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SUMMARY

Olympic and Paralympic Summer Sports Business Plan

In April 2005, the 28 Olympic summer sports and the Paralympic summer sports, the COC, CPC, and Sport Canada decided to create a Business Plan that would guide the way to achieving excellence at the 2008 (Beijing) and 2012 (London) Olympic and Paralympic Games. The Canadian Olympic Committee, the Canadian Paralympic Committee and the Steering Committee of the summer Olympic and Paralympic sports asked Dr. Roger Jackson to lead this work.

This is an initial Business Plan, to start the process. It will see several iterations in the months ahead as we engage partners in the discussions, redefine issues and cost them more accurately.

The implementation of this plan will establish, for the first time, a coordinated highly effective Canadian high performance sport system. With very strong and focused leadership in place, it will build effective partnerships with governments, sports and associated organizations. The result will be world-class programs, policies and financing that will place Canada amongst the top nations at the summer Olympic and Paralympic Games.

We are entering a new era in Canadian sport, one based on effective collaboration, accountability, goal setting, efficiency and collective action for the greater good. Our distinctly Canadian approach is based on establishing new, effective partnerships rather than on the efforts of a single agency, or agencies working independently. All existing funding partners must make changes in the way they contribute in order to harmonize policies and programs. Resource, jurisdiction and policy re-alignment by all partners is the gut of the new approach.

GOALS

Canada ranked 19th at the 2004 Athens Olympic Games with 12 medals, and ranked 3rd at the Paralympic Games in total gold medals. Based on the work of the Canadian Sport Review Panel, there is optimism that Canada can rebound from its Athens performance to place in the top 15 nations in the total medal count (with 18-20 medals) by the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, and the top 10-12 at the 2012 Olympic Games (with 24-30 medals); and to place in the top five nations in the gold medal count at both the 2008 and 2012 Paralympic Games with 25 gold medals.

The process of achieving this goal has started with the investment of $14.765 million of new ‘excellence’ funding from Sport Canada in 2005-06 for 28 targeted Olympic sport disciplines and $1.6 million for 14 targeted Paralympic sports. In addition, the Province of British Columbia has contributed $5 million to initiate the program. The next stage, however, will require an additional infusion of support to a level proportional to that provided to the winter sport Own the Podium-2010 program where an additional $22 million per year is being invested in 14 winter Olympic and four winter Paralympic sport disciplines.
**OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of this Business Plan are to:

a) establish a leadership structure (Podium) to lead, develop and manage the national high performance plan; and to give Podium’s leadership the authorities and tools required to implement it

b) identify the funding, organizational and performance gaps that exist within the summer sport system

c) identify the roles and responsibilities of each of the various funding and implementation partners in delivering the plan, and have them undertake these

d) establish needed partnerships with governments, the COC, the CPC, corporate sponsors and others to assist in developing and implementing the plan

e) accumulate the needed new revenue to meet high performance needs; to reorganize current funding priorities and sources; and to achieve long-term financial stability

f) identify and establish the technical leadership, programs and policies required for Olympic and Paralympic excellence

g) strengthen all the organizations required to implement the programs.

---

**IMPLEMENTATION**

**What will be achieved with the implementation of this plan?**

a) Clear performance goals and objectives will be identified.

b) For the first-time ever, there will be a coordinated national leadership for high performance sport (via the organization Podium), to establish partnerships, policies and programs, to create an efficient national network of services, and to develop and implement the national program.

c) There will be more than 300 full-time coaches for targeted Olympic and Paralympic sports at national and provincial levels. The coaches will be properly paid and will have good working conditions that will allow them to concentrate solely on coaching.

d) There will be 20 or more full-time high performance directors to lead technical programs in selected Olympic and Paralympic summer sports.

e) Athletes and coaches will all have ‘ideal’ training environments and appropriate and adequate competitions.

f) The COC and CPC will ensure an optimal environment for the athlete’s preparation and performance at the Games.

g) Each training group/sport/discipline will have its own performance enhancement team of highly qualified sport scientists and medical support as needed.

h) New emphasis will be placed on development of team sports, to involve many more superior athletes, and to provide them with much enhanced competition and training.
i) The provincial and territorial governments and sport organizations will strengthen their high performance programs for developing Olympic and Paralympic athletes, including support for coaches, high performance directors, training centres, athletes, talent identification and recruitment, new facilities and new competition opportunities, all of which will be better coordinated with the national funding and programs.

j) National Sport Organizations will be strengthened to better develop and support high performance programs, particularly by having a full-time high performance director.

k) Canadian Sport Centres will offer more comprehensive and higher quality programs and services. Podium will have a Coordinator of Canadian Sport Centres to provide the coordination and establishment of a national sport centre system with common goals and policies.

l) New corporate and federal government funding of $58.8 million per year will be established as well as new provincial/territorial funding. An Olympic Foundation will be created by the COC to assist in generating new revenues. A plan will be developed and established to encourage VANOC corporate sponsors and suppliers to continue their involvement with both winter and summer Olympic and Paralympic sport after 2012.

m) Podium will have a Coordinator of Sport Science and Medicine and will establish a network of sport scientists, to secure their involvement with high performance sport, and to encourage their training and development.

n) Innovative research (called “Top Secret” for the winter sports) will provide the athletes and coaches with the leading technologies and practices for their training and competition.

o) A national communications plan will be developed and implemented by the COC to promote the importance of high performance excellence to our communities, provinces and country.

All of these proposed goals for the summer sports are already being achieved for the winter Olympic and Paralympic sports via their Own The Podium-2010 program. With adequate financing and the establishment of Podium, they can be achieved for the summer sports.

Who is responsible for implementing and managing the plan?

The leadership for the national high performance program will be provided by Podium, the newly-formed entity to be set up by the funding partners - Sport Canada, the Canadian Olympic Committee, the Canadian Paralympic Committee, and corporate sponsors.

Podium will plan and deliver the national high performance Business Plan in full collaboration with the NSOs and other implementing partners, pulling together needed policies and programs into a coordinated national approach.

The implementation of the national plan will be undertaken primarily by the NSOs, their coaches and high performance directors, the Canadian Sport Centres, the performance enhancement teams, the F/T/P governments, the COC and CPC.
**What are the roles of the key partners?**

For the Canadian system to properly support Olympic and Paralympic excellence, it is absolutely critical that all the participants, including governments, sports organizations and corporate partners learn to work together in a highly efficient and coordinated way. This has never occurred before in Canadian sport.

This collaboration is the new paradigm for excellence, a Canadian version of other successful models. Podium is the core unit around which all partners can work together. The Business Plan indicates that each of the partners must adapt their programs, policies and approaches to some extent, to eliminate gaps or overlaps, and to create needed efficiencies. There must be a shared vision for high performance excellence, and a willingness of all partners to adjust, and to play the roles that they can play best.

The following comments highlight some of the jurisdictional, financial and policy contributions/changes that are needed from various partners.

**Sport Canada**

a) Establish Podium with the other partners, to provide the national high performance technical leadership for targeted summer and winter Olympic and Paralympic sports.

b) With the other partners, integrate the CSRP process and OTP-2010 program into Podium to form a single national high performance unit (Podium).

c) Fund 50% of the Podium annual corporate operations budget, the remaining half to be funded by the other partners (COC, CPC, corporate partners).

d) Fund all the costs for employment of additional national senior and junior coaches as outlined in the Business Plan.

e) Fund 50% of the costs (with the Provinces paying the other share) for hiring regional coaches that contribute directly to the development of athletes for the national program.

f) Fund the national senior and junior team’s competition costs as outlined in the Business Plan.

g) Establish national Paralympic Games and Championships so as to develop sport for athletes with disabilities.

h) Fund the special programs outlined in the Business Plan to improve Olympic and Paralympic team sports.

i) Along with other partners, adequately fund the Canadian Sport Centres and the Performance Enhancement Teams as proposed in the Business Plan.

j) Fund a number of planning studies to assist developing needed national coordination, clarity of roles and policies (i.e. specifically on athlete support, coaching, facilities and team sports).
k) Work actively with the provinces and territories to establish cooperation, and where necessary, bi-lateral agreements, in key areas including: coordinating programming and policies; national high performance sport facility financing; joint support of Canadian Sport Centres; hiring of regional coaches; modifying the Canada Games to become more excellence oriented; establishing Canada Paralympic Games; establishing highly viable Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD) programs; establishing national/regional talent identification and recruitment programs; hosting international competitions in specific sports; and coordinating athlete assistance programs.

Provinces and Territories

Attaining Canada’s high performance objectives is tied to a number of responsibilities and contributions at the provincial and regional levels of sport and recreation. Chief among these are:

a) providing sufficient funding to the provincial and territorial sport organizations (P/TSOs) so that they have the capacity to implement most of the needed programs
b) hiring full-time high performance directors and coaches for the P/TSOs
c) providing professional development, training and mentoring for P/TSO staff and governance volunteers
d) ensuring international sport standards are used when building sport facilities; ensuring adequate access for athletes (Olympic and Paralympic) and coaches
e) providing athlete assistance programs in all provinces that coordinate well with Sport Canada’s Athlete Assistance Program
f) establishing talent identification and recruitment programs, coordinated with training and coaching opportunities, and including collaboration with the school systems and sport organizations
g) increasing the number of high-level, sport specific competitions within provinces and territories, for able-bodied athletes and athletes with a disability; for this latter group, an enormous boost would be given if the provinces/territories established Canada Paralympic Games and provincial Paralympic championships
h) hosting the Canada Games more frequently, and creating more relevance of these Games to the development of future international medalists
i) assigning hosting of the Canada Games to communities that will leave the best legacies (facilities and programs) for high performance sport
j) strengthening Paralympic sport, particularly by establishing programs that search out and encourage people to become involved, and by having proper coaching, training and competition opportunities such as Provincial Championships and Canada Paralympic Games
k) promoting and implementing the Long Term Athlete Development model for both Olympic and Paralympic sports
l) promoting and supporting sport schools and their developmental programs
m) supporting Canadian Sport Centres in their province to a greater degree and establishing provincial centres
n) undertaking an audit of high performance sport facilities, and developing and implementing a plan for needed facilities

o) establishing provincial lotteries to fund provincial/territorial sport organizations, training and competition facilities, athlete support, coaches compensation and other programs.

