
Outcomes Report
2010 and Beyond Panel
Montreal Roundtables

Prepared by: The 2010 and Beyond Panel Secretariat

Holiday Inn Aeroport, Montreal
September 29, 2009
8:30 – 12:00 AM and 1:00 – 4:30 PM

Table of Contents

Key Findings	3
A. Introduction	4
B. Summary of Discussions – Morning Roundtable	4
a. Definition of High Performance	4
b. Own The Podium.....	5
c. Metrics of Success	5
d. Elements of the Better Way for High Performance Sport	5
e. Funding.....	6
f. Structures.....	6
g. Targeting	8
h. Language	9
i. International Models.....	9
j. Timing.....	9
C. Summary of Discussions – Afternoon Roundtable	10
a. Possible Improvements in the High Performance System	10
b. Definition of High Performance	11
c. Bilingualism	11
d. Metrics and Measurement	11
e. The importance of HP for Canada.....	12
f. Targeting.....	12
g. Special Olympics.....	12
h. Structure	12
i. The Olympic Committee	14
j. Willingness of the Sector to Change and Make Sacrifices	14
k. Role of Sport Canada.....	15
Annex I: Participants	16

Key Findings

Key findings are items that were brought forward a number of times or ideas that received general support by the roundtable participants.

1. There is general agreement on a number of key principles, which the Panel should use to assess and recommend new models or approaches for HP sport.
2. Bilingualism is a key principle, and athletes must be served in the language of their choice.
3. The sport community needs to better understand how to work with the private sector .
4. The definition of high performance should include a targeted Train to Train level and higher (LTAD) and should be based on medals, international results and the highest level of competition in each sport.
5. High performance does not exist in isolation and the report has to say something about that.
6. The HP system should be evidence-based and expert-led
7. We should set national goals, as was the case with the 2010 Paralympic and Olympic Games.
8. The focus of an HP body should not be what's in best interest of organizations but rather what's in the best interest of sport/athletes.
9. Sport Canada should focus on public policy, infrastructure/facilities, research, coaching development, funding and accountability.
10. There is considerable support for the development of sport institutes
11. There is considerable support for the targeting of resources.
12. There is strong support for an independent, one-window, big picture body to lead HP sport.
13. There is strong support for an (expanded) OTP program at the core of an HP body.
14. An existing organization might be able to assume the role of the HP body if it can meet the key principles and characteristics (criteria) identified by the sport community.
15. There should be consolidation of organizations and services, including Games bodies for mission preparation and hosting games.
16. We need a team sport strategy.
17. We need the professionalization of coaches.
18. We should have a made in Canada HP model.

A. Introduction

On September 28, the 2010 and Beyond Panel held two roundtables at the Holliday Inn Airport in Montreal. The purpose of the roundtables was to bring together leaders from the sport community to provide input to the Panel on a better way forward for high performance sport in Canada. The following report captures the key findings along with the key themes and perspectives that were expressed during the two roundtables. The summary of the afternoon session is somewhat shorter than the summary of the morning roundtable as it highlights only those themes and opinions which did not also emerge during the morning session.

B. Summary of Discussions – Morning Roundtable

A number of common themes and observations emerged over the course of the morning roundtable. These themes or outcomes can be summarized as follows:

a. Definition of High Performance

The roundtable began with a discussion of the definition of high performance that was put forward in the submission from Canada Games and the Coaching Association of Canada, as follows:

The pathway from recruitment of young talent to on average ten years of enhanced training leading to a career at a national or international level

This definition implies that the definition of HP would include talent identification, talent development and, ultimately, international success. Participants suggested that high performance can be defined in a very restrictive or a very broad way. For example, the definition of HP could also include a narrower scope such as winning medals at the Olympics Games. On the other hand, HP could include a range of performances at the highest level in a sport or international event. There was also discussion of the distinction between high performance as an end goal versus the things that make up a high performance system

Other participants suggested that HP starts once an athlete begins to train with a coach as part of an identifiable development program. The suggestion was made that this definition is too narrow and that HP is not just about one coach but about having a series of elements and strategies that make athletic development possible.

There was agreement that the *development* pathway has a number of gaps, and that each individual sport has its own pathway because athletes peak at different ages and enter or leave the pathway at different points. In effect, each individual sport needs to identify an entry point for HP and its own pathway to excellence. For example, the Canada Games is a gateway to HP for some sports but not necessarily for all. Similarly, there is a role for some PSOs in HP but less so in other sports.

