligibility** might be adjusted in **B.5 Player Nationality Eligibility**

<u>As a consequence the Organizers Regulations shall be amended as well as following:</u>
<u>2.4.3 Registrations</u>
LOC will develop in agreement with the IPCH Technical Delegates the Registration Form and Registration information.

The Registration Information to be given to the participating teams in the registration stage are :

- draft programme
- additional information about accommodation, meals and venues
- information about transportation between venues (if applicable)
- accreditation procedures and requirements
- classification information
- **procedures for the nomination of Reserve Players, including registration, classification and accreditation requirements;**
- media and communication information
- relevant information about power and electricity supplies
- contact information of the LOC
- final payment details
- Code of Conduct

In the Registration form the LOC shall ask following information

- Data of each Team Delegation Member (at least name, surname, nationality, date of birth, role within the team delegation) - the amount of required information might vary according to the needs of the LOC and applicable national laws..
- **Data for up to two (2) nominated Reserve Players, including all information required for eligibility verification, classification and accreditation preparation.**
- Final travel plan of each member of the team delegation
- Final on-site transportation requirements
- Room division suggestion
- Dietary requirements and allergies
- Special needs

The registration deadline date shall be at least 4 months prior to the event concerned.
The LOC and the IPCH Technical Delegates will agree on the relevant deadlines for both sending and receiving back the Registration package.

The Organizing Committee shall receive the Registration Form correctly filled in together with ~~high resolution digital team photograph (minimal 2400x1800 pixels) and portrait (passport like) photographs of all team delegation members (minimal 1.800x2400 pixels) at least 4 months before the concerned competition/event.~~

- **a high-resolution digital team photograph (minimum 2400 × 1800 pixels);**
- **passport-style portrait photographs (minimum 1800 × 2400 pixels) of all Team Delegation Members; and**
- **passport-style portrait photographs (minimum 1800 × 2400 pixels) of any nominated Reserve Players, where applicable;**

at least four (4) months before the competition.

Nominated Reserve Players shall submit all eligibility, registration and classification documentation within the same deadlines applicable to registered players, including any Medical Diagnostic Form and supporting medical documentation required under the IPCH Classification Manual.

Registration will only be confirmed upon receipt of the proof of payment of the final tranche of the participation fee as indicated in the Registration package.

After submission of the Registration Form any change in the list of people of the Team Delegation shall be communicated to the LOC and to the IPCH Technical Delegate as soon as possible. Team Managers will still have to hand over the Final List to the IPCH Jury upon arrival.

Motion n.13:

Aligning Team Area Limits with Team Delegation Limits

KEY CHANGES:

- Increased team assistant limit: Raises the maximum number of team assistants permitted in the Team Area from 10 to 13.
- Alignment with delegation limits: Aligns Rule 404 with the maximum Team Delegation of 26 persons established in the Competition Regulations.
- No change to other team composition limits: Retains the maximum of 2 coaches, 1 Team Manager and 10 players.
- Existing Team Area requirements maintained: All current rules governing accreditation, conduct, movement in and out of the Team Area, access to the playing field and referee area, and opening boundaries remain unchanged.
- No requirement to use the full allowance: The limit of 13 team assistants represents a maximum, not a mandatory number. Teams must continue to respect the physical capacity and designated function of the Team Area.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Game Rules — Rule 404, Team Staff

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The Competition Regulations permit a **Team Delegation of up to 26 persons**, while Rule 404 of the IPCH Game Rules currently limits the number of team members permitted in the Team Area to **23 persons**: up to 2 coaches, 1 Team Manager, 10 players and 10 team assistants.

This difference between the maximum Team Delegation and the maximum number of persons permitted in the Team Area has created uncertainty during competitions, particularly where teams have registered a full delegation but have not been able to accommodate all delegation members within the Team Area. This may result in delegation members repeatedly entering and leaving the Team Area during the match, creating unnecessary situations of non-compliance with the rules and potentially exposing individuals to disciplinary sanctions.

The proposed amendment therefore aims to **align the maximum number of persons permitted in the Team Area with the maximum Team Delegation of 26 persons**.

The amendment does **not** change the size, layout or designated function of the Team Area. All existing requirements governing the Team Area, including the obligation for coaches and other team members to remain within their designated Team Area during play and the existing provisions governing when they may leave it, remain fully applicable.

The proposed maximum of 13 team assistants should also not be interpreted as a requirement for teams to have 13 team assistants. It establishes the **maximum number of delegation members that may be accommodated in the Team Area**. Each National Association and team may determine the composition of its delegation according to its own needs, provided that the applicable maximum numbers and registration requirements are respected.

The total number of persons present in the Team Area must remain within the physical capacity of the designated area. **No enlargement or extension of the Team Area is intended or permitted as a result of this amendment.** Teams remain responsible for ensuring that all members of their delegation can be accommodated appropriately within the designated space without obstructing the playing field, referee area, match table or other operational areas of the venue.

Where a delegation member has media, communication or other non-sporting responsibilities, their presence in the Team Area remains subject to the applicable event and venue regulations. The Team Area is primarily a **sporting and team operational space** and must not be used as a general media or content-production area. Media activities must take place in the spaces and under the conditions designated by the Local Organising Committee and applicable competition regulations.

The proposed amendment therefore provides teams with greater flexibility in determining the composition of their Team Area while maintaining the existing spatial, operational and behavioural requirements. It is intended to prevent unnecessary movement of delegation members in and out of the Team Area and to provide a clear and consistent framework for the maximum number of people who may be present during a match.

Current Text

404 Team staff

Each team is allowed to have the following Team Members in the Team Area:

- Maximum 2 coaches (1 coach and 1 assistant coach)
- 1 Team Manager
- Maximum of 10 players
- Maximum of 10 team assistants

Each member of team staff must have an accreditation card.

The coach(es) are responsible for:

- Ensuring that the players meet the regulations with respect to sticks and powerchairs.
- Checking players' names, numbers and class points on the match form before the match starts.
- Ensuring that the team is present on the playing field and ready to play on time.
- Ensuring that the total of class points of the team on the playing field doesn't exceed 12 points.