Over half of the items in the above list could be addressed by the provincial and territorial sport organizations if they had the resources, and thus the capacity to do so. The remaining items would need direct provincial government involvement.

**Canadian Olympic Committee and Canadian Paralympic Committee**

The COC and CPC have several unique roles to play. The COC is better suited to undertake some of these as a result of their financial and leadership capacity.

a) A primary role for the COC is to generate considerable financing for Podium programs. The COC has an endowment from the 1988 Calgary Games, and will soon have more funding from the 2010 Winter Games. However, these amounts are not sufficient in themselves to establish non-governmental financing of the summer sports, and to continue financing the winter sport after 2010.

b) The COC and CPC have exclusive jurisdiction over the staging of Games missions. As performance partners, they must ensure that the very best conditions are available for athletes to perform. Two sections of the Business Plan outline major roles that they can, and have started to undertake.

c) The COC and CPC also have exclusive jurisdiction over their own team selection policies. They must work with sports to set these to include qualified developmental athletes for future Games (Olympic, Paralympic, Pan American and Para-Pan American).

d) The COC and CPC must work with other multi-sport Games franchise holders, such as the Commonwealth Games Association of Canada, and Canadian Interuniversity Sport which selects the University Games team, to coordinate athlete selection and participation numbers to best give needed experiences to an expanded number of top developing athletes.

e) There needs to be a major effort to coordinate all the various athlete assistance programs operated by federal and provincial governments and various corporations. The COC can assist the corporate sponsors to participate in a coordinated manner.

f) The COC should not undertake high performance technical programs that could best be undertaken by Podium. Instead, it should build on its high performance Games preparation programs, the basis of which are the 19 initiatives which it undertook for the Torino Games.

g) The COC will expand its commitment to provide more comprehensive pre-Games services to the NSOs leading up to each Olympic Games and commencing these services earlier in the quadrennial.
h) The COC should take the lead in determining the desirability of an athlete incentive program that rewards medalists. If the program is to go ahead, the COC should take responsibility for establishing the program with corporations and in collaboration with the CPC.

i) Just as the COC and CPC financed this Road to Excellence Business Plan, and the COC initiated the winter sport Own the Podium plan, the COC and CPC should commission other reports. They could do this with other partners. Topics that need attention are: coordinating athlete support; developing policy on national coaches’ compensation, recruitment, retention and training; establishing a national high performance facilities survey; reviewing the need for a national Sport Institute.

j) With support from the national funding partners, the COC should establish a major national communications program for high performance sport. Whereas Podium would be the national technical unit, the COC would be the national high performance communications unit.

k) The financing for Podium comes from many sources. Whereas the federal government wishes to provide its share directly to the sports, the COC plays critical roles in acquiring new funding, and in providing ‘banking’ services for non-governmental Podium projects.

l) The COC would also offer all business services for Podium from its existing staff in Toronto and Ottawa. This is currently happening with OTP-2010, and it eliminates the need for Podium to duplicate these services.

---

**Targeting Sports**

**Priority Targeted Sport Disciplines**

In 2004 and 2005, the CSRP very thoroughly reviewed all summer Olympic and Paralympic sport disciplines against a series of criteria to predict their medal potential at the 2008 and 2012 Games. The sports were ranked and targeted to receive funding for the 2005-06 and subsequent fiscal years. Thus, the ‘excellence’ funding was focused on the highest priority sports, to better meet their needs to achieve medal success.

Because the ‘excellence’ funding was limited, a number of lower priority sports did not receive funding. Indeed, the targeted sports could have used more to give them more comprehensive programming and a better chance to win medals. Thus, depending on the resources available, the number of priority disciplines could increase, and the depth of funding to them could also increase.

The following two charts indicate the medal potential of targeted and non-targeted sports as determined by the CSRP in their 2005 evaluation. Some of the targeted sports have not yet demonstrated their ability to win medals in 2008 or 2012, but it was felt that by providing them with some new funding, they might be successful.

The non-targeted sports did not receive ‘excellence’ funding in 2005-06, but with adequate funding, several could have a good chance at a medal by 2012.
Targeted Sports (2005-06) and their Olympic Medal Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRP Sport Ranking</th>
<th>2004 Medals Achieved</th>
<th>2008 Medal Forecast</th>
<th>2012 Medal Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A Canoe / Kayak -Sprint</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Athletics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Soccer - Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball - Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpolo - Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A Artistic Gymnastics - Men</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trampoline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling-Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B Baseball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball-Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A Artistic Gymnastics - W</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchro Swim</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triathlon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball - Beach</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling-Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B Basketball-Men</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball-Women</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C Canoe-Slalom (athletes)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing - W(epée)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taekwondo-Women</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D Table Tennis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Medals</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Baseball and softball are on the 2008 Olympic program but not on the 2012 program.
Non-targeted sports in the 2005-06 CSRP Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRP Sport Ranking</th>
<th>2004 Medals Achieved</th>
<th>2008 Medal Forecast</th>
<th>2012 Medal Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5B Soccer-Men</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball-Women</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A Archery</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badminton</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxing</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Pentathlon</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Gymnastics</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taekwondo-Men</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weightlifting</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B Field Hockey-Men</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey-Women</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Handball</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpolo-Men</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Medals</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paralympic Medal Forecast

Based on the 2005 CRSP evaluation, and current funding levels of about $1.6 million/year, the following Paralympic disciplines have been prioritized with 2008 projections of 60 medals and fifth place based on total gold medals. Because of ongoing revisions to the Paralympic program, it is not possible to predict medal totals, or even the events that will be on the program, however, probable and potential medal winning sports are noted.
CSRPs Paralympic Medal Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSRPs Sport Ranking</th>
<th>2004 Paralympic Medals</th>
<th>Potential 2008 Paralympic Medals</th>
<th>Potential 2012 Paralympic Medals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Medals</td>
<td>72 with 28 gold</td>
<td>60 plus</td>
<td>80 plus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing

In 2005-06, the allocated new ‘excellence’ funding was $16.365 million for Olympic and Paralympic summer sport disciplines. Sport Canada provided $12 million, COC $4.265 million and CPC $100,000.

Of the $16.365 million, the Olympic sports received $14.765 million and the Paralympic sports $1.6 million. This was the amount allocated and not the amount requested or needed.

In 2005-06, during the CSRPs process, the targeted sports requested approximately $33 million for specific programs, the non-targeted sports requested $12 million, and the Paralympic sports needed an estimated $7 million, for a total of $52 million. Thus there was a shortfall of approximately $36 million per year.

However, this shortfall does not include financing for needed items such as program funds for innovation, recruitment, Podium operations, additional athlete support, games mission preparation, junior athlete development and other needed provincial development programs.
In order to assess this total need, the Business Plan looked at the cost of all required expenditures for both national and provincial elements of the plan.

This review estimated that for both targeted sports and the development of the Canadian high performance system, there was a requirement of $88.4 million, $46 million (51%) to be funded by the federal government, $12.8 million (15%) by the corporate sector and $29.6 million (34%) to come from the Provinces/Territories, primarily for coaching and athlete support. This Provincial/Territorial funding is critically important to complete the high performance development pathways.

To put this sum into perspective with the winter sport ‘excellence’ funding (OTP-2010), the 14 winter sport disciplines and the four Paralympic sport disciplines (total 17) receive additional annual ‘excellence’ funding of $22 million. For the 25 targeted summer sports and 14 Paralympic summer disciplines (total 39), the need is $58.8 million annually from the same national (federal government and corporate) sources.

**Road to Excellence Requirement for Additional Annual Funding in 2006-07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Additional Annual need ($ million) 2006-07</th>
<th>Partner Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal ($ million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial ($ million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate &amp; COC/ CPC ($ million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete support</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Science</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Sport Centres</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Review</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Secret Innovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Identification</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Preparation (COC &amp; CPC)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media support</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Resources Required</strong></td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
Risks

The main risks in implementing this Business Plan are as follows.

a) We do not have enough funding in the system to achieve excellence. Thus, if we can not resolve this, we will not be able to implement new programs. Additional annual funding of $58.8 million of federal and corporate support needs to be added to the current national high performance budgets of selected summer Olympic and Paralympic sports and supporting organizations. We need a long-term financial solution.

b) We do not have leadership for the national high performance summer sport program. Podium must be established with the authority and opportunity to coordinate, direct and manage the system to required standards under the aegis of the national funding partners. This is happening with the winter sports (OTP-2010) and this needs to be extended to include the summer sports (Podium).

c) Key provinces have to do more to develop sport excellence at the regional level. Our failure to engage them and to create the necessary foundation programs will severely limit success. Additional annual funding of $29.6 million is required from the provinces.

d) We must establish effective partnerships with the key players, and create their willingness to modify, coordinate and harmonize policies and programs so as to create an effective, efficient and comprehensive system. Podium is the mechanism to achieve this.

e) It is going to take time to recruit, train and retain the world-class coaches that are critical to athlete success. We will be unsuccessful if we do not provide excellent compensation, training and working conditions for them.

f) We must have sufficient numbers of talented athletes in the system. They must be very well supported, and have access to excellent training facilities and competition opportunities.