The discussion continued that HP is really about the highest level of delivery for a sport.

As in other roundtables, it was emphasized that only 1 or 2% of Canadian athletes will ever be high performance athletes and that what kids need is the right set of skills at the right time to excel. While participants emphasized the extent to which many aspects of sport are interdependent, there was agreement that it is acceptable to start with the HP system, with OTP at its core, and then to move onto improvements and reforms in other aspects and elements that contribute to the HP sport system.

b. Own The Podium

There was much conversation about the role of OTP. There was overall support for continuing and expanding the OTP approach to HP. The view was expressed that OTP was a success because it could make strategic decisions but also, fundamentally, because they had more money/resources than past initiatives. Concern was expressed that these resources are still scarce in comparison to our competitors and that the OTP model doesn't take care of team sports and doesn't touch on all elements of HP sport (for instance, non-Olympic sport). There was an expressed desire for OTYP to reach more sports and more athletes.

c. Metrics of Success

Fundamentally, there was agreement that if you want to have success you need to pool your money and restrict the number of sports and athletes that get funded. Canada can't support 60 or 65 sports at the highest competitive level. Because of this, a practical definition of success is very important – for instance, the number of medals at Olympics and World championships is not a good measure of the success of team sports. For team sports the better metric is the maintenance of high level results.

Participants indicated that it is also important to think about HP success in terms of impact on the sport system and Canadians as a whole. For example, a good result in a sport like soccer can have more impact than a gold medal in a more obscure sport.

d. Elements of the Better Way for High Performance Sport

Participants discussed the elements of a better way for high performance sport including

- **Infrastructure** – There is need for more consistent performance infrastructure based on national sport institutes.
- **Financial Model** – There is still an ongoing challenge around funding to support HP athletes
- **Science and Technology** – There should be more investment in science and technology to support our HP athletes
- **Consolidation and Improved Efficiency** – right now the HP system is fragmented.
 - There should be one HP voice to government and the ability to interact with corporations.
 - One body that brings together technical expertise

- One window for corporate sponsorship
 - there is confusion as to who HP sport is and how they provide value
 - we need to maintain and build upon the 62 sponsors for VANOC
- One place which brings together the technical units in OTP, high performance units in government, and national sport centres
- **Effectiveness** – one voice/window for the HP funding
- **Alignment** – we need to align the federal system with the provincial sporting system
- **Resources** – resources are critical, nothing is possible without the appropriate resources

A few additional elements that were suggested were that any type of HP entity would have to have a highly independent board with no athletes and no representation from NSOs. There needs to be expertise at a technical level and the BOD has to empower management to make decisions. It is important to have good objective thinkers who are willing to look at potential and outcomes. The organization should be athlete centered, independent and should not be membership based.

e. Funding

The perspective was offered that the sport sector needs to stop looking to government to do everything as the government is not going to fix sport; it has other higher priorities and the future health of HP sport is our responsibility.

There was agreement that private sector money will be necessary. A participant offered that the success of the new HP sport body would be predicated on its success in raising private funding.

Concern was raised that within the next two years there will be issues with the federal deficit and that this is a time bomb that will ultimately hurt all of sport as it will many public serving organizations. As such, the sector will have to look at being as efficient as possible in terms of their investment dollars. A single window approach is one way to maximize the effectiveness of our investment.

There was support for a roundtable oriented towards corporate sponsors and that when the corporate world sees a better alignment of planning and marketing, they will come on board as sponsors. The idea was also brought forward that there is equal but different value to high performance versus community sport, and that there are two different corporate audiences for each.

f. Structures

The suggestion was brought forward that the HP organization or entity would need to have service agreements with its partners and other entities in the HP system. It was emphasized that organizations shouldn't be forced to do anything, and that consolidation should be through some kind of natural process such as service agreements. Whatever the method of consolidation, as far as sport organizations are concerned there needs to be a single window approach to funding, HP services and program evaluation.

There was support for the idea of consolidating existing high performance infrastructure to create sport institutes in Canada (for example, in Montreal, Toronto, Calgary, and Vancouver). To do so it is important to have the appropriate:

- Funding base;
- Infrastructure/facilities;
- Competent staff including coaches and technical staff;
- Support for competitions opportunities
- Links between the federal and provincial level; and
- Structures to bring the levels together and create effective training environments.