The coach(es) or the Team manager are responsible for:

- Requesting the substitution of a player.
- Requesting an allocated time out.
- Requests are sent to the match table according to the event procedures and competition regulations.

During the match, coaches and other team members shall stay in their own team Area.

Coaches and other team members are allowed to leave the team area and enter the referee area/playing field:

- During the intermission and allocated and technical time outs.
- In case of an injury or powerchair defect, after the referee has stopped the match.

During the intermission, if they remain on the field, teams must stay in their own penalty area.

During the match, coaches and team assistants are not allowed to open the Boundaries.

Proposed Text

404 Team staff

Each team is allowed to have the following Team Members in the Team Area:

- Maximum 2 coaches (1 coach and 1 assistant coach)
- 1 Team Manager
- Maximum of 10 players
- **Maximum of 13 team assistants**

Each member of team staff must have an accreditation card.

The coach(es) are responsible for:

- Ensuring that the players meet the regulations with respect to sticks and powerchairs.
- Checking players' names, numbers and class points on the match form before the match starts.
- Ensuring that the team is present on the playing field and ready to play on time.
- Ensuring that the total of class points of the team on the playing field doesn't exceed 12 points.

The coach(es) or the Team manager are responsible for:

- Requesting the substitution of a player.
- Requesting an allocated time out.
- Requests are sent to the match table according to the event procedures and competition regulations.

During the match, coaches and other team members shall stay in their own team Area.
Coaches and other team members are allowed to leave the team area and enter the referee area/playing field:

- During the intermission and allocated and technical time outs.
- In case of an injury or powerchair defect, after the referee has stopped the match.

During the intermission, if they remain on the field, teams must stay in their own penalty area.

During the match, coaches and team assistants are not allowed to open the boundaries.

Motion n.14 + Motion n.15:

Review of Competition Group Formation

Motions M14 and M15, submitted respectively by the Athlete and Coaches Committee and by The Netherlands, address the same subject: the revision of the criteria and procedures used to form groups in IPCH competitions. Although both motions seek to address the same aspect of competition organisation, they present alternative proposals. Member Nations are therefore invited to review both options carefully and consider which approach they support.

Motion n.14

Introducing World Ranking-Based Pots for Competition Group Draws

KEY CHANGES:

- Seeding retained: The winner and runner-up of the previous edition remain the top seeds of Groups A and B, respectively.
- World Ranking-based allocation: All remaining participating teams are ordered according to the latest official IPCH World Ranking available at the time of the draw and divided into two pots.
- Two-pot system: Higher-ranked teams are placed in Pot 1 and the remaining teams in Pot 2, reducing the likelihood of highly ranked nations being drawn into the same group.
- Balanced distribution: Teams from each pot are randomly drawn into Groups A and B, with equal numbers from each pot allocated to each group.
- Pot size rules: Each pot must contain an even number of teams. Where an equal division into two even-sized pots is not possible, the pots are adjusted to the closest possible even sizes, with Pot 1 containing the larger number of teams.
- Random draw maintained: The procedure retains the random character of the drawing ceremony while introducing a ranking-based mechanism to promote more balanced groups.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Competition Regulations — Section C.1, Drawings Ceremony.

Presented by: IPCH SEC and Standing Committees

Purpose and Rationale

The current drawing procedure places the winner and runner-up of the previous edition of the same competition as the top seeds of Groups A and B. All remaining participating teams are then mixed together and drawn completely at random.

The level of national teams in Powerchair Hockey can vary significantly, particularly between the highest-performing nations and the rest of the field. Under the current procedure, there is therefore a risk that several highly ranked nations are randomly drawn into the same group, resulting in significantly uneven groups.

IPCH already maintains a World Ranking that provides an objective basis for comparing the current competitive level of participating nations.

The objective of this proposal is therefore to **create more balanced groups while maintaining an element of randomness in the drawing ceremony**. The winner and runner-up of the previous competition would continue to be placed as top seeds, while the remaining teams would be divided into two pots according to the World Ranking before being randomly drawn into the groups.

The proposal suggests to amend the drawing procedure so that, after the previous winner and runner-up have been placed as the top seeds of Groups A and B, all remaining participating teams are divided into two pots according to the official IPCH World Ranking.

The higher-ranked half of the remaining teams shall form **Pot 1**, while the lower-ranked half shall form **Pot 2**.

Each pot must contain an even number of teams so that the teams from each pot can be distributed equally between Groups A and B. If the remaining teams cannot be divided into two equally sized pots while maintaining an even number of teams in each pot, the size of the pots shall be adjusted accordingly, with Pot 1 containing the larger number of teams.

Teams from Pot 1 shall first be randomly drawn into Groups A and B, followed by the random drawing of teams from Pot 2.
The number of teams drawn from each pot into each group shall be distributed as equally as possible.

This approach maintains the random character of the drawing ceremony while reducing the likelihood of significantly unbalanced groups.

Current Text

C.1. Drawings Ceremony

1. The drawing ceremony shall take place at least 6 months before the competition starts.
2. The drawing ceremony is the moment when the participating teams are divided into groups by a lottery performed by IPCH representatives.
3. Procedure
    a. Previous winner of the same type of competition shall be placed in group A as top seed. The runner up of the same type of competition shall be placed in group B as top seed.
    b. All the other teams are mixed together and randomly picked for places A2 - B2 - A3 - B3 etc until the groups are full.
4. The duties and responsibilities of the organisers are explained in the IPCH Organisers Regulations.

Proposed Motion

C.1. Drawings Ceremony

1. The drawing ceremony shall take place at least 6 months before the competition starts.
2. The drawing ceremony is the moment when the participating teams are divided into groups by a lottery performed by IPCH representatives.

3. Procedure:
    a. The previous winner of the same type of competition shall be placed in Group A as top seed. The runner-up of the same type of competition shall be placed in Group B as top seed.
    b. All remaining participating teams shall be ordered according to the latest official IPCH World Ranking available at the time of the drawing ceremony and divided into two pots. The higher-ranked teams shall be placed in Pot 1 and the remaining teams in Pot 2.
    c. Each pot shall contain an even number of teams, allowing the teams from each pot to be distributed equally between Groups A and B. Where the remaining teams cannot be divided into two equally sized pots while maintaining an even number of teams in each pot, the pots shall be adjusted to the closest possible even sizes, with Pot 1 containing the larger number of teams.
    d. Teams from Pot 1 shall be randomly drawn into Groups A and B, with an equal number of teams from the pot placed in each group.
    e. Once all teams from Pot 1 have been drawn, teams from Pot 2 shall be randomly drawn into Groups A and B, with an equal number of teams from the pot placed in each group, until both groups are complete.
4. The duties and responsibilities of the organisers are explained in the IPCH Organisers Regulations.