It is crucial for the partners to commit to finance, and thus begin the implementation of the Business Plan by May 2006. The 2008 Games in Beijing are two years away. To achieve the goals outlined in the plan, most of the proposed work and new initiatives must begin in fiscal 2006-07.
SECTION 1 – THE BUSINESS PLAN

BACKGROUND

Many have commented that as Canadians, we would win the gold medal for creating good reports about the frailties and inadequacies of our sport system, but subsequently not do anything about them. We hope to change all that with this Business Plan – an action plan, not a report - and we will do so if we have the commitment to achieve excellence from the whole sport community, adequate resources and national high performance sport leadership.

After serious cutbacks in federal funding in the 1990s, the past two years have seen a considerable improvement. What started the momentum was Vancouver being awarded the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in 2003. With the leadership of Mark Lowry of the Canadian Olympic Committee (COC) and the support of John Furlong the CEO of the Vancouver Olympic Organizing Committee (VANOC), things started to happen quickly. Cathy Priestner Allinger headed up a winter sports review, and the result was the birth of a ‘best ever’ winter sports program called Own the Podium-2010, funded by VANOC corporate sponsors and the Province of British Columbia (total of $55 million over five years) and the federal government ($55 million over five years).

In 2005, the federal government also acquired additional annual funding ($12 million) to greatly expand ‘excellence’ programs for selected summer Olympic and Paralympic sports. In collaboration with the COC and Canadian Paralympic Committee (CPC), the government established the Canadian Sport Review Panel (CSRP), comprised of technical experts to evaluate both the sport’s capability to win medals at the 2008 and 2012 summer Olympic and Paralympic Games, and their proposed programs leading to these Games. The CSRP would recommend what funding should be provided by the Funding Partners to the sports and to others that support them.

All this action with the winter sports motivated the summer Olympic and Paralympic sports to develop their own action plan, and in April 2005, the COC and the CPC asked Dr. Roger Jackson to lead the development of their Business Plan, called "Road to Excellence.”

A Steering Committee (see prior list) was formed by the summer sports to guide the development of a Business Plan that was to identify what needs to be done, who does it, how it is to be done, and the costs and timelines.

THE BUSINESS PLAN

This is an initial Plan, to start the process. It will see several iterations in the months ahead as we discuss and redefine issues, cost them more accurately, and engage partners in the discussions.
When this Plan is implemented, we will create a highly effective national high performance sport system, with very strong and focused leadership, effective collaborative partnerships to assist, new clarity of roles and responsibilities of governments, sports and associated organizations, and appropriate programs, policies and financing, that will place Canada amongst the top few nations at the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

For the Plan to be effectively implemented, three things must happen:

a) A national leadership structure for Canadian high performance sport (called “Podium”) must be created and put in place.

b) Additional annual federal and corporate funding of $58.8 million needs to be added to the current national high performance budgets of selected summer Olympic and Paralympic sports and supporting organizations, to broadly expand programs. An additional $29.6 million of annual funding needs to be provided by the provinces for supporting provincial programs.

c) There must be a true commitment and full cooperation by all the governments, sport organizations and corporate partners to achieve the goals of the national high performance plan, and to undertake their specific responsibilities in this effort.

Do we really want to improve our system and leadership to achieve excellence? If we have the collective will to say and mean “yes”, and to collaborate selflessly for the good of this challenge, then we will do it.

1. What are the vision, goals, objectives, principles, strategies of the business plan?

This Business Plan relates to both Olympic and Paralympic sport, and specifically to those sports that have a reasonable chance to achieve international success (medals).

**Vision**

The vision is for Canadian summer Olympic and Paralympic athletes to be consistently amongst the best in the world, with great success at the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2008 and 2012. Canada will have the commitment, leadership, national sport system, programs, policies and resources required to ensure this achievement to and beyond 2012.

**Mission**

The mission is to develop world class ethical athletes who consistently win medals at Olympic and Paralympic Games, World Championships, and other Games.
Performance Goals

The goals are:

a) for summer Olympic sports, Canada places in the top 16 nations in the total medal count by the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, and top 12 by the London Olympic Games in 2012

b) for summer Paralympic sports, Canada consistently places in the top five nations in the gold medal count in 2008 and 2012.

Objectives

The objectives of this Business Plan are to:

a) establish a national high performance leadership structure (Podium) in Canada to lead, develop and manage the national plan; and to give its leadership the authorities and tools required to implement it

b) identify the funding, organizational and performance gaps that exist within the summer sport system

c) establish needed partnerships with governments, the COC, CPC, corporate sponsors and others to assist in developing and implementing the plan

d) identify the roles and responsibilities of each of the various funding and implementation partners in delivering the plan, and have them undertake these

f) accumulate the needed revenue to meet high performance needs; to reorganize current funding priorities and sources; and to achieve long-term financial stability

g) identify and establish the programs and policies required for Olympic and Paralympic excellence

g) establish the technical expertise (coaches, high performance directors etc.) and other professionals that are required, and to strengthen all the organizations required to implement the programs.

Principles

a) We need to create the financing, opportunities, encouragement and all other conditions for an athlete or a coach to become the world’s best.

b) For such success, it is absolutely paramount that world-class coaches work with proper compensation, under proper conditions and with talented athletes who are available to train.

c) High performance excellence will be achieved by ethical means.
Strategies
The Business Plan will implement strategies to:
   a) establish first-rate leadership for Canadian high performance sport
   b) generate the needed stable long-term resources for the plan
   c) establish agreement on national standards and goals from all partners
   d) establish a coordinated efficient national system necessary to achieve the desired success
   e) engage partners to assist, particularly the provinces, corporate sponsors and others
   f) consolidate and improve current national high performance programs and policies to an international standard
   g) acquire, retain and support world-class and developing coaches and create ideal working conditions and compensation for them
   h) maximize integration between summer and winter sport initiatives when benefits are possible for both groups
   i) ensure there is a competent full-time High Performance Director (HPD) working with each sport
   j) strengthen the Canadian Sport Centres to better serve athletes and coaches
   k) ensure Performance Enhancement Teams (PETs) are highly competent and available for all athletes and coaches
   l) ensure timely notification and distribution of funding to recipients
   m) ensure excellent monitoring and evaluation of programs and of those implementing them
   n) acquire knowledge and understanding of the world’s best practices and the most innovative and effective ethical approaches to high performance sport excellence.

2. What is the business?
The business is assisting Canadian athletes to achieve sustainable world excellence in sport.

3. What are the components of an action plan?
   a) National goals - Establish clear goals that are agreed to by the sport community and partners.
   b) System leadership - Establish the leadership structure and leadership, and give it clear responsibility and authority to manage and/or influence all parts of the national plan. The structure could be a high performance agency and/or functional partnerships.
   c) Business plan - Establish the Business Plan and its strategies, and within it, identify the needed programs and policies and how and when to implement them.
d) Athlete identification, recruitment and development - Ensure there are long-term athlete development (LTAD) programs for each sport and that the provinces and PSOs work together to implement them.

e) Technical leadership - Acquire world-class technical resources (coaches and HPDs) to lead and implement the preparation of athletes.

f) Sport leadership - Strengthen the 'organizational readiness' of the sports delivery agencies and leadership, specifically the NSOs, the CSCs, and the PETs.

g) Partnerships - Establish the partnerships and their commitment to contribute to and implement the plan.

h) Involvement of the provinces and territories - Establish excellent and comprehensive foundation programs for sport excellence: this includes, amongst other things, development of needed facilities; support for Sport Centres (CSCs); athlete recruitment, development and financial assistance programs; employing coaches in Olympic and Paralympic sports; supporting the professionalization of provincial sport organizations (PSOs); and establishing additional provincial competition programs.

i) System funding - Acquire the financial resources to implement the Business Plan; establish a timely and efficient distribution of these funds for high performance purposes.

j) Policy development - Have all partners adjust their policies so as to deliver resources, leadership and programs in an effective, efficient, coordinated and timely manner

k) Program development - Develop and implement new and enhanced programs for high performance athletes and coaches.

l) Facilities – Ensure that world-class training and competition facilities are available and accessible.

m) Competitions – Ensure that there are sufficient and appropriate competitions for both junior and senior athletes.

n) Innovation and ‘Top Secret’ – Ensure that the best training and competition conditions and techniques prevail and that innovation is ever-present in the preparation of athletes and coaches.

4. Who is responsible for implementing and managing the plan?

a) The leadership for the national high performance program will be provided by Podium, the newly-formed entity to be set up by the funding partners - Sport Canada, the Canadian Olympic Committee, the Canadian Paralympic Committee, and corporate sponsors.

b) Podium will plan and deliver the national high performance Business Plan in full collaboration with the NSOs and other implementing partners, pulling together needed policies and programs into a coordinated national approach.

c) The implementation of the national plan will be undertaken primarily by the NSOs, their coaches and high performance directors, the Canadian Sport Centres, the performance enhancement teams, the F/T/P governments, the COC and CPC.
5. What is outstanding about this opportunity?

Establishing national high performance leadership and an efficient and effective system to develop high performance sport in the country is long overdue. Many major reports attest to this.

The awarding of the Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games to Vancouver and Whistler, and VANOC’s desire to help the Canadian Olympic and Paralympic winter athletes shine at these Games has created a rare opportunity to significantly advance winter sports and all elements of the sport delivery system. The federal government and corporate sponsors have provided additional annual funding of $22 million for five years to assist the winter sports. The summer sports want to share in this momentum.

In 2005-06, the summer Olympic and Paralympic sports received $12 million of ‘excellence’ funds from the federal government, a good first step, but much less than what is needed to reach the proposed national goals.

This Business Plan is presented to assist the summer Olympic and Paralympic sports utilize this rare momentum to articulate what they want to accomplish and how they are going to achieve this.

