WFDF Ultimate Committee

2006 Congress Report

Chair - Brian Gisel

November 11, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Ultimate Committee Structure	3
	1.1. Committee Chair	3
	1.2. Committee Members	3
	1.3. Events Manager	4
2.	2005 – 2006 Year in Review	6
	2.1. World Games 2005	6
	2.2. Change to Masters Division Age Restrictions	7
	2.3. Revision of WUCC Team Bid Allocation Process	7
	2.4. WUCC Eligibility Requirements	8
	2.5. WJUC 2006	
	2.6. Medals for Events	10
	2.7. Rules Revisions	11
	2.8. WUCC 2006	12
3.	Items for 2007	14
	3.1. Eligibility Revisions	14
	3.2. Tournament Director Manual	14
	3.3. Rules Revisions	15
	3.4. UC Timeline	15
	3.5. Event Bidding Process	16
4.	Summary – Discussion Items	17
	4.1. Gender Ratio for Mixed Division – 2007 Rule Set	17
	4.2. Host for PACC 2007 – Mexico City	18
	4.3. AOUC 2007	18
	4.4 Vision of WLICC Event	18

1. ULTIMATE COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

1.1. Committee Chair

Brian Gisel - Vancouver, Canada

- Chair ultimate committee discussions
- World Games liaison
- Rules development
- Eligibility rules, divisions
- Event formats, schedules and seeding
- WFDF Member of TRG for WUCC and WUGC
- · Chair event captain's meeting
- Chair event tournament rules committee
- Liaise with other international ultimate organizations BULA, EFDF, IGO, IWGA, WDG
- Disabled athlete issues
- Read all correspondence on wfdfultimate mailing list
- Read all correspondence on wfdf-executive mailing list

1.2. Committee Members

Si Hill - London, United Kingdom

Dan Engstrom – Goteborg, Sweden

Julia Jouhki - Helsinki, Finland

Rue Veitl – Muenchen, Bayern (Germany)

Thomas Griesbaum – Karlsruhe, Germany

Paul Eriksson - Stockholm, Sweden

- Reports to the Ultimate Committee Chair
- Focus on specific aspects of Ultimate administration

Bill Rodriguez - USA

Mami Tezuka - Japan

1.3. Events Manager

The position of Events Manager has been vacant since early 2006 as Deirdre Abrahamsson moved on to work for the European Athletics Championship 2006. Deirdre has provided us with some transitional support after leaving her position.

- Reports to the WFDF President and works closely with the Ultimate Committee Chair
- Paid WFDF staff person who supports the work of the Ultimate Committee.
- Oversees event bidding process and communicates with bidders and selected host
- Oversees event contract process wording of contracts, discussion, and negotiations
- Helps support Tournament Directors with event planning
- Manages post-event reports and documentation
- Assists with revision and updates of the Tournament Director's Manual and other event documents
- Solicit bids for events
- New international event development (regionals, masters, universities)
- Support for new members national championships
- Read all correspondence on wfdfmemberlink mailing list
- Read all correspondence on wfdf-executive mailing list

Deirdre has been in and out of this role over the past 18 months. The Chair of the Ultimate Committee has taken on approximately 200-300 hours of work over the past 12 months on WFDF issues, this level of commitment might lead to the "burn out" factor that plagues members of WFDF over the period of many years of dedicated work.

2. 2005 – 2006 YEAR IN REVIEW

2.1. World Games 2005

2.1.1. Document Overview:

See Appendix A – Tournament Format See Appendix B – Event Committee Summary

2.1.2. Process

During the run up to and organization of this event the job descriptions of WFDF staff were clearly defined and managed. The Head Game Official (Brian Gisel) was responsible for running the Competition side of the event (Format, Rules, Team Concerns regarding play, Head Official, etc...). Liaison with the Event, Media, External Relations, Public Relations and other aspects of the event were managed by other WFDF officials. This division of labour made for a very efficient organizational structure and a well run event.

2.1.3. Future Direction

For WG 2009 in Kaohsiung, Taiwan, the number of athletes, teams and days of competition are of a major concern for our Sport. The format used in Germany was a step up from 2001, but did not allow our athletes to play the game at the highest possible level. A much-improved situation would be 6 Teams with 13 Players per team with competition occurring over 4 days. More athletes per team is of greater importance than more days of competition. Both of these factors are of more importance than more total teams.