There should be a unified system across the training centres that eliminates geographic competition for athletes. Moving to an institutes model would greatly reduce the cost for athletes and provide greater visibility in the regions. Other countries have had institute systems for much longer than Canada including the French who have had an institute system for 60 years, the US for 33 years, and Australia for 20 years.

Participants felt that the potential impact of an institute system is clear. The new aquatic centre, for instance, has had a huge impact on Canada's performance at the World Championships. In just 26 months, 6 of 9 medals that Canada won at worlds were won from athletes from the Centre. The Centre provides an opportunity for coaches to meet every day at the deck of the pool and it brings together all four aquatic sports in one facility.

The assertion was made that in Australia the government is rethinking the whole private agency approach, and that over time the private sport agency has become just another government agency. They are going to completely revise this system because the board is named by government and the CEO is named by the Board and this isn't true independence. On this basis it is important to build an organization that is cost effective and that provides the most support possible to athletes. To do so, it will be important to cut through the bureaucracy. Sponsors will only invest in an organization that they are sure can deliver. It was suggested that the COC could be such a body.

The question was asked as to why the COC has not already filled this role? It was noted that the COC has been historically seen as a political body. The claim was made, however, that the governance has completely changed and that any high performance function (such as OTP) operating under the COC would have an independent board separate from the COC.

The comment was made that most sport people and organization don't understand the new COC governance and that, when people say that they want an independent agency, what they are really saying is that they want the HP funding decisions made outside of government. Another participant suggested that the allocation of funding has to be completely independent and that right now the COC does not represent the HP sport system but rather is part of the sport system.

Participants expressed the view that we need an overarching independent organization – either an existing organization that would have to change to meet the necessary criteria, or to build upon an existing program like OTP, or establish a new organization to play that role. Participants agreed that the COC would definitely be an important player in the future of HP sport. It was noted that the mandate (charter) of the COC is derived from an international source. It was suggested that the mandate of this new organization would need to be derived from Canadian sources, such as federal legislation.

Concern was expressed that a government agency would not be far enough out of government to really be independent and that there needs to be no political involvement in the allocation of funding. Participants suggested that what is needed is an organization that can lead the existing HP organizations and lead in the development of key partnerships. It would provide focus and a shared sense of purpose.

In discussing the possible scenarios, the Panel enquired as to the possibility of having Olympic marketing capacity as part of a new overarching HP body. This is something that apparently would not work, as the new organization would not be given access to Olympic marketing rights.

Overall, there was belief that the sector needs the OTP approach and it also needs the COC to be a strong marketing partner. If they compete head to head for the same dollar it won't be effective.

g. Targeting

The question was asked whether we should be targeting sports based on results and whether we should be looking at the return on the dollar investment in terms of what a medal actually costs us. For example, to win an Alpine medal is 10-15 times the cost of a Short Track medal (speed skating medal is cost about \$65k while an Alpine one costs about \$1.5m). The suggestion was made that Canada should target funding according to the following principles:

- First, sports in which Canada has medal hopes such as speed skating, swimming, etc
- Second, athletes that have a chance to medal
- Third, sports where Canada enjoys a smaller, advantageous field of competition

One participant commented that Canada is a poor country when it comes to HP resources, and that it should therefore behave like a poor country and invest accordingly. While there was a general appreciation of this comment, participants felt that this would upset a lot of organizations and a lot of people (athletes, Canadians).

For example, when Australia chose to focus their funding post 1976, they focused on only eight sports. Most countries invest in swimming, rowing, track and field and cycling because they make up about 66% of the total medals. There are 102 medals to be won in swimming, but Canada won only 1 medal in this field despite having funded it very heavily. The same is true of track.

The perspective was expressed that some funding should go into supporting the longer-term strategic sustainability of sport, for example through an endowment fund, a national foundation or a national lottery. There was also support for providing support to very talented people in non-targeted sport. In general there was support for the notion that targeting should be a principle but not a rule. There was also support for the notion that funding should shift to what we truly value, that the public interest should be served. This might prove difficult, however, since everyone has a different definition of, or way of measuring, the public interest.

h. Language

Language was an important issue that was raised in the roundtable in that some athletes in Canada are not able to train in their language of choice. A key principle for any new HP organization or entity will be to offer bilingual services to all athletes.