Motion n.15

Replacing Drawings with World Ranking List-Based Group Divisions

KEY CHANGES:

- Removal of the drawing ceremony: Eliminates the requirement for a drawing ceremony for Regional Championships, World Championships, qualification tournaments and similar events.
- World Ranking-based allocation: Divides participating nations into groups according to the official IPCH World Ranking List, following the qualification and selection process set out in Competition Regulations B.1.
- Top seeds retained: The winner of the previous edition of the same type of competition heads Group A, while the runner-up heads Group B.
- Sequential group allocation: The remaining participating nations are allocated in World Ranking order, alternating between groups (e.g. Nation 3 to A2, Nation 4 to B2, and so on).
- Joint publication of group divisions: IPCH and the Local Organising Committee (LOC) may jointly publish the resulting group divisions.
- Organisational cost reduction: Removes the need for the LOC to organise and fund a drawing ceremony.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Competition Regulations — Section C.1 — consequential removal of the drawing ceremony provisions.

Presented by: The Netherlands

Purpose and Rationale

Currently for regional and world championships drawings are used to divide participating nations into groups. This has led to unequal division of nations leading to big differences in the group stage. The costs for a drawing ceremony need to be covered by the Local Organizing Committee.

By removing the need of drawings we could get more balanced group divisions and safe cost for the Local Organizing Committee as an additional advantage.

The aim of the proposal is to eliminate the need of drawings to have more balanced group divisions for regional ,world championships and similar events like qualification tournaments.

Current Text
IPCH Organiser Regulations/Section III Ceremonies:

1. DRAWING CEREMONY
The drawing ceremony is the moment when the participating teams are divided into groups by a lottery performed by IPCH representatives. The Drawing ceremony should be organised by the LOC in agreement with IPCH Technical Delegate(s) after receiving the confirmation from the participating Nations, The procedure for performing the lottery draw is explained in the IPCH Competition Regulations. The drawing ceremony should, if possible, be combined with promotional events for the sport or the competition, and should provide a presentation of the competition. The drawing ceremony shall be streamed, and participating nations representatives shall be informed in advance and invited to participate on site (if possible).

Proposed Text
The drawing ceremony should be removed from the Organiser Regulations. IPCH/LOC jointly could publish the group divisions.

In the Competition Regulations

C.1. Drawings Ceremony

should be replaced by C.1. Group Divisions with the following text:

The participating nations are divided into groups considering the following:

1. **How many nations are participating?**
2. **How many groups are needed?**
3. **Following the qualification/selection of nations participating as per Competition Regulations B1. Participation**
    a) **the winner of the same kind of event will head Group A.**
    b) **the runner-up of that event will head Goup B.**
    c) **any of the following slots are based on the remainder of participating nations in World**
    d) **Ranking List order. i.e. Nation 3 goes to slot A2, Nation 4 goes to slot B2 etc**

Motion n.14 + Motion n.15:

SEC and IPCH Standing Committees analysis

The SEC acknowledges that both motions aim to reduce the risk of unbalanced groups but adopt different approaches.

Netherlands Motion n.15 – Replace the Draw with World Ranking-Based Group Allocation
The proposal would eliminate the random draw and allocate teams to groups directly according to the World Ranking List. This would improve predictability, transparency and consistency in group allocation, while potentially reducing the organisational workload and costs associated with the drawing ceremony.

However, the World Ranking would become the sole basis for determining group composition, with no element of randomisation. As a result, any limitations in the ranking's ability to reflect teams' current competitive strength would directly affect group allocation. The proposed allocation method is straightforward for a two-group format; however, its application to competitions with different numbers of groups or alternative formats would require further rules.

ACC Motion n. 14 - Two-Pot World Ranking Draw
The proposal would use the World Ranking List to divide teams into seeding pots, while retaining the random draw to determine group allocation. This approach aims to reduce the risk of unbalanced groups while preserving an element of uncertainty and the sporting value of the draw.

However, it cannot guarantee balanced groups, as teams of similar competitive strength may still be drawn into the same group. Its effective implementation would also require clear rules on pot composition and team distribution, particularly where the number of participating teams is uneven or the competition format changes. These provisions would need to be sufficiently robust to ensure consistent application across competitions.

Overall Assessment
The SEC also recognises that the drawing ceremony can serve purposes beyond determining group composition. While its promotional impact may vary depending on the format and context, it can provide an opportunity to engage a wider audience, attract media attention and develop partnerships. Previous editions have demonstrated its potential to support local promotion, networking and fundraising. The ceremony can also provide an additional opportunity for the appointed Technical Delegate to meet the Local Organising Committee (LOC), visit the competition venues and review operational arrangements at a stage when the event's technical requirements can be assessed more directly.

Conversely, retaining the ceremony does not automatically guarantee these benefits, and its organisation entails costs and resource requirements. If the ceremony were removed, the potential savings should therefore be considered alongside the possible need for a separate technical visit to ensure adequate venue familiarisation and coordination between the Technical Delegate and the LOC. Any such requirement should be reflected in the Organizers Regulations.

The SEC also notes that allocating teams solely on the basis of the World Ranking List could create additional strategic incentives for Member Nations. Participation in ranking competitions, as well as competitive decisions in individual matches, could potentially be influenced by the impact on future ranking positions and, consequently, group allocation at major championships. While this does not imply that nations would deliberately seek to manipulate their ranking, making the World Ranking the sole determinant of group composition could increase the strategic importance of ranking positions beyond their primary purpose of reflecting competitive performance. This potential unintended consequence should be considered when assessing the long-term implications of the proposal.

Member Nations should consider these sporting, organisational and promotional implications when deciding whether to support either proposal or retain the current system.