WFDF prepared a comprehensive feedback report for IWGA on WG 2005. This report included recommendations for the number of players and days of play in 2009. At this time the number of athletes and the schedule for Ultimate are still being discussed with the Sports Program Committee of the IWGA.

The other issue for 2009 will be the inclusion (or exclusion) of the Host Nation at the event. The Host nation in 2009 has entered no teams in WUCC 2006, an event where WFDF was going to assess that countries Ultimate development. With current information I would recommend that WFDF not grant an automatic bid to the event for the Host Nation.

2.2. Change to Masters Division Age Restrictions

2.2.1. Document Overview:

See Appendix C – Masters Age for WFDF Events

2.2.2. Process

"At the WFDF Congress and Players Congress in 2006, we will look to re-visit this issue to see if the age restriction should continue to increase and if so at what pace" – From Masters WFDF Document

2.2.3. Future Direction

The UPA and CUPA are currently or have recently moved the age of Masters to 33 years. There are no known plans to move this age to 35 years in the short term. I would recommend that WFDF re-visits this issue at 2008 Congress.

2.3. Revision of WUCC Team Bid Allocation Process

2.3.1. Document Overview

See Appendix D - WUCC Bid allocation Procedures Final

2.3.2. Process

The past rules for total allocation to WUCC events were vague and rule of thumb based.

The new rule set was worked on by the Team Events Committee, with major input from Bill Rodriquez and Brian Gisel. Concern was raised by Bill about using Pre-Event Demand (system set up by WUCC 2006 to gauge interest in the event by teams from around the Worlds. This system did not rely on a team contacting it's National Federation and was just a way for the event to see who might be likely to attend) as a factor in allocating bids. A similar system can and should be set up going forward, but the fact that such a system might affect final bids needs to be clearly communicated to all teams. In 2006 this was not the case, however the tournament ended up giving bids to all teams who asked and did not reach maximum capacity. No teams were turned away who showed early interest.

The new rules are more objective and mathematical. This change is important as the number of countries playing Ultimate grows and demand for spots at WUCC reduce the number of bids given to "traditionally strong" countries. Assuming WUCC 2010 is held in Europe at a site which can only accommodate 80-90 teams, bids to the event will be hotly contested.

2.3.3. Future Direction

The next use of these rules will be for WUCC 2010. After WUCC 2006 a new allocation test will be run using results from WUGC 2004 and WUCC 2006 (dropping WUCC 2002). These sample results will be sent to the WFDF Board for their consideration.

Official 2010 bid allocations will be calculated and published shortly after WUGC 2008.

2.4. WUCC Eligibility Requirements

2.4.1. Document Overview

See Appendix E – Roster and Club Team Definitions Final See Appendix F – Club Rule Eligibility Questions See Appendix G – UPA Club Team Eligibility Rules

2.4.2. Process

The revision of the Club Team Eligibility had many challenges. The final version that has been used for all non-USA teams will need to be updated by WFDF prior to 2010, but it serves as a valuable stepping-stone towards Club rules that could be acceptable for all teams attending both WUCC and other International Club Team Events.

The Process used to create these rules generated much debate among WFDF Team Event Committee members and other interested parties. At the heart of the issue of the rules was the definition a Club team and members of that team. Additional concerns were raised as to the process used which, due to time constraints caused by the upcoming WUCC event, did not allow as wide a distribution of the rules as may have been wished.

The rules were debated by the UPA and an alternative set was devised for US based teams. These rules were designed to fit more in line with the club team process of the UPA. It is unclear if future iterations of any WFDF rules will allow the UPA to drop the use of this special rule set.

2.4.3. Future Direction

It is the opinion of the Chair of the WFDF Team Events Committee that the past rules were not clear or effective and did not lead WFDF towards a goal of stronger and more concise rules. The rules in place for 2006 are not perfect, but they have generated the debate needed to push the rules towards a final, acceptable goal.

It is important to note that much of the debate centered on what was meant by a "Club" team and what WFDF was attempting to accomplish with the WUCC event. Further revisions of the Club Team Eligibility rules cannot begin until WFDF clearly defines and agrees upon the scope and goals of the WUCC event.