One of the participants also noted the fact that the Canadian Sport Institute Paper (2008) prepared for the CSC National Coordinating Committee identified Montreal as a natural site for the development of a national sport institute given the large number of high performance athletes coming from and training in Quebec, the province's history of support for sport development and the unique features of the province's culture and language.

i. International Models

One participant expressed the view that there is a myth within Canada about the extent to which the Australian HP system is aligned and integrated, when many of the components of the system operate autonomously, and organizations often compete with each other. Nevertheless, noted this participant, the Australian model does appear to deliver good results. The participant also provided information on the German system, where the government financially supports an independent agency that operates on the basis of partnerships. These partnerships are based on the principle of "sport autonomy" and the agency supports various aspects of the HP system through agreements for the achievement of specified goals and objectives over time. It was further noted that the German Olympic Committee and the German Sport federation merged in 2006 to become the German Olympic Federation which allows the members of the sport community to use the Olympic rings in order to generate their own revenues, and that this model should be explored in Canada.

j. Timing

Participants suggested that the timing of the government's actions is critical and it is important to act now.

C. Summary of Discussions – Afternoon Roundtable

The afternoon roundtable addressed many of the same issues as were raised in the morning, and this has been reflected in the Key Findings section of the report (page 3). Where there is repetition of the themes from the morning this repetition is noted.

a. Possible Improvements in the High Performance System

One important element addressed by participants was the need to integrate the system, to build on what the sector has already been doing and to connect more closely and in a more coordinated kind of way. The likely vehicle for this coordination would be through an independent agency or a central organizing body of some kind. The structure and services of this organization should focus on the life of an athlete through training, progressive competitions, funding and eventual world-level competitions.

Another element of integration was the need for Games organizations (franchise holders) to do a better job of collaborating and coordinating things like hosting and mission preparation. Currently, organizations like Commonwealth Games Canada don't formally link into an organization like OTP and there needs to be a more formal way of connecting the pieces.

Another piece that might be more closely linked and integrated would be the colleges and universities, bringing together athletes and coaches with scientists and researchers.

There was strong agreement that the Canadian Sport Centres should be an active component of any new HP organization and that they should have better connections with the academic sector. At the level of individual universities and CSCs, memorandum of agreements for shared activities such as coach driven research or giving researchers information on the exciting developments coming out of the centres. Suggestions for reasons as to why this hasn't already happened included concern that sport scientists will challenge the rationale and effectiveness of what is currently being done by NSOs.

The assertion was made that scientists and researchers who have an interest in sport science have stepped away because there was no system for funding sport science in Canada. As a result there has not been a clear career path or career advancement based on peer reviewed research.

There was support for the notion that the HP system should be evidence-based and expert- led and that researchers should be able to compete for funds to support HP research.

Participants suggested that it would be useful to link the CSCs together and for them to identify research priorities and to coordinate research activities.

Participants stated that the most important improvement is to be able to create and nurture environments that would promote the development of high performance athletes and coaches. HP facilities would support intense training with paid coaches and the services they need. The real question is how best to establish these training facilities. A critical component of this ability to deliver is longer term stability in terms of funding and certainty. If you want to attract international level coaches you need to have funding stability.

A n HP system should develop a common strategy and clear shared objectives and should develop partnerships to work together, nationally, provincially, locally and also with our partners provincial and municipal governments . The aquatic excellence sport centre is a good example, in that it brings together four water sports with agreements at the provincial and national level. At this facility, athletes have a concentration of infrastructure that they can use including support and medical services.

In terms of partnerships, participants suggested that the main people involved should be coaches and athletes. There was concern that coaches make huge sacrifices but they are not considered to have a real career path in Canada. As such, it will be critical to support and recognize coaches.

As in the morning session, participants suggested that the creation of national sport institutes would be a good first step. The basic tenet of these facilities is that the best train with the best, supported by the best coaches and support services.

Another important element of an effective HP system is communications. Participants suggested that it is important to get the media talking about promoting non-professional sport. It was suggested that sport organizations haven't done a good job of communicating the value of high performance sport.

b. Definition of High Performance

As in previous roundtables, there was discussion of the definition of high performance and at what stage an athlete enters the HP system. In this regard, it was suggested that the real challenge is to align what is happening at the provincial level to the national HP system. The reality is that it is very hard to draw any line that demarcates HP and that it is especially hard without any money to back it up. Perhaps the strongest approach might be to align the services through agreements. These agreements can form the basis of accountability frameworks.