Motion n.16

Introducing a Running Clock When the Goal Difference Reaches Ten Goals

KEY CHANGES:

- Running-clock threshold: Introduces a running clock whenever the goal difference between the teams reaches ten goals or more.
- Clock management during stoppages: The clock continues to run following a referee's whistle and throughout the subsequent dead-ball period while the goal difference remains at least ten goals.
- Return to normal timing: If the goal difference falls below ten, the clock resumes the standard effective playing-time procedure, stopping at referee interventions until play restarts.
- Existing rules maintained: The amendment affects only match-clock operation. Referee authority, penalties, restarts and other playing rules remain unchanged.
- Specific exceptions preserved: Rule 710, which requires game time to stop throughout a penalty shot, remains applicable unless separately amended.
- Operational consistency: Related competition and officiating instructions should be reviewed to ensure consistent implementation by referees, timekeepers and match officials.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Game Rules — Rule 201, Regular Game Time; Rule 710, Penalty Shot

Presented by: Finland

Purpose and Rationale

Under the current Game Rules, the match clock stops every time the referee intervenes in the match by a whistle signal. This applies regardless of the score or the goal difference between the teams.

When the goal difference reaches ten or more, stopping the clock for every referee intervention may unnecessarily extend a match whose outcome is already likely to be clear. Introducing a running clock in this situation would help matches proceed more efficiently and support competition scheduling, while allowing normal effective playing time to resume if the goal difference falls below ten.

The proposed change concerns only the operation of the match clock. All referee decisions, penalties, restarts and other rules of play would continue to apply normally.

Proposal is to amend Rule 201, Regular game time, of the IPCH Game Rules so that the match clock does not stop for a referee's whistle while the goal difference between the teams is ten (10) goals or more. If the goal difference subsequently falls below ten goals, the match clock shall again operate according to the normal effective playing-time rules.

The purpose of the amendment is to reduce unnecessary delays when the goal difference is ten goals or more and to make the duration of matches more predictable.

The running-clock procedure would begin as soon as the goal difference reaches ten. During this period, the clock would continue to run when the referee stops play with a whistle. If the goal difference later falls below ten, normal effective playing time would resume from that point.

The amendment would not change the duration of the two match halves, the authority of the referees, the rules governing penalties or the procedures for restarting play. It would only change whether the match clock stops during referee interventions when the specified goal-difference threshold applies.

Current Text

201 Regular game time

The match consists of two halves of 20 minutes playing time, with a break of 10 minutes between periods.
The playing time is as described below:

- The game is in play when the match clock starts at the commencement of each match, half time, extra time and/or when the referee whistles for resumption of play.
- The match clock stops every time the referee intervenes the match by a whistle signal. The game is considered 'dead' until the referee whistles for resumption of play.

Each match half or extra time is over as soon as the signal sounds. If the hall is not equipped with a signal or the signal is not loud enough, the period or match is over as soon as the referee ends it with the appropriate whistle signal.

Proposed Text

201 Regular game time

The match consists of two halves of 20 minutes playing time, with a break of 10 minutes between periods.
The playing time is as described below:

- The game is in play when the match clock starts at the commencement of each match, half time, extra time and/or when the referee whistles for resumption of play.
- The match clock stops every time the referee intervenes in the match by a whistle signal. The game is considered 'dead' until the referee whistles for resumption of play.

When the goal difference between the teams is ten goals or more, the match clock shall continue to run following a referee's whistle signal and during the subsequent dead-ball period. If the goal difference falls below ten goals, the match clock shall again stop following a referee's whistle signal and remain stopped until the referee whistles for resumption of play.

Amendments: The Game Rules and any related competition or officiating instructions should be reviewed to ensure that the running-clock procedure is applied consistently by referees, timekeepers and match officials. Rules that expressly require the match clock to be stopped in specific situations shall continue to apply unless separately amended. This includes Rule 710, which states that game time shall be stopped during the entire penalty shot.

Motion n.16:

SEC and IPCH Standing Committees analysis

Prior to receiving the motion submitted by Finland, the SEC and IPCH Standing Committees had already discussed and analysed the issue of very large goal differences, including through discussions with World Abilitysport. Following this assessment, it was decided not to submit a motion on this matter, as the available considerations did not provide sufficient grounds to conclude that a regulatory change was necessary. However, the possibility that a Member Nation might propose such an amendment was anticipated. The following assessment outlines the main considerations informing the SEC's position.

Sporting and competition considerations
Large goal differences may reflect differences in the competitive level and development of participating nations. While a running-clock rule may be appropriate in some national competitions, its application in international championships requires consideration of the broader sporting context.

International competitions involve not only match outcomes but also individual performances, official statistics, Top Scorer rankings, records and opportunities for athletes to contribute to their teams' results. Introducing a running clock once the goal difference reaches ten goals could reduce the playing time available to athletes and affect these outcomes. Any such change would therefore need to be assessed against the importance of maintaining consistent playing conditions and the integrity of individual and team statistics.

Feedback from players who have experienced large defeats has also highlighted that teams should be allowed to continue competing at full ability. Reducing the competitive effort of the leading team could be perceived as disrespectful to the opposition, while continued competition may provide valuable experience for developing nations.

Operational considerations
As there are several factors that impact the length of matches, introducing a running clock may not achieve the intended purpose of making the competition more efficient or its overall schedule more predictable. Additional factors include, but aren't limited to:

- when in the match the 10-goal differential is reached (early in the first half or late in the second),
- the number of cards given to players,
- player injuries, and
- technical time outs.

Implementation would also require clear procedures for switching between running-clock and standard timing, including the interaction with existing provisions such as Rule 710 on penalty shots. Referees, timekeepers and other match officials would need to apply these procedures consistently.

Longer-term development considerations

Very large goal differences should also be considered in the context of the development of the sport internationally. They may partly reflect differences in the maturity, experience and competitive resources of participating nations. While competition regulations can address some immediate consequences, they do not necessarily resolve these underlying differences.

Longer-term measures could include strengthening development opportunities and considering whether different levels or circuits of international competition could provide more regular matches between teams of comparable competitive strength.

