

Motion to Modify the WDSF Athletes' Code of Conduct and Standards of Ethics

Background:

The WDSF is the one true Governing Body for DanceSport as recognized by the IOC. In pursuit of its mission the Member Bodies, Commissions and the Presidium of the WDSF have made outstanding improvements to the way the sport is conducted across the globe. We can easily present a list of the great work that has been done and that continues to be under development. Unfortunately in the current climate of DanceSport, there is one thing that is:

- Overshadowing much of the progress and good work accomplished
- Consuming untold dollars and precious hours from everyone in the organization.
- Redirecting the limited resources of the WDSF and its Member Bodies and,
- Hindering the growth of the Member Bodies, pulling us from the purpose stated in our Statutes (#5): "to ensure the improvement and popularization of DanceSport"

Of course that one thing is the act of suspending/banning athletes and adjudicators from participating in the WDSF because they have participated in "unregistered" events.

These policies were enacted by the AGM for the Presidium to uphold based on our understanding of certain criteria from the IOC. We, the Member Bodies of the WDSF, were informed that:

"The IOC is strongly requesting us not to allow any competitions for our athletes where IOC-IDSF Rules and Regulations are not obligatory. This was expressly mentioned by the IOC Sports Department in our meeting in Dubai." Citation - President's Report of 2010 (page 8)

Other than this information, we actually have never seen a directive or mandate from the IOC that the WDSF or its Member Bodies must conduct the business of DanceSport in a restrictive manner. The movers of this motion believe the **Supporting Documentation** at the conclusion of this motion will help you conclude that the IOC DOES NOT REQUIRE an International Federation (IF) to limit/restrict the activities of an athlete inside the Olympic family.

Further, the current text of "The Code" devotes five paragraphs to language about athletes obtaining "written consent" to participate in events that are "non-WDSF". However no such application has been submitted and no such consent ever granted, that we are able to discover.

In the current environment we propose going one step further than the simple label of "WDSF" and "non-WDSF" competitions. Further, it should be clear that the Member Body retains the right to make determinations of suspension with respect to domestic competitions.

We urge everyone to vote in favor of this change so our fine democratic sports organization can return to the business of growing and improving our sport without the distraction of responding to outside entities that we do not recognize.

Motion:

[Current text of "The Code" with strikethrough indicating deletions and additions in underlined text]

Operating Policy - WDSF Athletes' Code of Conduct & Standards of Ethics

3. Rules of Conduct

Athletes who enter any World Ranking tournament, Cup, Championship or Grand Slam competition granted by WDSF, are governed directly by the WDSF Statutes and all other Rules and policies adopted by WDSF. WDSF can take all appropriate action to ensure that any athletes' conduct is in the best interests of DanceSport.

~~No athlete may participate in a DanceSport competition or event which is not listed on the official WDSF Competition Calendar (any such non-listed event being a "Non-WDSF Event") unless s/he has obtained advance written consent for such participation from the WDSF.~~

The WDSF rules of participation for athletes and adjudicators encompass three distinct classes of recognition:

1. **Registered.** These are competitions organized and/or sanctioned by the WDSF or a WDSF Member Body. Participation in these events is allowed based on the rules of eligibility or nomination governing each event.
2. **Non-Registered.** These competitions are unrecognized by the WDSF. As such they may not conform to the standards of the WDSF. Participants do so at their own risk and cannot be assured of the same protections that are part of competing in WDSF events and the events of the WDSF Member Bodies. Nor can they be assured that the competition is compliant with the **World Anti-Doping Code**, is officiated by certified and licensed adjudicators and complies with the rules of fair-play enjoyed inside the WDSF. Participation and associated rules of discipline in "Non-Registered" events are determined by the WDSF Member Body for which the athlete or official represents.
3. **Non-Permitted.** These are competitions that are sanctioned by alternative unrecognized organizations such as, but not limited to, the IDSA, IDU or the WDC-AL. Participation in these competitions is not permitted by the WDSF. Athletes that choose to participate in these Non-Permitted events may be subject to suspension from future World Ranking Tournaments, Cups, Championships or Grand Slam competitions granted by the WDSF. Participation and associated rules of discipline with respect to Domestic Competitions in "Non-Permitted" events are determined by the WDSF Member Body for which the athlete or official represents.

~~The WDSF may consider granting such consent only if it is satisfied that (i) the organisation ultimately responsible for the regulation of such Non-WDSF Event not only has in place Anti-doping rules which comply with the **World Anti-Doping Code** but which also implement an effective Anti-doping programme based on such rules and (ii) the participation of the relevant athlete(s) in such Non-WDSF Event will not disrupt the organisation or staging of an event listed on the official WDSF Competition Calendar.~~

~~The grant or refusal of such consent shall be within the absolute discretion of the WDSF and grounds need not be given in the event of refusal; for the avoidance of doubt, the WDSF may decide to refuse consent for reasons unrelated to Anti-doping and/or the disruption of an event listed on the official WDSF Competition Calendar. In the event that the WDSF does not respond to a given request, it shall be deemed that such request for consent has been refused.~~