Without a clear goal it will be very hard for definitive rules to be put in place.

No matter what the final product, there will always be a need for exceptions due to the divergent nature of the teams and individuals attending the event. While exceptions to the rules should not be the standard it is not reasonable to think that stringent adherence to the rules in all cases will be possible.

2.5. WJUC 2006

2.5.1. Document Overview

None

2.5.2. Tournament

Held in Devens MA, USA from Aug 14-18, 2006 and included teams from:

Junior Open: USA (1st), Canada (2nd), Colombia (3rd), Australia, UK, Sweden, Finland, Israel

Junior Women: USA (1st), Canada (2nd), Australia (3rd), Finland

On and off field organization was outstanding. Tournament organizers went above and beyond in helping teams from Israel and Colombia attend this event. Venezuela was also very close to attending. Overall, team attendance was disappointing for the event.

2.5.3. Future Direction

Linda Sidorsky, the WJUC 2006 Tournament Director has volunteered to become a member of the WFDF Ultimate Committee with the role of Juniors Liaison. Her role would be focused on helping juniors teams attend WUGC and WJUC events (logistical help – Visa's, Travel arrangements, etc...) and also help organize these team while at the events (Social aspects unique to juniors – especially for WUGC event).

WFDF and National Federations need to work more closely when it comes to junior teams attending WFDF events. Unlike other divisions, there is not always a "Team" support structure in place years in advance of an event and the lack of organizational lead-time can have an adverse effect on attendance.

Fundraising and organizational structure should be lead by National Federations and be in place on an on-going basis, not just in the years of the events.

2.6. Medals for Events

2.6.1. Document Overview

Appendix H – Medal RFP Appendix I – WFDF Medal Vendors

2.6.2. Process

In early Summer 2006 an RFP was sent to a number of Vendors (See Appendix I) to source medals for WUCC 2006. Responses came from Ultimate Promotions (Squamish, Canada) and Paul Keir (Tasmainia, AUS). Price and quality indicated lead to the selection of Ultimate Promotions as the Vendor for WUCC 2006. Medals were produced for 1st, 2nd and 3rd place in all 4 playing divisions.

2.6.3. Future Direction

Past process has had WFDF control the creation of Medals for WUGC and WUCC events. This process tended to not allow for any sponsorship agreement between the event and the vendor. Also, lack of resources on the part of WFDF has meant that no attempts were made over the past 10+ years to increase the quality or lower the cost of the medals provided.

An example of a missed opportunity is that Ultimate Promotions would have liked to provide WJUC 2006 with medals for free, in exchange for sponsorship opportunities. For WUCC 2006 over \$400 CAN was reduced from the final invoice in exchange for sponsorship at the event.

In the future it is the opinion of the Chair of the Team Events Committee that the sourcing and payment of the medals be given over to the event. WFDF will provide events with a full contact list of possible vendors, and final approval of the quality and cost of the medals must be given by WFDF prior to production.

This system will allow each event to "brand" the medals in a unique way (typically by using the tournament logo), and will also offset possible increased costs to the players by allowing some of the expense to be reduced by the use of in kind sponsorship agreements.

2.7. Rules Revisions

2.7.1. Document Overview

Appendix J – 20061101 WFDF Version 2007 Rules Document Appendix K – Rules Sub-Committee

2.7.2. Process

Building on the work started by Jonathan Potts in 2004/2005, the rules sub-committee was created in Fall 2005 to revise the current WFDF Rules of Ultimate. This process was originally intended to have a new version in place by January 1, 2006, but it became quickly apparent that the timeline was much too tight and a release on January 1, 2007 was more realistic.

Over the past 12 months the rules have been re-written, with focus on:

- Layout and structure improvements,
- Reduction of repetitive rules and ambiguity
- Increased clarity of existing rules
- Addition of proven rules that have been added to other rule sets (UPA) over the past 10 years.

The results have been 16 version of the new rules, with the most up to date shown as appendix J in this document.

The rules have been shown and commented on by the WFDF Rules Sub-Committee, WFDF Team Events Committee, WFDF Board and Members of MemberLink. Communication of the new rules has been kept as open as possible.