Overall Evaluation

The SEC and IPCH Standing Committees recognise the operational concerns underlying the Finnish proposal. However, based on their previous assessment, they consider that the case for introducing a running clock in international competitions has not been sufficiently established.

While running-clock adjustments have reportedly been adopted with positive results in some national leagues and competitions, the **different nature and objectives of international championships, including European and World Championships, must be taken into account. In these competitions, playing time, individual performances, official statistics, scoring records and individual awards all form part of the sporting context**. **Furthermore, a running clock may shorten individual matches but does not necessarily improve the overall efficiency or predictability of tournament operations.**

The SEC and IPCH Standing Committees therefore consider that these implications should be carefully weighed by Member Nations, to whom the final decision rests.

Regardless of the outcome of this motion, the SEC and IPCH Standing Committees reaffirm their commitment to supporting the development of the sport and encourage all Member Nations to contribute actively to initiatives that promote participation, technical development and opportunities for international competition. **Reducing competitive gaps requires a collective effort to support emerging nations, facilitate exchanges and create more opportunities for teams to develop through regular competition**.

In the longer term, this may also involve exploring different competition levels or circuits, as seen in other sports, to provide teams with more appropriate competitive pathways. Such developments could create opportunities to review qualification systems and competition formats, with the aim of promoting more balanced and meaningful competition while preserving the sporting integrity of international championships.

The challenge of large goal differences should therefore be considered not only in terms of match-clock regulations, but also as part of the broader development of international Powerchair Hockey. Member Nations are encouraged to consider both the immediate implications of the proposed amendment and the collective opportunities to strengthen the competitive structure of the sport.

Motion n.17

Change to the 10-Team Tournament Playoff System

KEY CHANGES:

- Revised playoff structure: Increases the number of playoff matches from 9 to 11 for competitions with 10 participating teams.
- Direct qualification for group winners: The first-placed teams in Groups A and B qualify directly for the semi-finals, rewarding group-stage performance.
- Expanded medal opportunities: Second- and third-placed teams compete in qualification matches for places 1–6, giving third-placed teams a pathway to the semi-finals and medal matches.
- Revised placement matches: Fourth- and fifth-placed teams compete in placement semi-finals for positions 7–10, followed by matches determining final rankings.
- All positions determined on the field: Maintains meaningful placement matches and determines the final standings from first to tenth place through competition.
- Increased competitive engagement: Aims to maintain sporting incentives throughout the group stage and playoff phase.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Competition Regulations — Section C.2, Article 13, 10-Team Tournament Playoff System.

Presented by: Finland

Purpose and Rationale

The current playoff system for competitions with 10 participating teams places only the top two teams from each group into the medal playoffs, while teams finishing third and fourth compete for places 5–8 and fifth placed teams play only for places 9–10. This means that teams finishing third in their groups have no opportunity to compete for medals despite often being very close in performance to the second-placed teams.

The proposed amendment rewards group winners by granting direct access to the semi-finals while still allowing teams finishing second and third in the groups to compete for medal positions through qualification matches. The proposal also ensures that all teams continue to play placement matches after the group stage and that final rankings from 1st to 10th place are determined on the field. This structure creates a stronger incentive to win the group while increasing competitive opportunities for more teams.

The proposal aims to amend Competition Regulations Article C.2.13 to introduce a revised playoff structure for competitions with 10 participating teams.
The proposed format:

- rewards winning the group through direct qualification to the semi-finals
- allows more teams to compete for medals
- provides meaningful placement matches for all teams
- determines all final rankings from 1st to 10th on the field
- increases competitive interest throughout the tournament

Current Text

IPCH Competition Regulations C.2 Playing system

13. In case of 10 participating teams, the Play Offs (8 matches) shall be conducted in the following order:

a. 1st match for placing 5 - 8: 3rd of group A - 4th of group B
b. 2nd match for placing 5 - 8: 3rd of group B - 4th of group A
c. Semi-Final 1 for placing 1 - 4: 1st group A - 2nd group B
d. Semi-Final 2 for placing 1 - 4: 1st group B - 2nd group A
e. Match for places 9 and 10: 5th of group A - 5th of group B
f. Match for places 7 and 8: loser of a) - loser b)
g. Match for places 5 and 6: winner of a) - winner of b)
h. Bronze medal Match for places 3 and 4: loser of c) - loser of d)
i. Gold medal Match for places 1 and 2: winner of c) - winner of d)

Proposed Text

IPCH Competition Regulations C.2 Playing system

Replace Article C.2.13 with the following:

13. In case of 10 participating teams, the Play Offs (**11 matches**) shall be conducted in the following order:

a. Qualification Match 1 for places 1-6: 2nd group A - 3rd group B
b. Qualification Match 2 for places 1-6: 2nd group B - 3rd group A
c. Placement Semi-Final 1 for places 7-10: 4th group A - 5th group B
d. Placement Semi-Final 2 for places 7-10: 4th group B - 5th group A
e. Match for places 9 and 10: loser of c) - loser of d)
f. Semi-Final 1 for places 1-4: 1st group B - winner of a)
g. Semi-Final 2 for places 1-4: 1st group A - winner of b)
h. Match for places 5 and 6: loser of a) - loser of b)
i. Match for places 7 and 8: winner of c) - winner of d)
j. Bronze Medal Match for places 3 and 4: loser of f) - loser of g)
k. Gold Medal Match for places 1 and 2: winner of f) - winner of g)

Motion n.17

SEC and IPCH Standing Committees analysis

The Finnish proposal seeks to revise the playoff format for 10-team competitions, allowing third-placed teams in the group stage to compete for medal positions while rewarding group winners with direct qualification to the semi-finals. The proposal **increases the number of playoff matches from nine to eleven**, based on the current listed match sequence and the format used at the 2026 World Championship.

Sporting Considerations
The proposal has a clear sporting rationale. It provides third-placed teams with an additional opportunity to compete for medals, particularly where the difference in performance between second and third place in a group may be small. At the same time, direct qualification to the semi-finals rewards group winners and increases the importance of finishing first in the group.

The proposed format also maintains placement matches for teams outside the medal positions, ensuring that all teams continue to compete for their final ranking. However, the extent to which the revised format improves the overall competitive experience should be considered alongside its operational implications.