~~The WDSF may maintain, and publish on its website, a register of Non-WDSF Events which it deems not to satisfy the criteria set out at (i) and (ii) above (any such event being a "**Specified Event**").~~

~~Athletes should not requesting consent to participate in Specified Events as such consent will not be granted under any circumstances.~~

~~Requests for consent to participate in a Non-WDSF Event (which is not a Specified Event) shall be sent by e-mail no later than two months prior to the commencement of such event to the WDSF Sports Director at the current address shown for him or her on the WDSF Web Site.~~

This motion is respectfully submitted by the WDSF Member Bodies of:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1. Canadian Amateur DanceSport Association (CADA) | 6. Finnish Dance Sport Assosiation (FDSA) |
| 2. Deutscher Tanzsportverband e.V., (DTV) | 7. Icelandic Dance Sport Federation (DSI) |
| 3. USA Dance | 8. DanceSport Wales |
| 4. Svenska Danssportförbundet (Sweden) | 9. Danmarks Sportdanserforbund (DS) |
| 5. New Zealand DanceSport Assoc. (NZDA) | |

Supporting Documentation – no IOC requirement to suspend:

Appendix to this Section:

1. Email exchange between the IOC and Ken Richards of USA Dance via the IOC website email submission
2. Excerpt from the IOC's Olympic Charter Eligibility Code
3. Excerpts from the Economist Magazine article on Snowboarding in the Olympics.

#1- Question To The IOC

Does the IOC require an IF to restrict participation of athletes to only recognized or Olympic-family competitions? Or does the IOC not really care if an athlete competes in events outside of the Olympic family, as long as they follow the rules once they do partake in Olympic family events.

This message is not an unsolicited e-mail.

E-mail ref: 5915

Answer From The IOC

Dear Mr. Richards,

You will find in section II of the Olympic Charter (p.75) the rules regarding participation at the Olympic Games. Note that it is the responsibility of each IF to establish its own sport's eligibility criteria for the Olympic Games in accordance with the Olympic Charter.

Sincerely,
Research and Reference Service
IOC Olympic Studies Centre

The IOC Olympic Studies Centre endeavours to provide you with accurate and up-to-date information. However, it offers no guarantees, express or implied, as to the accuracy or completeness of the information provided. You accept that use of the information provided is at your own risk.

WWW.INNSBRUCK2012.COM - Follow [Youth Olympic Games](#) on [Twitter](#), [Facebook](#) and [YouTube](#)

#2 – The Eligibility Code of the IOC

II. PARTICIPATION IN THE OLYMPIC GAMES

40 Eligibility Code*

To be eligible for participation in the Olympic Games, a competitor, coach, trainer or other team official must comply with the Olympic Charter, including the conditions of eligibility

established by the IOC, as well as with the rules of the IF concerned as approved by the IOC, and the competitor, coach, trainer or other team official must be entered by his NOC.

The above-noted persons must:

- respect the spirit of fair play and non violence, and behave accordingly; and
- respect and comply in all aspects with the World Anti-Doping Code.

Bye-law to Rule 40

- 1. Each IF establishes its sport's own eligibility criteria in accordance with the Olympic Charter. Such criteria must be submitted to the IOC Executive Board for approval.*
- 2. The application of the eligibility criteria lies with the IFs, their affiliated national federations and the NOCs in the fields of their respective responsibilities.*
- 3. Except as permitted by the IOC Executive Board, no competitor, coach, trainer or official who participates in the Olympic Games may allow his person, name, picture or sports performances to be used for advertising purposes during the Olympic Games.*
- 4. The entry or participation of a competitor in the Olympic Games shall not be conditional on any financial consideration.*

#3 - Economist Magazine Article

FIS off - Nov 22nd 2011, 16:32 by J.P.

<http://www.economist.com/blogs/gametheory/2011/11/snowboarding-and-olympics>

IN JULY snowboarders around the world cheered. The International Olympic Committee (IOC) announced that a new discipline, slopestyle, will debut at the next winter games in the Russian resort of Sochi in 2014. Many aficionados see slopestyle—where riders are judged on how they fare in a series of tricks, like jumps and slides, off assorted obstacles on a single run—as the ultimate test of overall ability. Its inclusion in the Olympic itinerary ought to be an unalloyed boon for the increasingly popular winter activity.

The mirth did not last long, however. On November 9th the International Ski Federation (known by its French acronym FIS), which lords it over Olympic snowboarding, blew a raspberry at professional snowboarders and the tours they compete in by insisting that the only way to qualify for the games is, in effect, to participate in its own circuit. The IOC subsequently gave the FIS proposal its seal of approval.

FIS has been running snowboard competitions in other formats, like half-pipe and “big air” (where riders do a single trick off a huge ramp). But it is a relative newcomer to slopestyle: its first foray into the discipline was held in 2009, and it has run only a handful of big events since. Professional tours, like Ticket to Ride (TTR), which invented the formula, Dew Tour

and X-Games, have been at it for a decade. Now they fret that every four years top athletes, many of whom regard Olympic victory as the apotheosis of sporting achievement, will be torn between the tours and FIS-run qualifiers.