2.7.3. Future Direction

The current latest version of the rules represents the proposed Final Version for January 1, 2007. The changes to the actual rules of play are minor, but the structure of the rules has had a drastic alteration. A companion document that will highlight the changes in the rules of play (e.g. the creation of a "Callahan" Goal) will be created.

Once the 2007 Version of the rules are in place, the Rules Sub-Committee will continue to make minor revisions (both from internal discussions and as a result of suggestions from the Ultimate community at large). The need for changes to the rules of play (addition or subtraction of current rules) will be discussed.

The current plan is to release a new version at least once every two years, always on January 1st.

2.8. WUCC 2006

2.8.1. Document Overview

Appendix L – Final WUCC 2006 - Seeds Appendix M – WUCC Schedule Outline vFinal Appendix N – WUCC 2006 Master vFinal Appendix O – Captains Meeting Agenda

2.8.2. Process

The Chair of the Ultimate Committee has been working closely with the TD of WUCC 2006 to develop and adjust the tournament budget, logistics, bid allocations, seeding, pool structure, team eligibility, and schedule.

WFDF will also run the WUCC 2006 Captains Meeting on November 11th, 2006.

2.8.3. Future Direction

With 91 Teams entered into the tournament WUCC 2006 is looking to be a very successful event. The continued growth of the Mixed division is putting pressure on other divisions, as has been felt in other Ultimate Communities.

With the size of WUCC (and WUGC) being a limiting factor for venues, the idea of a splitting of events along Gender Ratio basis may be considered. It is unclear if two events could be created in the same year (and thus reduce the number of participants in both) or on consecutive years.

Example:

- 2010 WUCC Mixed (Junior, Open [age], Masters)
- 2010 WUCC (Open, Women, Masters Open)

3. ITEMS FOR 2007

3.1. Eligibility Revisions

3.1.1. Overview

WFDF needs to develop a definitive vision of WUCC. Once that has been accomplished the tournament eligibility rules can be able to be developed to help achieve that vision.

The creation of the tournament vision will need direction from the WFDF Board.

The revision of the eligibility rules can be directed by the UC, possibly with the creation of a sub-committee. The issue of separate rules for USA team will need to be discussed with the UPA, a single solution would be preferable. Input from the Ultimate community at large will be valuable both in terms of rule development and eventual buy-in.

The issue of roster verification is one that will follow quickly on the heals of any Eligibility rules and will necessitate the corporation of National Federations.

3.1.2. Timeline

The Eligibility rules for WUCC 2010 should be in place by January 1, 2009. This will allow the rules to be known prior to the qualification tournaments (Nationals) taking place in member countries.

3.2. Tournament Director Manual

3.2.1. Overview

The Current TDM is an attempt to be "All Things to All People". Organizers who bid for and host major events are not in need of information on how to organize and run these events. Rather, the TDM needs to be more TOC-WFDF focused.

Having run numerous local events the TD typically knows how many tents to order. What is less known may be specific information that is unique to an event of the scale of WUCC or WUGC. Waiver templates, Correct Division and Tournament Names, Information on Medals and their creation, WFDF Meeting requirements, Schedule

information and so on. The TDM should help the TOC deal with the needs of the World event and reduce the issues that arise when a tournament that is being organized in one location (Host Venue) is also being overseen by another organization (WFDF)

3.2.2. Timeline

A version of the new TDM could be created during the run up to WUGC 2008, and be in place in the final version by January 1, 2009.

3.3. Rules Revisions

3.3.1. Overview

The 20070101 Version of the WFDF Rules of Ultimate will be a significant step forward in terms of the rules of Ultimate. As Ultimate is still a relatively young sport, rule changes and modification will be needed on an ongoing basis.

The WFDF Ultimate Committee will need to develop a method of collecting data from the Ultimate community on the use of the new rule set. Adjustments will be necessary, both in terms of the clarification or deletion of current rules and the addition of new rules.

The WFDF Rules Sub-Committee will continue to work on modifications and submit finalized changes to the WFDF UC on a yearly basis.

3.3.2. Timeline

When completed, revision of the WFDF Rules of Ultimate will be published on January 1st of the following year.