Operational Considerations

An additional competition day would therefore be required to implement the proposed format sustainably. Distributing the playoff matches over three days would help maintain appropriate intervals between matches, preserve athlete recovery time and provide more manageable working hours for Technical Delegates, officials, medical personnel, the LOC and other members of the competition workforce.

The additional day would also allow sufficient time for technical meetings, evaluations, administrative work and other activities essential to the delivery of an international championship.

Implementing this change would require a revised competition schedule, potentially involving earlier arrivals, later departures or other adjustments to the event programme. It would also have financial implications, including potential additional accommodation, staffing, venue and other organisational costs for the LOC and participating teams.

Overall Evaluation

The SEC and IPCH Standing Committees recognise the strong sporting rationale of the Finnish proposal. By allowing third-placed teams to compete for medal positions while rewarding group winners with direct qualification to the semi-finals, the revised format could increase competitiveness, create more unpredictable playoff match-ups and enhance the overall sporting appeal of the championship. The proposal also ensures that all final positions are determined through matches.

However, its implementation has significant operational and financial implications. The proposal applies specifically to competitions with ten participating teams and increases the playoff phase from nine to eleven matches, based on the match sequence used at the 2026 World Championship.

The scheduling analysis indicates that **an additional competition day would be necessary to implement the proposed format sustainably**. The existing six-day competition programme was already extremely demanding with ten participating teams. Accommodating eleven playoff matches within the current Saturday/Sunday window would extend competition days considerably and place additional pressure on athletes, officials, Technical Delegates, classifiers, medical personnel and the wider Local Organising Committee (LOC).

Adding a competition day would allow the playoff matches to be distributed across three days, helping to maintain appropriate intervals between matches, preserve athlete recovery time and provide more sustainable working conditions for the personnel responsible for delivering the event. It would also allow sufficient time for the technical, administrative and evaluation activities that are essential to the successful delivery of an international championship.

Member Nations should therefore be aware that adopting this proposal would require a corresponding revision of the competition schedule. This would mean either bringing forward arrivals, postponing departures or otherwise reorganising the event programme to accommodate the additional day. These changes would have financial implications, including potential additional accommodation, staffing, venue and other organisational costs for the LOC and participating teams.

Overall, the SEC and IPCH Standing Committees consider the proposal **sportingly interesting and worthy of consideration**, provided that its operational requirements are fully recognised. Member Nations should assess not only the benefits of the revised playoff format, but also their willingness to support the additional competition day and the associated costs necessary to implement it while maintaining appropriate playing conditions, recovery periods and operational standards.

Motion n.18

Individual choice of official accommodation

KEY CHANGES:

- Individual accommodation choice: Allows each registered delegation member to choose between official LOC accommodation and independently arranged accommodation at IPCH World and European Championships.
- Official accommodation maintained: Requires the LOC to continue offering an official central accommodation package that meets applicable IPCH accessibility requirements.
- No change to delegation status: Members choosing independent accommodation retain their delegation membership, accreditation, sporting eligibility and access to required competition services. Dependants staying with them do not acquire delegation status or accreditation.
- Separate pricing and no double payment: Requires competition fees and official accommodation costs to be listed separately. Members choosing independent accommodation before the booking deadline would not pay for an unused official accommodation place, and no surcharge could be imposed solely for choosing an alternative.
- Responsibilities of Member Nations: Requires nations to arrange and cover the costs of independent accommodation, including associated accessibility, meals, care and transport arrangements, and to provide the required accommodation details by the registration deadline.
- Registration and implementation: Allows IPCH or the LOC to request a brief reason under a published procedure, with personal information handled confidentially. Related registration, transport, financial and accommodation provisions would need consequential amendments.

- **Regulatory reference**: IPCH Organiser Regulations – Part I, Section 4.2, Team Delegation Accommodation & Meals; consequential amendments to Sections 2.4, 5 and 6.1 of Part I, and Sections 1, 3.1 and 4 of Part II.

Presented by: Belgium

Purpose and Rationale

At many Powerchair Hockey championships, teams stay together in one central accommodation venue rather than in separate hotels. This arrangement should remain available because it supports accessibility, transport, meals and team operations. The problem is that accommodation is generally booked for the delegation as a whole, leaving little flexibility when one athlete needs a different arrangement.

One example reported by Belgium involved an athlete who was still breastfeeding her baby. The baby had to travel and stay with the mother but could not be registered as a member of the official delegation. Because the central sleeping venue was restricted to delegation members, the baby could not stay there. If accommodation can only be selected for the entire delegation, the apparent alternatives are to move the whole team or make the athlete's participation impracticable. In addition, the team may have to pay both for the unused official room or bed and for the external accommodation needed by the mother and baby. Neither is proportionate. This is one illustration of a broader problem that can also arise from accessibility, medical, care, family or personal-support needs.

The proposed change creates a limited, individual opt-out. One registered athlete, or a small number of registered delegation members, may stay in independently arranged accommodation while the rest of the team uses the official central venue. The independently accommodated persons remain full members of the delegation and retain the same sporting rights and accreditation. Their Member Nation assumes responsibility for the external accommodation and any services not booked from the LOC.

This general approach can address the Belgian example and comparable accessibility, medical, care, family or personal-support situations while allowing IPCH or the LOC to request a brief reason where the published procedure requires it, without obliging them to arrange extra accommodation. Examples from other para sports show that competition charges and accommodation charges can be stated separately.

Why this change is needed

One concrete example is a breastfeeding athlete whose baby must travel and stay with her but cannot be accredited as a delegation member or admitted to the central sleeping venue. The current delegation-level approach does not address this situation. Requiring the athlete to separate from her baby can make participation impracticable, while moving the entire team is unnecessary, expensive and disruptive. A per-person choice allows the athlete and baby to stay externally while the official central accommodation continues for the rest of the team. In this example, the baby remains outside the delegation and receives no accreditation or competition access. The same general rule may assist delegation members with other accommodation needs. The Member Nation pays for the external accommodation but does not also pay for an unused official room, bed or package place for the athlete.