6. What exists?

Many of the key elements for high performance success exist, but are considerably underdeveloped.

a) Athlete support of $27 million for 2005-06 is about $7 million more than a year previously and appears adequate for the moment, although that program needs to be reconfigured to some extent.

b) In 2005-06, there was approximately $17.5 million spent on coaching - $13 million on coaches salaries for all sports, summer and winter, and $4.5 million to the Coaching Association of Canada for education and training, much of it at the community and developmental levels.

c) There are a small number of full-time HPDs, notably in the most successful sports.

d) Four of the nine Canadian Sport Centres provide fairly comprehensive services to a large number of high performance national team athletes.

e) A small number of summer sports/disciplines have their own PET, led by the coach and HPD.

f) There are a number of sport scientists interested in helping summer sports, but to this point there have been scarce resources to involve them.

g) The federal government is supporting the implementation of a Long Term Athlete Development program for each sport.
7. What will be achieved with the implementation of this plan?

a) Clear performance goals and objectives will be identified.

b) For the first-time ever, there will be a coordinated national leadership for high performance sport (via the organization Podium), to establish partnerships, policies and programs, to create an efficient national network of services, and to develop and implement the national program.

c) There will be more than 300 full-time coaches for targeted Olympic and Paralympic sports at national and provincial levels. The coaches will be properly paid and will have good working conditions that will allow them to concentrate solely on coaching.

d) There will be 20 or more full-time high performance directors to lead technical programs in selected Olympic and Paralympic summer sports.

e) Athletes and coaches will all have ‘ideal’ training environments and appropriate and adequate competitions.

f) The COC and CPC will ensure an optimal environment for the athlete’s preparation and performance at the Games.

g) Each training group/sport/discipline will have its own performance enhancement team of highly qualified sport scientists and medical support as needed.

h) New emphasis will be placed on development of team sports, to involve many more superior athletes, and to provide them with much enhanced competition and training.

i) The provincial and territorial governments and sport organizations will strengthen their high performance programs for developing Olympic and Paralympic athletes, including support for coaches, high performance directors, training centres, athletes, talent identification and recruitment, new facilities and new competition opportunities, all of which will be better coordinated with the national funding and programs.

j) National Sport Organizations will be strengthened to better develop and support high performance programs, particularly by having a full-time high performance director.

k) Canadian Sport Centres will offer more comprehensive and higher quality programs and services. Podium will have a Coordinator of Canadian Sport Centres to provide the coordination and establishment of a national sport centre system with common goals and policies.

l) New corporate and federal government funding of $58.8 million per year will be established as well as new provincial/territorial funding. An Olympic Foundation will be created by the COC to assist in generating new revenues. A plan will be developed and established to encourage VANOC corporate sponsors and suppliers to continue their involvement with both winter and summer Olympic and Paralympic sport after 2012.

m) Podium will have a Coordinator of Sport Science and Medicine and will establish a network of sport scientists, to secure their involvement with high performance sport, and to encourage their training and development.

n) Innovative research (called “Top Secret” for the winter sports) will provide the athletes and coaches with the leading technologies and practices for their training and competition.
8. How will we develop athletes better than others?

We will achieve the necessary international performance standards by:

   a) setting difficult but clear goals, and demonstrating the will to achieve them
   b) establishing stronger, focused, passionate leadership at all levels of the HP system
   c) coordinating all necessary resources under a single efficient and effective leadership
   d) providing adequate resources
   e) recruiting, training, supporting and retaining highly qualified professionals
   f) recruiting and developing highly talented athletes – there will be Paralympic outreach programs to find and recruit individuals with a disability, making them aware of opportunities and overcoming resistance from family, the rehabilitation community, transport and other issues.
   g) creating and strengthening critical partnerships between the public and private sectors and sport
   h) using the motivation of hosting an Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games in Canada in 2010, and a focus on London in 2012 to motivate our athletes, coaches and the public.

9. What standards need to be met?

There are clear standards to be met: to win Olympic, Paralympic and World Championship medals at both the junior and senior levels. The leadership and programs will need to be among the best in the world to do this.

10. What are the effects of innovation and technological change in the next ten years?

There will be a strong innovation and research program for technology and human performance to support the athletes. This is described in the ‘Innovation and Research’ section of this Business Plan. The Canadian winter sports already are implementing such a plan through the OTP-2010 program. For Paralympic sport, this field remains relatively underdeveloped internationally and investment in these areas would provide an almost immediate impact on international performance. We must act soon or the advantage will be lost as leading countries develop their own similar programs.
11. How will the programs be developed?
Podium will work with all the partners (NSOs, CSCs, the funding partners and others) to develop, coordinate and implement the programs.

12. How will the programs be delivered and what is the timing?
The delivery system is in place now. The NSOs have national team programs with some national coaches and high performance directors. National training groups of athletes and coaches exist. Nine Canadian Sport Centres exist across Canada. There are numerous technical professionals who want to be involved but up to now we have not had the resources to engage them properly. This shortfall is even more pronounced in sport for athletes with a disability. To change this, we will need a comprehensive strategy to recruit, train/develop, remunerate and retain professionals such as coaches, high performance directors, and sport science and medicine professionals.

13. When will the programs/network be established?
This will depend on the timing of the creation of Podium for the national summer sport program, and the availability of financing. The winter sport program is already being implemented by the new OTP-2010 initiative for winter sports, a precursor to Podium.

14. What are the main risks in implementing the program?
The main risks are understood, as they have been with us for years.

a) We do not have enough funding in the system to achieve excellence; thus, if we cannot resolve this, we will not be able to implement new programs. We need a long-term financial solution.

b) We do not have national system leadership (Podium) for the high performance program and this must be put in place with the authority and opportunity to coordinate, direct and manage the high performance system to required standards. This leadership is happening with the winter sports (OTP-2010) and this needs to be extended to include the summer sports.

c) Key provinces have to do more to develop sport excellence. Our failure to engage them and to create the necessary foundation programs will severely limit success.

d) We must establish effective partnerships with the key players, and to create the willingness to modify, coordinate and harmonize policies and programs so as to create an effective comprehensive system.

e) It is going to take time to recruit, train and retain the world-class technical people (coaches, HPDs) that are critical to athlete success. We will be unsuccessful if we do not provide excellent compensation, training and working conditions for them.

f) We must have sufficient numbers of talented athletes in the system. They must be very well supported, and have access to excellent training facilities and competition opportunities.
15. What are the costs?

An additional $58.8 million a year is required for high performance programs for Olympic and Paralympic targeted summer sports, added to that currently being spent annually directly or indirectly by Sport Canada and the COC on international excellence.

There is a need for an additional $29.6 million of annual support for athletes and coaches from provincial sources to augment junior and senior national athlete development, in addition to other provincial funding (undetermined) for facility development, support to Canadian Sport Centres, talent identification, Long Term Athlete Development and other programs.

The goal is to ensure there is a sustainable funding up to and beyond 2012.
SECTION 2 – THE ENVIRONMENT
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1. The Current Environment

At the Athens Olympic Games in 2004, Canada ranked 21st in total gold medals (3), and 19th in total medals (12). To have finished 15th, Canada would need 20 medals. To finish in the top 10 nations, Canada would have to win at least 30 medals. Canada's total medal count in the past five summer Olympic Games was 10, 18, 22, 14, and 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Gold</th>
<th>NOC</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank by Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JPN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>KOR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CUB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>BRA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Comparison of Canada and Australia

Comparing the Canadian and Australian systems and results is revealing. Both countries have similar British sport traditions. Both compete at the Commonwealth, Olympic and Paralympic Games. Both have difficulty in attending major junior and senior events because of geographic isolation. Both have large land masses and must implement their programs across a continent. The Australian and Canadian dollars are almost equivalent value. Australia has a better year-round climate for preparation of summer sports and does not participate actively in winter sports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GDP world ranking</th>
<th>Population (millions)</th>
<th>Total medals 2004 Olympics</th>
<th>Total medals ranking</th>
<th>Total medals/million pop. ranking</th>
<th>Total medals/GDP ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>38th</td>
<td>64th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>29th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Australians have had extraordinary Olympic success since disappointing results at the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. Central to this rejuvenation was the commitment to do something, leading to the creation of the Australian Institute of Sport (AIS) in 1981 in Canberra, and the Australian Sports Commission (ASC) (1989), an agency outside of government with the mandate to develop and implement the national high performance sport program. It was given the funding (and created other funding) to do this.

Comparison of Australian and Canadian Medal Results for Summer Olympic Games.
Comparison of Australian and Canadian Medal Results for both Summer and Winter Olympic Games.

One will note that in the past two Olympiads when Canada’s summer and winter medals are compared to Australia’s, Canada still remains considerably less successful.

When the IOC awarded the 2000 Olympic Games to Sydney (1993), there were significant increases in funding (and thus programming) to prepare athletes for their Games. Central to this was the establishment of state sport institutes, the hiring of first-rate full-time national coaches and high performance directors for all sports, an athlete support and bonus scheme, performance enhancement teams (sport medicine and science) for each sport, increased competition and so on.

All of these elements are developed to some degree in Canada, but we have not made the commitment to finance and implement these areas well. We do not have a high performance leadership structure and funding agency as per the Australian Sport Commission. We commit less financing to high performance sport as do the Australians despite the fact that we have 50% more population and a stronger economy.