3.4 UC Timeline

3.4.1. Overview

A yearly "To Do" list for the Ultimate Committee is being prepared to help with the future organization of that branch. This timeline will include deadline dates for issues that come up in each of the 4 years of the WFDF cycle:

Year 1: WUGC (2008, 2012)

Year 2: WG, EUCC, PACC (2005, 2009)

Year 3: WUCC, WJUC (2006, 2010)

Year 4: EUC, PACC (2007, 2011)

This timeline will be meant as a way to stop issues that tend to come up every 2 or 4 years from falling through the cracks.

3.5. Event Bidding Process

3.5.1. Overview

The entire Event Bidding Process needs to be re-vamped. Solicitation of bids (Selling our Event to potential Hosts), development of potential bids, the creation of a clear time line, the ownership of the bid process for each event and a number of other issues need to be better defined.

Currently a lack of resources and focus has hindered our ability to obtain numerous bids for each event, and has not allowed us to nurture potential bidders, possibly even discouraging possible bidders, for our major events.

Bid deadlines are routinely extended or ignored, ownership of the bid process has not been clearly defined and communication of upcoming events tends to be lacking.

A new system needs to be created that will streamline the process. The focus of this system should be on increasing the quantity and quality of bids that WFDF receives for future International events.

WFDF is currently in the final stages of hiring a new Executive Director. The responsibility of operating the bid process for all events will be assigned to the Executive Director, who will lead the process of creating the new system.

3.5.2. Timeline

This system should be in place in time for bids to host events that occur in 2009.

4. SUMMARY - DISCUSSION ITEMS

The WFDF Board and the UC would like to have an Open discussion for the purpose of getting member feedback on the following items. It is not our intention to make decisions on these items at this time. Decisions will be made by the Board and UC in their respective areas of responsibility.

4.1. Gender Ratio for Mixed Division – 2007 Rule Set

The official rules surrounding different divisions of play will be set out in the High Level Competition Appendix of the 2007 WFDF Rules of Ultimate.

The current common (UPA, CUPA, Europe) gender ratio for Mixed is that the offensive team selects the gender ratio (4 female or 4 male players). This rule was created to move the Mixed division towards gender equity.

In my opinion the rule fails to achieve this goal, and causes a number of other problems.

- Roster Creation A team traveling to Worlds must assume that they will be
 playing 4 male AND 4 female players for each point and then carry a number of
 players to handle both situations. This will cause teams to bring larger rosters,
 and will result in much more bench time for players of the gender that is played
 less over the course of the event.
- Communication between points No rules have been created for the timely communication between the two teams to set the ratio, however this rule forces teams to add an extra level of communication between each point. With the time between points at Worlds regulated this could impact the ability of teams to strategize on the line prior to the pull.

I have suggested that WFDF lead the Ultimate community towards a rotating gender ratio system that swaps between 4 male and 4 female players on every other point. The results of this system would be a guaranteed number of points for each gender, true gender equity on the field and the ability of teams to plan for each point with the knowledge of what the gender ratio will be.

Note that these rules are specifically geared towards Worlds events, where scorekeepers and timekeepers are available to help teams stay on the system (just as they help teams track the score of the game).

4.2. Host for PACC 2007 - Mexico City

Mexico City has been the only bid for PACC 2007. There has been a lack of communication to the Ultimate Community to solicit bids for this event, but we have not been approached by any other organization. The official bid deadline on the WFDF site is set at June 1, 2005.

Mexico has bid for a number of previous events (WUCC, PACC) and we are confident in the organization that is in place to host this event. Furthermore, the location is idea for PACC's 2nd event. The ability to attract some teams from the USA and Canada will be key to the long-term success of this event.

4.3. AOUC 2007

WFDF is planning on sanctioning a first ever Asian-Oceanic Ultimate Championship in 2007. A separate meeting will be held at WUCC 2006 for the Asian and Oceanic countries to discuss this and other developmental aspects of the region. The tournament would act as a tune-up and ranking event for teams planning to participate in WUGC 2008 in Vancouver.

4.4. Vision of WUCC Event

What is WFDF's vision of the purpose of WUCC?

- Attendance of True Club teams vs. Attendance of Highly Competitive Teams
- Overall Attendance, Size and Division Structure
- Pickup Teams vs Combo Teams vs International Teams
- Needs of Emerging Countries vs Needs of Established Countries