The suggestion was made that high performance starts at the level of international competition but that it is also critical to try and grow the pool of participants.

c. Bilingualism

As in the morning there was a discussion of the importance of providing services in both French and English. Bilingualism is a key principle of any HP model.

d. Metrics and Measurement

Participants suggested that the success of OTP have been based on the development of clear measures of success and that we don't have equally clear and legitimate targets for non-Olympic and Paralympics sports. A national HP organization would have to set similar objectives for non-Olympic sports.

e. The importance of HP for Canada

There was a discussion as to why HP is important for Canada. The assertion was made that most Canadians would tell you it's because our gold medal winners are great examples for our children. As a sector we don't really know that medals drive participation, but even if they might they would only be successful if there is capacity to support the increased interest.

f. Targeting

The question was asked as to whether the HP system should focus on sports that Canadians see themselves in or on those in which we can realistically get medals. It was suggested that a vision for high performance sport is also important. The notion was put forward that the vision is to be the best in the world, being a contribution to Canada's pursuit of excellence. At the same time it is important to come up with a case for sport that mirrors Canadian values such as integrity and hard work.

As in other roundtables the point was made that it is important to also support those athletes that are just on the verge of reaching the international stage and that there be systems logic to the HP system.

The observation was made that right now there is targeted high performance sport and non-targeted high performance sport, and that an HP organization has to be able to deal with both.

g. Special Olympics

It was noted that the Special Olympics also reflect high performance for those who participate. Canadian heroes come in all shapes and sizes and that may look differently in a different sport or in the Special Olympics. HP means integrity, excellence, hard work and great coaching, but this can look different from one sport to another and one high performance measure to another.

h. Structure

There was concern that it would not be possible to have an organization that looks at all HP sports as OTP currently deals with the targeted sports but not the non-targeted sports. There was also concern that the HP organization or entity should not represent another organization in the already quite clutter HP world. The organization should be as minimally bureaucratic as possible.

In terms of funding, it was felt that there should be one application with a fully integrated plan for high performance. If the lead agency has to speak to many agencies that is alright but it should appear as one window for the sport world.

The view was brought forward that right now there is too much in the HP box and that all that is really needed is the coach the athlete plus money. It was suggested that the multisport centres, OTP and RTE and others are all filters that take a cut of the money that could go directly to athletes and coaches.

The vision of HP sport should be that excellence in sport is part of Canada's society, where we are top in Winter and top three in Summer sport, where Canadians watch (amateur) sport and corporations support sport.

The suggestion was made that we are trying to streamline a supply chain that we don't fully understand. Do the players all clearly know how they contribute to the HP system? A tongue in cheek suggestion was made that we need to understand what the value is of each player and be willing to vote the unproductive elements off the island; for example, an organization may doing extremely well at what it does, but if its work do not add value to the HP system then it needs to step aside and not expect support for HP. An additional suggestion was made that it would be useful to map the supply chain and inputs into Canada's HP sector to see where the valuable contributions are being made.

Another participant suggested that there needs to be an efficient set of external experts that are based in an autonomous agency. If the sport sector could make (or had historically been able to make) the decisions themselves then there would be no need for the Panel.

In terms of the structure of the HP agency, it was asserted that athletes need to train in an arena where they are supported with:

- Coaches
- Infrastructure
- Sport Medicine
- A common set of metrics for success
- Access to international standards based equipment
- A concentration of partners or training teams
 - Centralization is important
- Strong Competition
 - Training abroad, in terms of competitions against the best
- A Communications and marketing strategy, with a focus on amateur sport promotion
- A reasonable exit strategy for athletes and for coaches

Again, participants emphasized the importance of leadership and coordination and that OTP has represented a big step forward in this regard. At some point someone has to have the authority to act strategically and decisively. One participant suggested that what is clear is that we need an agency at the level of the OTP but one that would be made publicly accountable through a federal act. It would be a centralized agency that could make a difficult decision in terms of better services for athletes.

The question was asked as to why such a structure has not already emerged and what kind of accountability is necessary to move forward. One participant suggested that the agency has to have a government-like structure and that it needs to have a management structure and an independent board that is responsible to the people who fund it. Since the federal government is still going to be the primary funder, the federal government should draft legislation that creates an agency with the desired principles and characteristics.