To give but one example of a successful element of the Australian system, consider the success of the AIS in developing athletes. The numbers on the following chart represent only the athletes who use the national Institute in Canberra. The six State Institutes also develop many medalists.
### AIS at the Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AIS at the Olympic Games</th>
<th>AIS at the Paralympic Games</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles 1984</strong></td>
<td>32 current and former AIS athletes competed in four sports and won 5 silver and 2 bronze medals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seoul 1988</strong></td>
<td>116 current and former athletes competed in thirteen sports and won 1 gold, 2 silver, 2 bronze medals.</td>
<td>1 current athlete competed and won 2 gold medals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barcelona 1992</strong></td>
<td>139 current and former athletes competed in thirteen sports and won 3 gold, 7 silver and 3 bronze medals.</td>
<td>12 current and former athletes competed in two sports and won 10 gold, 8 silver and 6 bronze medals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atlanta 1996</strong></td>
<td>215 current and former AIS athletes competed in 13 sports and won 4 gold, 7 silver and 17 bronze medals.</td>
<td>26 current and former AIS athletes won 22 gold, 22 silver and 5 bronze medals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sydney 2000</strong></td>
<td>321 current and former athletes competed in nineteen sports and won 8 gold, 11 silver and 13 bronze medals.</td>
<td>53 current and former athletes won 29 gold, 17 silver and 15 bronze medals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Athens 2004</strong></td>
<td>289 current and former AIS athletes competed in twenty sports and won 10 gold, 10 silver and 12 bronze medals.</td>
<td>47 current and former athletes won 13 gold, 27 silver and 23 bronze medals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Australian Funding for Olympic and Paralympic Sport

The Australian funding has been primarily targeted to eight sports (athletics, basketball, canoeing, cycling, gymnastics, field hockey, rowing, swimming) which produced 102 of their 140 (73%) Olympic medals won from 1988 to 2000. Up to 50 sports may receive limited support from the Australian Sport Commission. There is little support for winter sports in Australia.

### Australian (ASC) Funding for Sport Compared to Summer Olympic Medal Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>AU$(000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canadian (Sport Canada) Funding for Sport Compared to Summer Olympic Medal Results.

The unusually high Canadian medal total at the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games was mostly a result of ‘eastern block’ countries boycotting the Games. Graph excludes funding for hosting international events.

The following graph compares Australian (ASC) and Canadian (Sport Canada) sport expenditures for all sport programs. In the 2004-05 fiscal year, there is a gap of $62 million CAD between the two systems. The Australians are concentrating much more funding on far fewer sports.
3. Paralympic Sport

Canada has been steadily improving its international ranking in Paralympic sport, finishing 3rd in total gold medals at the Athens 2004 Games. The funding levels for Paralympic sport have recently been increasing quite significantly.

Sport Canada Funding for all Paralympic Sport Including the CPC.
### Paralympic Team Ranking Based on Gold Medals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996 Paralympics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000 Paralympics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2004 Paralympics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Canada’s Top three standing at the last two Paralympic Summer Games implies system strength, these medals were won by a very small group of aging elite athletes. Significant changes are required or Canada will be facing a precipitous drop in medal standing as soon as 2008. An overview of the current situation is included in the unpublished CSRP report\(^1\) as follows.

---


40 The Environment
“Many of the Olympic factors discussed above are also critical to the development and success of our next generation of Paralympic medalists. In particular, the development and implementation of a Long-Term Athlete Development system is absolutely essential in order for Canada to maintain and improve on our status as leaders within Paralympic sport. While the policy of inclusion has been very successful at the national team level for a number of sports, over the last decade there has been virtually zero attention and resources devoted to shaping a development system to “re-stock” our current talent pool and develop new athletes. The CSRP recommends each Paralympic sport customize the generic Paralympic Long-Term Athlete Development Model developed by Sport Canada and the CPC for their sport, and work with their relevant provincial sport and disability organizations in order to create a truly comprehensive development system for Paralympic athletes.”

“It is important to note that because it generally requires a shorter amount of time to develop a Paralympic athlete (4-6 years depending on the sport), an immediate focus on long-term athlete development can be expected to produce significant results in time for the 2012 Games. Conversely, without significant attention to this matter, Paralympic medal counts can be projected to decrease rapidly from Canada’s current top-3 position internationally.”

“On the Paralympic program, the Panel predicts that up to 10 sports will have opportunities to win medals in 2012 with another two sports possessing the potential to medal through the efforts of individual athletes. Due to the increased awareness and value of Paralympic sport internationally, the emergence of dominant new countries, i.e. China, and the overall increase in depth and quality of field, it is unlikely Canada will be able to duplicate the medal count earned in Sydney and Athens. However, the Panel believes that with ongoing enhanced excellence support and a commitment to a structured Paralympic athlete development system, Canada will be able to achieve a top five ranking at the 2012 Paralympic Summer Games.”

**PETs** - “Paralympic sports reported that very few components of PET teams are currently in place and little sport science research has been devoted to athletes with a disability. There is strong interest from Paralympic NSOs to pursue the PET concept. Initial pilot projects undertaken in the sport science field indicate to the Panel that further development of expertise in this area would likely provide a significant competitive edge to Canadian Paralympians.”

**Vertical integration** - “The Panel is confident that progression through this process will lead to a greater integration and collaboration among clubs, PSOs and NSOs and endorses Sport Canada’s plans to continue investing in this initiative. As previously referenced, the development and implementation of these initiatives is absolutely essential to the future success of Paralympic sport in Canada and its ability to continue to achieve podium results. It is recommended that all targeted sports will have initiated the LTAD process by 2005-06.”

**AAP** - “Several Paralympic sports requested increased flexibility in AAP criteria for athletes who are achieving the required performance standards to meet carding criteria, but currently are ineligible as they participate in events with limited size of field. The impact is most significant for female athletes and athletes with a severe disability, where field size is most likely to be limited at international events. These sports are requesting consideration be given to these individual circumstances in the development of carding criteria to account for the limited field sizes in certain Paralympic events.”
Coaching development - “Through NSO submissions and interviews, it became quite clear that Paralympic sports have been under-serviced by the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC) in the development of Paralympic sport coaching certification programs and resources. In fact, many Paralympic sports still do not possess either technical coaching manuals or adaptive principles to facilitate the involvement of interested able-body coaches in sport for athletes with a disability. The CSRP recommends steps be taken immediately to ensure targeted Paralympic sports are fully engaged in the Coaches education process and also in future coaching initiatives in Canada.”


The high performance systems of six nations (France, UK, Spain, Canada, USA, and Australia) were reviewed to identify common characteristics that defined their sport systems. Brisson reviewed these and created the following table to compare the Canadian Sport system against these common characteristics for international success.

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Characteristics</th>
<th>Canadian Sport System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ clear understanding about the role of the different agencies involved and an effective communication network that maintains the system</td>
<td>♦ lack of clear targets; fragmented sport system; lack of coordination and communication leads to gaps and overlap; multiple funding agencies and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ simplicity of administration through common sporting and political boundaries</td>
<td>♦ sport organization does not correspond with political organization; multiple applications to a variety of agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ recognition that developing excellence has costs, with appropriate funding for infrastructure and people</td>
<td>♦ compared to six nations examined, Canada ranks near the bottom in sport investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ targeting of resources on a relatively small number of sports by identifying those that have a real chance of international success</td>
<td>♦ some examples of targeting by specific programs with federal government contribution but most funding is egalitarian and based on meeting minimum criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ comprehensive planning for each sport’s needs</td>
<td>♦ planning is not centrally coordinated or evaluated; no systemic reaction to expressed needs of sports; lack of sport science research, knowledge management and information sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ an effective system for the statistical identification and monitoring of the progress of talented and elite athletes</td>
<td>♦ a limited generic talent identification program is in place in BC, but no national system; proliferation of data bases with little information sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ well developed and sport-specific facilities with priority access for elite athletes</td>
<td>♦ no facility based training institutes; some specialist facilities are available to specific training groups such as those in Calgary for winter sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ provision of sports services to create a culture of excellence in which all members of the team (athletes, coaches, managers, scientists) can interact with one another in a formal and informal way</td>
<td>♦ select support services delivered to training groups through CSCs; the Calgary CSC has created a culture of excellence by including all elements in designated facilities (university, Olympic park) for winter sport athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ well structured competitive programs with ongoing international exposure</td>
<td>♦ world cup circuits not accessible for many athletes; junior athletes have limited international exposure; no professional or elite leagues in team sport except for hockey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ lifestyle support and preparation for life after sport for athletes</td>
<td>♦ many programs for personal and professional development; tuition support for carded athletes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The Future Environment
With adequate financing, and a central leadership structure for high performance sport, the Canadian system and those within it can be enormously strengthened, and much improved results will be achieved.
There have been several recent developments, such as increased federal funding, approval of the Canadian Sport Policy by the F/P/T governments, the establishment of the CSRP technical reviews, the establishment of the Own The Podium-2010 winter program and operating structure, and the implementation of the LTAD concept. There has been a new commitment by the NSOs, government funding partners and other stakeholders to work together to achieve national sport goals. This collaboration and cooperation is the key to creating a highly effective Canadian high performance system.

With the USA, Russia, China and the UK highly motivated to win, particularly the Chinese and the British with their hosting of the 2008 and 2012 Games, and with the Australians hosting the 2006 Commonwealth Games in Melbourne, the competition will be as tough as ever before. Germany is equivalent to Australia in medals, and the next three nations are Italy, France and Japan, all with more than 30 medals. Canada, with 12 medals and 19th place in Athens would need to achieve 5 more to be in 15th spot, 10 more to be in 13th spot and 20 more to be in the top 10.

6. Interest Of Canadians In Achieving Excellence In Sport

The national, provincial and multi-sport agencies, the coaches, the athletes, the Canadian Sport Centres, the performance enhancement teams and others all want to achieve such high goals. There is currently an enthusiasm in the Canadian sport system that we have not seen for years.

The polls consistently show that Canadians value achievement at the Olympic and Paralympic Games. One only has to note the enormous media and public interest in the success of Canadian athletes at the 2006 Olympic Winter Games in Torino.

The newly elected Conservative government has committed to spending a minimum of 1% of total federal health funding on physical activity and sport (about $300 million/year). They have also promised to maintain both the Sport Canada budget for amateur sport of $140 million/year and commitments to the 2010 Olympics and Paralympics, including the Own the Podium-2010 program. As well, they have announced a tax credit on spending of up to $500/year on registration fees and memberships for programs promoting fitness in children under sixteen, estimated to cost $130 million/year. Lastly, the Conservatives have pledged $50 million/year for community-based programs targeting youth at risk, which includes sport programs.