The administrative impact is limited. The LOC continues to organise one official accommodation package. It only needs to publish the competition and accommodation amounts separately and add a per-person accommodation choice to the existing form. The Member Nation, not IPCH or the LOC, arranges and carries the risk and cost of external accommodation and associated services. If a brief reason is required, it can be collected through the existing form under published criteria rather than through a separate accommodation process.

Examples of separate pricing in other para sports

Para table tennis (ITTF): The supplied example offers a three-night package including transport and full-board accommodation at EUR 610 for a triple-room option, EUR 640 for a double-room option and EUR 720 for a single-room option. An accreditation-only option is separately listed at EUR 350.

Para swimming: A competition-fee example lists EUR 500 per athlete or team official and EUR 350 per relay-only athlete. The separate Kocaeli 2026 accommodation guide lists official hotel options and states that accommodation includes breakfast, lunch and dinner.

Para dance sport (World Abilitysport): The supplied example lists an entry fee of EUR 20 per person per day and a registration fee of EUR 50. Accommodation is priced separately at EUR 180 per single room per night or EUR 150 per person per night in a double room. A three-day meal package is separately priced at EUR 200 per person.

Source of the pricing examples: information supplied by Sofie Meneve, G-sport Vlaanderen, on 6 August 2026. These examples illustrate a workable pricing structure and are not proposed IPCH fee amounts.

Current Text

New provision: no existing paragraph is proposed for replacement.

Proposed Text

Add a subsection under IPCH Organiser Regulations, Part II, section 1, Participation Fee.

Relevant provisions to align: Part I, sections 2.4 (Entries & Registrations), 4.2 (Team Delegation Accommodation & Meals), 5 (Transportation) and 6.1 (Competition/Event Information); Part II, sections 1 (Incomes), 3.1 (Travel Costs for Team Delegations) and 4 (Costs for Accommodation, Meals & Refreshments).

Reference: Edition 2024, valid from January 2025, linked on IPCH's official Competition Regulations webpage. The SEC shall confirm the numbering against the edition in force

ADD under Part I, section 4.2, Team Delegation Accommodation & Meals: Individual accommodation choice

1. At every IPCH World Championship and European Championship, the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) shall continue to arrange and offer an official accommodation package that meets the applicable IPCH accessibility requirements.

2. A Member Nation may choose, separately for each registered member of its delegation, either (a) the official accommodation package or (b) independently arranged accommodation. This choice may apply to one person, several persons or the whole delegation. The LOC or IPCH may require the Member Nation to provide a brief reason for the choice, using the published entry or accommodation procedure.

3. Choosing independent accommodation shall not affect a person's membership of the registered delegation, accreditation, sporting eligibility or access to required competition services. It does not allow a person who is ineligible for delegation membership to be accredited. It does allow a registered delegation member to stay externally with a dependent infant or another person who cannot stay at the official venue. This does not give that person delegation status or accreditation.

4. The LOC shall publish a competition-only fee per registered delegation member and the price of the official accommodation package separately. It shall also continue to offer a combined competition and accommodation package. For each person choosing independent accommodation before the booking deadline, no official accommodation charge shall be payable and the Member Nation shall not be required to reserve or pay for an unused official room, bed or package place for that person. This prevents double payment for official and external accommodation. No surcharge shall be imposed solely because independent accommodation was chosen.

5. The Member Nation shall identify the persons using independent accommodation and provide their accommodation address and a contact person by the normal registration deadline. The declaration, and any brief reason required by the LOC or IPCH, should be included in the existing entry or accommodation form. Any assessment criteria and deadline shall be published in advance, and personal or medical information shall be handled confidentially.

6. The Member Nation is responsible for arranging and paying for independent accommodation and for its accessibility, care arrangements, meals and transport. The LOC is not required to provide accommodation services, meals or transport to or from an independently selected venue unless those services are separately offered and booked. All delegation members must attend required competition activities on time and comply with applicable safety and insurance requirements.

7. Changes or cancellations of official accommodation already booked remain subject to the published booking and cancellation conditions.

Consequential amendments: Align Part I, sections 2.4 (Entries & Registrations), 5 (Transportation) and 6.1 (Competition/Event Information), and Part II, sections 1 (Incomes), 3.1 (Travel Costs for Team Delegations) and 4 (Costs for Accommodation, Meals & Refreshments). Update host contracts, bid requirements, invitations and forms so the choice can be recorded per registered delegation member. The new provision shall apply where the first official invitation is issued after adoption.

Motion n.18

SEC and IPCH Standing Committees analysis

1. Operational, Financial and Governance Implications
The SEC recognises the importance of accommodating individual needs and ensuring that all athletes can participate in international competitions in safe, accessible and appropriate conditions. However, **the Belgian motion proposes a general right for individual delegation members, or entire delegations, to opt out of official accommodation.** This goes beyond providing flexibility in exceptional circumstances and would fundamentally change the operational and financial model of IPCH Championships.

Official accommodation is not simply a hotel booking or an optional service. It is an integral part of the Championship environment, upon which the Local Organising Committee (LOC) bases its planning, contractual commitments and delivery of essential services. Accommodation is closely connected to room allocations, accessibility requirements, catering, transport, accreditation, emergency procedures and the day-to-day coordination of teams. These arrangements are planned as an integrated system to ensure the safe, efficient and consistent delivery of the competition for all participating nations.

Introducing a general opt-out mechanism would significantly increase operational complexity without removing the LOC's existing responsibilities or contractual commitments. The LOC would need to coordinate participants staying across multiple locations, reconcile accommodation choices with pre-agreed room allocations, manage meal provision and transport across different sites, and ensure that accessible rooms and suitable facilities are available where required. Communication, emergency planning and the coordination of athletes, personal assistants and other delegation members would also become more complex. These additional demands would require further planning, administrative resources and coordination, placing a significant additional burden on the LOC and potentially affecting the overall delivery of the Championship.

These challenges are particularly significant in IPCH, where accessible accommodation, appropriate facilities and equipment requirements must be identified and coordinated well in advance. Centralised accommodation allows the LOC to manage these needs in a more consistent and predictable way. Dispersing delegations across multiple locations would make this process considerably more difficult and could introduce additional accessibility and transport challenges.