It was suggested that there could be two components to the agency, one side looking at the podium the other side looking at how to create and strengthen the things that feed the HP system; things like the Sport Centres, strong training camps and strong pools of athletes. Another participant suggested that

the basis of the agency must be to let the athlete and the coach focus on improvement. An agency can help to align the services, but at the end of the day this is about athletes being able to put aside distractions and focusing on training and on improvement.

An HP organization should be nimble and it should be able to build on the components that are there right now in the HP system to make them more effective. It should be able to make recommendations where they are needed and ensure that they are acted on.

Participants commented on the need for the HP organization to be sheltered from the political ups and downs that sport has experienced for many years; it should have permanence and continuity. It should have an important role in developing and supporting existing and future national sport institutes. There should be integration of funding and respect for and coordination with organizations in other jurisdictions. It was suggested that one of the best ways to support the independence of the HP organization would be to fund it through an endowment similar to the model in the U.S.

It was suggested that an HP organization could serve as a clearinghouse for funding and that it could help manage the properties of the rights holder and make recommendations on a strategic hosting policy.

i. The Olympic Committee

One participant claimed that, in most countries, NSOs report directly to the Olympic Committee and to no one else. Some participants suggested that to fulfill this role in Canada the COC would either have to dilute its Olympic mandate or not dilute it and focus on Olympic sports. It was clear, however, that the focus of an HP organization would have to be on the best interests of sport and not the best interests of the HP organization. There was also concern that through its mandate and structure that the COC already plays a big role, and that adding other things to this role would risk frittering away its ability to deliver on its main mandate. Participants felt that any HP model, including a COC-led model, would need to meet the fundamental principles and key characteristics that are essential for the success of HP sport, as recommended by the sport community.

j. Willingness of the Sector to Change and Make Sacrifices

Several participants suggested that they would be willing to give up things if they became redundant in a new approach for HP sport in Canada and that everything is on the table. The question was also asked if there is a willingness for some NSOs to merge and integrate? It was suggested that there is a level of willingness and collaboration at the Board level but that at the level of staff it is hard to get agreement because of fears around layoffs.

There is also willingness to try and coordinate activities between NSOs and PSOs.

There was a strong feeling that the sector has already started to implement change and that OTP is a big change in and of itself.

k. Role of Sport Canada

It was suggested that Sport Canada should be a provider of stable funding and that it should leave the technical leadership and HP decision making to the agency. It should not be involved in the decision making process for the allocation of funding for specific sports or HP strategies. At the same time, Sport Canada would still have two levels of accountability:

- Use of public funds – punitive capacity to ensure that they are invested as intended; and
- Outcomes – since the agency is charged with the public trust, it must still be charged with achieving the objectives it is supposed to achieve (e.g. reporting to Parliament)

It would also remain responsible for everything non high performance including publicly funded non-high performance components.

Annex I: Participants

MONTREAL, September 29, 2009 MORNING

	Name	Organization
1	Marcel Aubut	Canadian Olympic Committee
2	Pierre Langlois	Centre National Multisport - Montréal
3	Raymond Côté	Sports-Quebec
4	Sacha Vaillancourt	Hockey Canada
5	Sue Hylland	Canada Games
6	Louis Barbeau	Cycling / CPC
7	Ahmed El-Awadi	Water Polo Canada
8	Dianne Normand	CSC Atlantic
9	JD Miller	B2Ten
10	Pierre Dubé	Fondation athletes d'excellence Quebec
11	Dominick Gauthier	Former Olympian, NC

MONTREAL, September 29, 2009 AFTERNOON

	Name	Organization
1	Linda Cuthbert	Former President, Aquatic federation of Canada; Commonwealth Games Association
2	John Cawley	McConnell Foundation
3	Michel Larouche	Diving Canada Head Coach
4	Gerry Janneteau	Sportcom (media)
5	Tom Jones	Jeux du Commonwealth
6	Jean Paul Caron	Gymnastique
7	Akaash Maharaj	Equestrian
8	Guyline Bernier	Centre National Multisport - Montréal Referee (national/international)
9	Jamie Ferguson	CCPTSF
10	Nicolas Gill	Judo Canada
11	Danielle Sauvageau	Former hockey coach, CNMM consultant, COC coach mentor
12	Luce Mongrain	Centre Sportif Alphonse Desjardins
13	Jean-Marc Chouinard	Former Olympian
14	Scott Thomas	University of Toronto
15	Sharon Bolenbach	Special Olympics Canada