This Business Plan requires $58.8 million additional national support (federal government and corporate) for the systematic development of sport excellence, responding to needs for coaches, and training and competition support.

This political and financial support is one area where Canada’s main competitors have a significant edge. To overcome this, Canadian athletes and teams have to compete in front of Canadian audiences more frequently, against known opponents, with a good chance of success.

There needs to be much greater media coverage of Canadian athletes in major competitions. This is a marketing issue, one that is well known to the Canadian arts and commercial media.
SECTION 3 – PROGRAM DELIVERY
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1. **Podium**

**Background**

**Canadian System Requirements To Achieve International Sport Success**

Three recent reports have all identified that the single greatest problem with developing Canadian high performance sport is the lack of dedicated leadership and supporting structure to lead, coordinate and manage the national high performance system and programs.

- Report to Federal, Provincial and Territorial Ministers (2004)\(^4\)
- Own the Podium-2010 Report (2004)\(^5\)
- Canadian Sport Review Panel (CSRP) Report (2005)\(^6\)

The following comments from the Report to the Federal, Provincial and Territorial Ministers are representative of these three reports:

"The Canadian sport system lacks leadership. It is a fragmented sport system that lacks coordination and communication in planning, evaluation and investment among multiple funding agencies. The complex system is complicated by jurisdictional conflicts. The historic fragmentation of high performance sport development partners at both the national and provincial levels has resulted in an overly bureaucratized, dysfunctional system. For example, sport organizations at the national level are required to make multiple applications to various funding organizations, which are making funding decisions without any coordinated, centralized leadership and without any common performance targets to direct their efforts. Not surprisingly, the result has been a series of funding agencies that act independently and in some cases compete to provide leadership according to their individual visions for sport. Of all the other elements of the sport system examined …….. this situation is by far the most problematic, and the most at odds with international best practices."

"**Recommendations:** The desired actions and outcomes require the involvement and collaboration of NSOs, PSOs, the national funding partners (Sport Canada, COC, CODA, VANOC) and the F/P/T government funding partners. In order to achieve the Canadian Targets for athlete performance, it is recommended a High Performance Sport Commission (HPSC) be created to coordinate the planning, investment, evaluation and appropriate intervention in high performance sport at the national level and provide an example for Provincial/Territorial investors to consider." (p.38)

---


Important Recent Developments

A number of recent developments have paved the way for the creation of the national leadership structure, Podium.

a) Establishment of a pool of funds for winter sport excellence – With the awarding of the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games to Vancouver, and upon the initiative of the winter sports to use this opportunity to significantly advance their high performance programs, they, VANOC and the federal government agreed that $110 million would be provided over five years, half coming from the government and the other half coming from VANOC corporate partners, the Province of BC, the COC and CPC, and possibly others. Very significantly, all agreed to work together on this project, to coordinate their funds, and to establish an independent leadership entity (OTP-2010) to manage the project.

b) Establishment of an independent high performance technical panel (CSRP) – In 2005, the federal government created and funded the Canadian Sport Review Panel (CSRP). This Panel of technical experts was to assess high performance plans and performance objectives of all Olympic and Paralympic sports and to provide recommendations to national funding partners for targeting federal excellence funding to winter Olympic and Paralympic sports ($11 million per year) and to summer Olympic and Paralympic sports ($2 million per year).

c) Establishment of coordinated funding – Other funding partners of high performance sport (e.g. COC, CPC, corporate sponsors, Province of BC) decided to coordinate their own funds with the federal government’s funds via the CSRP evaluation process. A steering committee of the funding partners was established to encourage common purpose, coordination of efforts and funding and to harmonize funding policies. This coordinated funding approach is fairly unique in the history of Canadian sport.

d) Creation of an operating structure for Own The Podium 2010 – In January 2006, following several months of initial activity, a new high performance unit called Own The Podium 2010 (OTP-2010) was created to lead and manage the winter sport excellence program. OTP-2010 hired a CEO and other staff, and established offices at Canada Olympic Park in Calgary. The CSRP was integrated into OTP-2010 to form one, external, leadership entity with consolidated responsibilities. Funding Partners would concentrate on coordination of programs, policies and funding, and OTP-2010 would concentrate on technical leadership, strategy, planning, evaluation of programs, recommending funding, and implementation.

The following graphic describes the OTP structure put in place by the winter sports and the funding partners to manage the implementation of the OTP-2010 program.
Own The Podium 2010 Organizational Plan

**Winter Sport Caucus**
- Advise CEO of OTP 2010 on various matters, including approving the OTP strategic plan
- Implement programs for their sport
- Participate in a bi-annual review of the overall progress of the OTP program

**Funding Partners**
- Provide resources to NSOs and others
- Establish appropriate funding policies and process
- Consider recommendations as proposed by OTP program CEO
- Change various programs and policies when needed in order to assist creating a much improved, coordinated administration for high performance sport

**Canadian Olympic Committee**
- Provide supportive business services at the request of OTP program CEO; these could include developing and executing legal agreements, employment agreements, financial management of VANOC funds, managing cash flow issues to NSOs and others
- Coordinate with the OTP program and VANOC on areas of mutual interest, such as communications and marketing
- Manage certain programs of interest to NSOs, such as Games Missions support

**VANOC**
In collaboration with the OTP program will:
- Assist with OTP communications and marketing
- Continue to provide OTP expertise
- Assist corporate partners with OTP issues
- Provide access to Olympic facilities and ‘home field’ advantage to Canadian teams
- Provide offices and other business support to NSOs when needed

**Winter Sport Caucus**
13 winter sports

**Funding Partners**
VANOC, SC, COC, CPC

**Performance Partners**
- CODA
- Sport Centres
- Govt. Quebec
- Govt. BC
- etc.

**OTP Group**
Under the leadership of the OTP CEO, the group will, amongst other tasks:
- Provide overall leadership of the OTP program
- Manage all operations of OTP program
- Coordinate all partners re OTP projects, policies, programs, issues
- Provide communications for the program
- Assist corporations and other partners
- Assess the annual budget requests of the NSOs and others, and provide recommendations to the Funding Partners
- Provide on-going assessment and support of those recipients of OTP funding
- Develop the OTP strategic and business plans
- Suggest needed policy and program solutions
- Provide regular updates on progress to various partners
Podium

The creation of Podium is the single most important change to the Canadian sport system to achieve international success.

This Business Plan stresses the immediate importance (summer of 2006) of incorporating the summer sports into the same high performance leadership structure as is now in place for the winter sports. Through this process, the CSRP evaluation of summer sports, and the resultant implementation of their programs would be integrated with those of OTP-2010. This action would create a single national high performance leadership unit for summer and winter, Olympic and Paralympic targeted sports (Podium).

Why is Podium needed?

There is need for full-time, totally dedicated leadership for Canada’s high performance program. If this issue is not addressed, we will continue to be fragmented, without common goals and leadership.

No current government or sport organization is able to provide the needed central technical leadership with the intensity, flexibility and responsiveness required to meet new difficult standards. There are multiple funding partners that need to be engaged to lead the Canadian Sport System to the level of success envisioned. Podium will be the focal point for the needed coordination and collaboration of all partners.

Is the sport community behind this concept of Podium?

Yes. The COC, CPC, CSRP, CSCs and the NSOs wish to create Podium to create the needed leadership. They don’t believe that any existing funding partner can fulfill this role by itself, nor can the system continue fragmented and leaderless.

Is the creation of Podium unique?

The structure already exists for the winter sports (OTP-2010) and appears to be a great success.

Sport Canada has created independent agencies to do specific tasks before. It created Hockey Canada, the Coaching Association of Canada, Participaction, the National Sport and Recreation Centre, The Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport (CCES), the Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada (ADRsportRED), the Canada Games and other agencies to undertake special roles.

More specific to this situation, between 1973 and 1976, the Canadian Olympic Association (now COC), Sport Canada and the provinces formed Game Plan 76 as a Secretariat of the partners to coordinate resources to prepare the Canadian team for the Montreal Olympic Games. Whereas the Canadian medal count at the 1972 Games resulted in a 27th place finish, at Montreal, the Canadian team finished 11th.
What would be the mandate and responsibilities of Podium?

Podium would be established to:

a) be responsible for the planning and implementation of Canada’s high performance programs in conjunction with the NSOs

b) work with the NSOs, CSCs, federal and provincial/territorial governments, universities, communities and others to coordinate and strengthen the Canadian high performance system

c) set national high performance goals (medals and top finishes) in collaboration with the funding partners and the NSOs, based on the resources available and the interests and capabilities of the NSOs

d) receive requests from the NSOs, the CSCs and others who wish funding in support of high performance programs, and to make funding recommendations to the funding partners

e) review and assess the NSO’s capacity to provide world-class programming to their athletes and their possible achievement of international medals

f) provide on-going evaluation of the high performance programs and those of the NSOs, CSC’s and others that receive funding

g) enter into agreements with the NSOs, CSCs and others as appropriate

h) be accountable to the funding partners for their funds to Podium

i) encourage and finance research, innovation and testing to improve performances of athletes and coaches

j) make critical links between partners to maximize efficiencies and effectiveness

k) implement a national communications/promotions program in support of the Podium program and its goals

l) assist funding partners to acquire necessary revenues

m) attend national and international forums, sports competitions and meetings to improve knowledge

n) report annually to the Canadian sport community and Podium partners.

Would any funding partner lose control of its funding or its relationship with the NSOs?

No. All funding partners would continue to dispense their funds directly to the sports, and to manage that process, financial accountability and reporting. Podium works in partnership with them to help coordinate their funding.