The financial implications are equally concerning. Accommodation contracts are negotiated in advance and may include minimum room commitments, cancellation conditions and costs linked to other services. Allowing participants to opt out does not automatically release the LOC from these obligations or eliminate the costs of rooms already contracted. Similarly, separating the competition fee from the accommodation price does not, in itself, resolve the financial exposure associated with unused rooms or other fixed commitments.

If participants opt out while the LOC remains liable for the contracted accommodation costs, the resulting shortfall would need to be absorbed by the organiser or recovered elsewhere. This could require an increase in the competition fee payable by all participating nations, including those continuing to use official accommodation. Teams opting for independent accommodation would, in addition, have to cover their own accommodation costs and potentially additional transport and support expenses.

The proposed model could therefore increase, rather than reduce, the overall cost of participation. Its financial impact would depend on the number of participants opting out and the contractual conditions of each Championship, but the motion does not eliminate the underlying costs or explain how these risks would be sustainably managed. Instead, it risks transferring the financial consequences of individual accommodation choices to the LOC and, ultimately, to the wider membership.

Experience from other events reinforces these concerns. Following the August 2026 event, during which a small number of teams requested independent accommodation arrangements, **The World Abilitysport Governing Board has confirmed that it does not intend to offer individual, out of package, accommodation choices as a general policy in future. World Abilitysport has also expressed concern about its events being used as a precedent in support of the present motion, particularly given the practical difficulties and potential inequalities that can arise from allowing participants to make separate accommodation arrangements**

This experience is relevant because it demonstrates that the question is not simply whether independent accommodation can be arranged in individual cases, but whether it is operationally and financially sustainable when offered as a general option across an international competition. The difficulties experienced by another international sport organisation provide a practical warning against introducing a model that could create similar challenges for IPCH and its LOCs.

The proposed motion would also have significant implications for accreditation and the consistent application of Championship regulations. **A delegation member remains subject to the applicable accreditation requirements, Code of Conduct and competition rules regardless of where they are accommodated.** If delegation members were distributed across multiple external locations, IPCH and the LOC would need to determine how operational

communication, emergency procedures, safeguarding arrangements and other applicable requirements could be implemented and monitored consistently.

If external accommodation were to form part of the official Championship environment, further questions would arise regarding the responsibilities, controls and requirements applicable to those locations. This would add administrative and operational obligations and would require a substantial review of the relevant regulations and procedures. The motion therefore cannot be considered a simple change to accommodation arrangements; it would have consequences for the wider governance and delivery of the Championship.

Furthermore, a general opt-out mechanism could create inequalities in the practical support available to different delegations, even when they remain subject to the same formal delegation limits. Different accommodation arrangements could lead to different support networks, logistical conditions and access to additional assistance, making consistent oversight and equitable treatment more difficult to maintain.

Taken together, these considerations demonstrate that the proposed mechanism would introduce substantial operational complexity, financial uncertainty and administrative burden. **The central issue is not whether exceptional accommodation arrangements should be possible, but whether a general right to opt out is proportionate, sustainable and compatible with the effective delivery of IPCH Championships.** The SEC considers that the consequences of such a structural change have not been adequately addressed by the motion.

The SEC therefore supports retaining official accommodation as the standard Championship model, while allowing genuinely exceptional needs to be addressed through a clear, confidential and case-by-case procedure. This approach would preserve the ability to respond appropriately to individual circumstances without transferring disproportionate financial and operational risks to the LOC or compromising consistency between participating nations.

2. Safeguarding and the Specific Circumstances Referenced in the Motion

The SEC recognises the importance of safeguarding both athletes and children. However, it does not consider it appropriate to comment further on the specific circumstances concerning the child present during the 2026 World Cup, or to use that individual case as the determining argument for or against the proposed motion.

The matter was managed by **IPCH in coordination with World Abilitysport, with reference to the applicable IPC and World Abilitysport safeguarding frameworks. Advice and reassurance were also sought from legal professionals and experts in safeguarding and human rights management in major sporting events**. The procedure applied was considered appropriate in its objective of safeguarding both the athlete and the child.

More generally, the SEC considers that the specific needs of individual athletes, including family-care and personal-assistance requirements, should be identified and addressed through appropriate advance planning involving the athlete, their national team delegation and the support personnel available on site. IPCH and the LOC should work with the relevant delegation representatives to identify reasonable and appropriate arrangements within the framework of the Championship.

This reflects a **shared responsibility**: organisers must provide a safe, accessible and workable competition environment, while national delegations are responsible for planning and organising the specific support needs of their members, including appropriate care arrangements where required.

The circumstances of an individual case should not, in themselves, determine the merits of a general accommodation policy. The motion must instead be assessed against its wider operational, financial and governance implications and its potential impact on the sustainable and equitable delivery of future IPCH Championships.

3. Institutional Position and Recommendation to Member Nations
Following a review of the proposed motion and its operational, financial and governance implications, **the SEC, the IPCH Standing Committee and World Abilitysport do not support the Belgian motion in its current form.**

This position reflects the significant practical challenges that the proposed approach would create for the organisation and delivery of IPCH Championships, including the potential increase in costs, the additional burden on LOCs, and the implications for consistent operational oversight and equitable treatment of participating nations.

Member Nations remain free to consider the motion and determine their own position. However, they should be fully aware that **the proposed change is not supported by the SEC, the IPCH Standing Committee or World Abilitysport, and would depart from the established operational framework governing IPCH Championships.** It would also raise significant questions regarding alignment with applicable World Abilitysport and IPC requirements, particularly in relation to accreditation, safeguarding, operational oversight and the responsibilities of the LOC.

The SEC and IPCH Standing Committee urge Member Nations to consider not only the intended benefits of individual accommodation choice, but also the broader consequences for the financial sustainability, operational feasibility and consistent delivery of future Championships. In particular, nations should consider that a change of this nature would require substantial work to review and amend existing regulations, procedures and Championship delivery arrangements, while potentially introducing additional costs and administrative responsibilities for both organisers and participating teams.

The recommended alternative is to retain official accommodation as the standard Championship model, supported by a clear, confidential and proportionate case-by-case procedure for exceptional circumstances. This would allow individual needs to be addressed appropriately without compromising the sustainability of the event or creating disproportionate additional responsibilities for the LOC.