It is not the first time that FIS and snowboarders have found themselves at loggerheads. In the 1990s the sport was evolving under the auspices of the rider-led International Snowboarding Federation (ISF). Then, in the run-up to the 1998 Nagano games, the IOC controversially handed oversight of Olympic snowboarding to skiers from FIS. In protest, Terje Haakonsen, then the sport's leading light and a shoo-in for the first Olympic half-pipe gold, boycotted the event, outraged at what he saw as a hostile takeover by FIS, with the IOC's complicity. No one seemed to care what snowboarders themselves wanted.

Matt Barr, a former editor of *White Lines Snowboarding Magazine* who now runs ACM, an action-sports marketing consultancy, quips it is as if a badminton federation was tasked with running Olympic tennis, only to implement tweaks in the way professionals play the game—using a slightly smaller court, say—just for the Olympics. If the pros want to take part in the games, in other words, they just have to lump it. Many snowboarders see FIS's latest move as another power grab. Some are mulling a Mr Haakonsen-style boycott.

To mend fences TTR had, over the summer, called for a joint ranking to serve as the basis for qualification, much as the Association of Tennis Professionals and the Women's Tennis Association do for men's and women's tennis, respectively. In the proposal, supported by a clutch of prominent riders, results from all FIS and TTR events, as well as any other tours that join in, would count towards a rider's position. This would allow competitors freely to pick where they want to compete, without dashing their Olympic hopes. In the event, FIS spurned TTR's advances, citing "rules and regulations which are not compatible with Olympic qualification".

Some of the FIS demands, like greater anti-doping scrutiny and safety standards, are uncontroversial. Reto Lamm, who heads TTR, says that his organisation is more than willing to shape up in those areas. Other quibbles, though, seem disingenuous. Take judging. It would be reasonable to assume that, given the tours' incomparably greater experience with slopestyle scoring, FIS, a slopestyle ingenue, ought to defer to them rather than foist its own newfangled rules on a sport it has only recently embraced (though it has been judging other snowboarding disciplines, like half-pipe, since the 1990s).

Cynics say the FIS decision was dictated by worries that, given a choice, top riders would continue to stay away from its events, generally perceived as unhip and second-rate. "If the Olympics are supposed to be the pinnacle event, then why aren't the pinnacle events leading up to it going to be recognised as the qualifying events?" laments Chas Guldemon, a professional rider widely thought to have a shot at Olympic gold and the co-founder of We Are Snowboarding, a group lobbying to align the interests of competitors and event organisers. Mr Guldemon shuns the FIS World Cup altogether.

FIS retorts that it already sanctions many TTR events, albeit not the top-tier invitation ones elite athletes tend to compete in. (FIS rules stipulate that only contests sanctioned by its member national associations count towards Olympic qualification; the top tour events do not meet this criterion.) To allay concerns over such riders' bulging calendars, it plans to organise about five high-profile events a season, and athletes need not compete in all of them to qualify for the Olympics. By comparison, TTR puts on about ten of its most coveted five- and six-star slopestyle competitions. FIS has also offered to fiddle with its own calendar by, for instance, rescheduling its 2012 World Cup event in Stoneham, Quebec, to avoid clashing with a TTR event in Oslo.

The tours and riders say that this apparent olive branch is too little, too late. The skiers' intransigence, they complain, makes meaningful compromise unlikely in time for the Sochi games. In the long run, FIS is shortchanging their sport by divvying up attention and resources. Conflict between TTR and FIS dilutes the value of the snowboarding, says Mr Lamm.

This value is soaring. The IOC's decision to fast-track slopestyle's admission to the Olympics was almost certainly prompted by a desire to capitalise on snowboarding's growing trendiness. The final of half-pipe at the last games in Vancouver, won by Shaun White, the sport's mop-haired superstar whom even non-aficionados may have heard of, was the games' second most-watched event, attracting over 30m viewers, according to NBC, an American broadcaster. Sponsors are flocking in. FIS would no doubt love for more of that appeal to rub off on it (and for some of the ensuing cash to stay with it).

FIS has played a part in transforming snowboarding from a niche pastime into an Olympic-worthy pursuit, albeit mainly during the games themselves. But it is the tours and the riders who deserve the lion's share of credit for the sport's runaway success. TTR and others are probably too well entrenched to suffer the ISF's fate. But they have every reason to view continued FIS meddling with suspicion. And they are understandably reluctant to let the grasping skiers free ride on their hard work.

In Summary – this article points out a number of lessons for DanceSport:

1. Slopestyle is a new discipline of Snowboarding that will debut in the 2014 Olympics under the governance of the International Federation of Skiing.
2. There have been in existence many highly respected "Professional Tours" in this sport for many years before the Olympic acceptance into the games.
3. Now that they are in the games the IF is requiring the athletes to qualify for the games at their recognized competitions. But they continue to be permitted to ski in these other Professional Tours.
4. The Federation has worked out sanctioning arrangements with many of the existing events to comply with their rules.
5. While the differences are resolved, neither organization is banning athletes from participating in the events of the other.