The following schematic indicates the flow of funding and the communication between parties. Podium interacts with both parties only for the ‘excellence elements’ of programming. The funding partners continue to have their own direct relationship with the recipients.
Podium’s ‘influence’ is that it is given a mandate by the funding partners to assess the plans of the sports and to make recommendations to the funding partners. Podium works in collaboration with the NSOs and CSCs to assist them.

Some see that Podium is weakened by not having its own funds to dispense, and have expressed the desire to establish the equivalent of the Australian Sport Commission (a fully funded agency) so as to have complete financial and policy control, and to avoid numerous bureaucratic and political challenges of funding partners. It is important to consider that possibility in the future.

However, with the immediate need to create leadership and an operating structure for the NSO programs for the 2008 and 2012 Games, the model expressed above will work well, as long as the funding partners cooperate to streamline and coordinate their financial administration and to assist in other ways. It will take considerable energy, cooperation and goodwill, not to mention trust, to see an efficient process and partnership develop. If all are committed to do all possible to achieve the goals of winter and summer excellence, then it will work.

**How would the funding partners be involved with Podium?**

a) All funding partners would be a member of the Funding Partners Secretariat.

b) Certain Sport Canada, COC or CPC consultants might be seconded to work with Podium, such as for the annual technical and financial review.

c) Partner and Podium consultants would work together on policy and program development for high performance sport.

d) The CSRP would be integrated into Podium.

e) The COC could provide essential business services to Podium in addition to being a funding partner.
Indeed, all this is currently happening with the winter sports OTP-2010 program and it is a very simple matter to add summer sports without diminishing the focus on winter sports and the 2010 goals. The winter sport drive for excellence in 2010 continues to create innovation and focus and experience and this will greatly kick-start the program initiatives for the summer sports.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that as soon as possible in 2006, Podium be created and given the mandate and resourced to manage the ‘excellence’ programs for the prioritized summer sports focused on the 2008 and 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. At the same time, the CSRP and OTP-2010 would be integrated with Podium, and would undertake their previous responsibilities. A single, national high performance leadership structure for summer and winter, Olympic and Paralympic sport would finally exist.

**Financial Considerations**

The administration of Podium (winter and summer sports) is estimated at three million dollars a year, being less than 4% of the operating budget for winter and summer sport ‘excellence’ funding. The current operating budget for OTP-2010 is less than $1 million per year. New funding required would be up to $2 million which includes compensation, operating costs, research and studies, policy and program development, communications, partner relations, marketing, national seminars and meetings, international surveys and other elements.

**2. Role Of The Provinces and Territories**

**Background**

**Provincial/Territorial Sport Policies**

The policy framework for P/T involvement in sport development is the Canadian Sport Policy (2002),\(^7\) where reference is made to previous intergovernmental agreements such as the policy document High Performance Athlete Development in Canada (1985)\(^8\). It is a starting point to describe the responsibilities of the federal and provincial/territorial governments to create a coordinated plan for the development of high performance athletes. The stated primary P/T program areas of responsibility are “recruitment and development of athletes, the support of research, the support of provincial/territorial sport organizations, which might include team programs for athletes and coaches, hosting major championships and games, and the development of sport facilities”.

\(^7\) The Canadian Sport Policy (May 24, 2002), as endorsed by Ministers in Iqualuit Nunavut on April 6, 2002, published by Sport Canada.

\(^8\) High Performance Athlete Development in Canada (1985), Federal-Provincial/Territorial Agreements relating to sport and physical activity, endorsed by Ministers Responsible for Sport, Fitness and Recreation.
Provincial/Territorial Priorities
The F/P/T Ministers responsible for sport have identified sport and recreation infrastructure (facilities) as a priority. Health care delivery is also a priority for all P/T governments, where illness prevention includes the promotion of physical activity and sport participation. Given that health care and illness treatment takes up (on average) 40% of some provincial budgets, up from around 30% just five years ago, the primary focus tends to be on physical activity and community level sport participation rather than on high performance sport development.

Federal/Provincial/Territorial Collaboration
The federal, provincial and territorial governments have agreed on a number of collaborative plans and actions to implement the Canadian Sport Policy. With respect to high performance sport (excellence), these include a comprehensive framework for Long Term Athlete Development, competency-based coaching development, enhancing the capacity of Canadian Sport Centres, strengthening sport sciences, diversifying the resource base, and a national hosting policy for competitive events. The federal government has also entered into bilateral agreements and shared investments with P/T governments, primarily in support of increased sport participation.

The degree to which all these programs are developed varies greatly between provinces. Indeed, for high performance sport development, most provinces are doing much less than what is needed.

Economic Realities
While most governments entered the current fiscal year with either balanced budgets or small surpluses, this situation may change dramatically in the future. The spiraling price of oil has hit provincial/territorial governments hard as they face increased operating costs for hospitals, schools, jails, school buses and other fleets (e.g. emergency services) and other institutions and services.

Funding for high performance sport development may not be high on the priority list in this context. On the other hand, wellness and physical activity are of significant concern with P/T governments. Pursuing physical activity and sport participation as a means of reducing health care costs, or at least mitigating the rate of increase, makes economic sense.

The single biggest roadblock to enhanced capacity of P/TSOs has been money. High performance sport in Canada has largely been led by governments, who are ideally suited for this role. But governments have many responsibilities, and choosing among them is not easy, especially when budgets are in deficit, expensive programs need to be delivered, and economic factors are unpredictable. Money must either be found, or redirected, or leveraged within existing funds, or a combination of all three. Strategic P/T investments in high-performance sport must also be aligned with existing P/T financial priorities. These will vary from province to province, region to region. A one-size-fits-all is unlikely to serve as a useful approach to building capacity at the provincial and regional levels.
Importance of Provincial and Territorial Involvement

It is evident that fulfillment of the Canadian Sport Policy’s pillar of Excellence, and success at the Olympic and Paralympic Games, depends on capacity at the provincial and regional levels. This needs to be greatly strengthened.

Canada’s high-performance sport has largely operated more by default than by design. When talented, committed individuals begin to excel, we begin to provide (some of) the necessary supports for success. This approach is tantamount to a policy of providing a bathing suit once someone knows how to swim. It may be helpful, but not very timely or productive. In some cases, it is simply too late.

No other sector approaches excellence quite this way. We do not start educating our medical specialists after they have set up a practice. We do not expose our teachers to pedagogy after they have been given a class to teach. We do not train lawyers on matters of law once they have entered the courtroom. We should not, therefore, want to educate, train and expose our athletes and coaches in matters of high-performance only after they reach a highly competitive level.

Indeed, the type of education, training and exposure to athletic excellence that needs to occur at the developmental ages is different than what is required later on. This is where a certain quality and quantity of coaches really matters. This is where the quality and quantity of talent identification, recruitment, facilities and competitions really matters. The formative stages are the base upon which we not only build successful athletes, but we fulfill the purpose and goals of sport and recreation in our society. This is where provincial and regional levels have a unique jurisdiction and responsibility.

Provincial and territorial governments are already involved to some extent in the areas for which they agreed they were responsible in the Canadian Sport Policy and previous policy agreements. Strengthening provincial/territorial involvement in high performance sport is a function of capacity and resources. Strengthening P/T capacities must be applied to a purpose or goal. There are several to choose from within the Canadian Sport Policy, including the recent priority of sport and recreation infrastructure.

Moreover, at the provincial/territorial (and regional) level, sport’s contribution to activate Canadians, reduced health care costs, and encourage civic security and vibrant communities also depends on sustained capacity of the sport system. As such capacity is developed, the ability of provincial and territorial sport organizations to assist with Olympic and Paralympic sport is enhanced.

Provincial Funding

The table below identifies provincial expenditures on sport (and in some cases, recreation and wildlife) as presented by the Ministers of sport at their meeting in Regina in 2005. Comparisons between provinces are not entirely appropriate as each provincial expenditure is made up of different elements. For example, some provinces hosted major events (e.g. World Aquatic Championships in Montreal) and others did not. However, this data is a starting point and some comparisons can be made that at least sensitize us to the level of expenditure at the provincial/territorial level, and federally.
Provincial Expenditure on Sport, Recreation and Wildlife, and Federal Expenditure on Sport (2005-06), as presented by Provincial, Territorial and Federal Governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2005-06 Investment ($)</th>
<th>Investment/pop ($/yr)</th>
<th>Ranking on Investment/pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTA</td>
<td>3,256,800</td>
<td>20,133,000</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>4,254,500</td>
<td>10,900,000</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAN</td>
<td>1,177,600</td>
<td>20,098,500</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFLD-LAB</td>
<td>516,000</td>
<td>2,701,800</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>752,000</td>
<td>4,034,000</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>4,412,000</td>
<td>102.60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>937,900</td>
<td>9,566,000</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUN</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4,710,000</td>
<td>157.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONT</td>
<td>12,541,400</td>
<td>23,516,100</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>138,100</td>
<td>3,389,200</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUE</td>
<td>7,598,100</td>
<td>59,380,800</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASK</td>
<td>994,100</td>
<td>13,960,478</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUK</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>3,228,201</td>
<td>104.14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>32,270,500</td>
<td>143,400,000</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $323,430,079

If the data is reviewed by geographic region, as presented below, Quebec, with the same population as the west (BC & AB) spends almost twice as much per capita. The Prairie provinces are spending considerably more per capita than most, and Ontario is spending the least per capita by quite a margin. Notwithstanding the limitations of this data, it does suggest that there is under-funding per capita for developmental and high performance sport in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia, and this should be reviewed in more detail. Other than Quebec, these provinces are where the majority of Canada’s national team athletes reside, and where we need to see excellent developmental programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2005-06 Investment ($)</th>
<th>Investment/ Pop ($/yr)</th>
<th>Ranking on Investment/pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maritimes &amp; Territories</td>
<td>402,833</td>
<td>28,813,000</td>
<td>71.52</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>7,598,100</td>
<td>59,380,800</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>12,541,400</td>
<td>23,516,100</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairies (MB, SK)</td>
<td>2,171,700</td>
<td>34,058,978</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (BC, AB)</td>
<td>7,511,300</td>
<td>31,033,000</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2008 and 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games are upon us. We have national aspirations to do well. Our failure to strengthen capacity at the provincial/territorial and regional levels will undoubtedly, one way or another, seriously limit our potential to excel at the Games. We must acknowledge this reality.

Current federal government, corporate sector and national sport organization commitments will likely not be enough to achieve Olympic and Paralympic excellence goals if provincial, territorial and regional capacities remain as they are. The inherent implication of the Canadian Sport Policy is that excellence, participation, capacity building and interaction are inextricably linked, and interdependent in ways that make each individual one unlikely to progress or succeed without the other.

What is to be done?

Attaining Canada’s high performance objectives is tied to a number of responsibilities and contributions at the provincial and regional levels of sport and recreation. Chief among these are:

a) hiring full-time high performance directors and coaches in priority sports
b) providing professional development, training and mentoring for PSO staff and governance volunteers
c) ensuring international sport standards are used when building sport facilities; ensuring adequate access for athletes and coaches
d) providing athlete assistance programs in all provinces that coordinate well with the national AAP
e) establishing talent identification and recruitment programs, coordinated with training and coaching opportunities
f) increasing the number of high-level, sport specific competitions within provinces and territories, for able-bodied athletes and athletes with a disability; for this latter group, an enormous boost would be given if the provinces/territories established Canada Paralympic Games
g) hosting the Canada Games more frequently and creating more relevance of these Games to the development of future international medalists
h) establishing Canada Games in communities that will leave the best legacies (facilities and programs) for high performance sport
i) strengthening Paralympic sport, particularly by establishing programs that search out and encourage people to become involved, and by having proper coaching, training and competition opportunities
j) promoting and implementing the LTAD model for both Olympic and Paralympic sports
k) promoting and supporting sport schools and their developmental programs
l) supporting Canadian Sport Centres to a greater degree and establishing provincial centres in other communities
m) undertaking an audit of sport facilities used for high performance sport and
developing a national action plan to construct needed facilities
n) establishing provincial lotteries to fund training and competition facilities and
other high performance needs and programs.

Over half of the items in the above list could be addressed by the provincial and territorial
sport organizations if they had the resources, and thus the capacity, to do so. The
remaining items would need direct provincial involvement.

If we cannot do all the above in the short-term, then we should focus on building
human resources (capacity), coaching, hosting provincial, national and international
competitions, and building high performance facilities and infrastructure. These
four elements emerge first within a provincial and regional environment, where the
foundations of future success are established.

1. Building Capacity

In addressing these priorities, the development of a sound, well-governed, professionally
staffed sport system at the P/T level (i.e. PSOs, TSOs) is most likely to have the greatest
impact on high performance development.

At the provincial (and regional) level, sport’s contribution to more active Canadians,
reduced health care costs, civic security and vibrant communities also depends on
sustained capacity of the sport system. As such capacity is developed, the ability of P/T
sport organizations to assist with Olympic/Paralympic sport is enhanced.

Focusing on capacity building would:

a) address a hereto largely neglected area of the Canadian Sport Policy
b) align with the responsibilities of P/T governments (support participation,
   volunteerism and athlete development initiatives for the next generation of high
   performance athletes through support of P/T sport organizations)
c) allow strengthened P/T sport organisations to address sport participation in ways
   that contribute to the LTAD model, such as the provision of appropriate quality
   coaching and competitive opportunities.

2. Strengthening Coaching

Setting and achieving Olympic and Paralympic goals is a serious undertaking. It requires
the kind of innovation, highly specialized programs and technical expertise normally
associated with extremely complex manufacturing, engineering or exploration. It
requires professional expertise coupled with extensively integrated support systems.
Doctors are not better trained than Olympic medalist athletes. This is the world of high
performance coaching and technical development.

Initiatives in the F-P/T Priorities for Collaborative Action 2002-05 included: fully implementing competency-based education
and training, developing a hosting strategy, fostering diversification of the resource base, implementing the ethics strategy,
infrastructure, and assisting aboriginal sport development.
Yet coaching in Canada has largely focused on creating educational tools and certification programs to train and equip coaches. There has been inadequate attention given to the positioning of coaches as highly valued public leaders with career pathways that attract, retain and reward them for their difficult and specialized work.

A number of approaches are available for our consideration.

a) Establish a ‘Coach Career Pathway’ model for provincial level coaches, one not unlike the approach taken to establish LTAD. Initiate its implementation via the Canadian Professional Coaches Association, while establishing a longer-term Coach Career Pathway model via an F/T/P working group similar to that used for the LTAD.

b) The Federal Government must assume financial responsibility for supporting all national high performance senior and junior coaches, and should provide matching funds via bilateral agreements with the provinces for qualified provincial level coaches. Matching funds should be based on having a third party responsible for providing coaching infrastructure and management, such as a Canadian Sport Centre, a university, a sport club, or a PSO.

c) Adhere to the highest quality standards. While provincial coaches are required to meet specified NCCP levels, provinces/sports still seek and obtain exemptions due to insufficient capacity or availability of coaches. NCCP courses are often not held due to low attendance caused by problems of time and cost. Rectifying these problems should be a priority for bilateral agreements on high performance.

d) Launch a public promotional campaign that highlights the important role of coaches as public leaders and as drivers of human excellence, with messages designed to foster greater attention and attraction to high performance coaching.

e) There is need for a campaign promoting Paralympic sport awareness and education that targets current coaches of Olympic sports.

3. Hosting Major Competitions

The availability of competitions to apply the innovation, programs and expertise is the equivalent of research trials and field work in any other complex undertaking. Access to facilities that replicate the conditions of international competition are equally necessary.

A number of approaches are presented.

a) Identify provinces prepared to bid for and host national and international events over the next five years, with federal support in accordance with their new hosting policy and the "Strategic Framework for Hosting International Sporting Events in Canada” adopted by F/P/T governments. These events could be junior and senior World Cups, World Championships, National Championships, Provincial Games and others, for both Olympic and Paralympic sports. Hosting such events should be directly linked to locations where athlete and facility development would be most useful.
b) To date, western Canada has enjoyed the benefits of several multi-sport and major events. Opportunities to expand the benefits throughout Canada should be pursued, particularly in the major metropolitan areas where most of our international athletes reside.

c) The Canada Games should be a primary P/T mechanism for contributing to high-performance sport. While the Canada Games were started as a celebration of Canadian sport and a mechanism to achieve Canadian unity, it is now apparent that the Canada Games can have a significant economic impact on the jurisdiction that hosts them. The London 2001 Summer Games resulted in a total of $93.38 million in economic activity for Ontario, $63.48 million within London. The Bathurst Campbellton 2003 Winter Games generated a total estimated economic activity of $70.4 million in New Brunswick, including $57.6 million in the Bathurst–Campbellton region.

These financial benefits, and the suggested changes in this Business Plan to encourage the Canada Games to be more excellence oriented (see section on Competition) suggest that the Canada Games could be hosted more frequently, and in communities where facilities can be best used by large numbers of developing athletes.

4. Building High Performance Facilities

At the 2005 F/P/T sport Ministers’ Conference, Ministers identified sport and recreation infrastructure as their number one priority, and directed officials to develop the parameters of a long-term national approach to sport and recreation infrastructure.

High performance infrastructure goals should be included in this national approach, which may also be of interest to mayors of Canada’s larger cities. (The Facilities and Equipment section of this Business Plan discusses the need for a national inventory of high performance sport facilities in Canada). Such facilities need to be accessible for athletes with a disability and they need to meet international federation standards.

In the early 1990s, the infrastructure program initiated by the federal government encouraged the repair, renovation and construction of new municipal infrastructure dedicated to sport and recreation. Many municipalities identified sport and recreation infrastructure as their top priority. However, with the advent of recent community infrastructure concerns such as safe water supply, the issue of “hard infrastructure” moved up the priority lists of municipalities, and sport and recreation infrastructure has fallen back.

An infrastructure program initiated by the federal government and dedicated to sport and recreation infrastructure, cost-shared among governments, should be pursued.

Financial Considerations

This Business Plan acknowledges that provincial/territorial governments can best support sporting excellence when the capacity of the sport system at the P/T level has been enhanced. This can occur with bilateral agreements or lottery revenues that support sport participation and capacity building, with specific initiatives that enhance the PSO’s ability to develop and deliver high performance developmental programs.

Bilateral Agreements

The introduction of bilateral (federal-provincial/territorial) agreements in 2003 was enthusiastically greeted by all. Matching federal funds that focus on capacity building, with specific initiatives directed to enhancing the P/T sport organization’s ability to develop and deliver programs, should be increased.

Provincial/territorial governments must be free to design programs that address provincial priorities, while being sensitive to the need to assist the nationally identified targeted sports.

Federal matching funds should be directed to projects and programs that align with provincial priorities (such as sport infrastructure or health).

The next round of bilateral discussions should focus on strengthening the P/T sport organization’s ability to address some of the areas where provinces/territories can assist with Olympic and Paralympic sport.

Lotteries

Since the lottery system was established in Canada in the 1970s, P/T governments have welcomed the resources generated through gaming. In the late 1980s, every P/T government, with the exception of Saskatchewan, re-focused the lotteries from support for culture and recreation to supporting general government revenue.

Lotteries now form a significant portion of general revenue. For example, in 2004-05, Ontario received $1.9B from lottery and gaming revenues, of which $1.5B was directed to hospitals, $100M to the Ontario Trillium Foundation (OTF), and $300M to general government priorities. Approximately $30M of the OTF money is used to support sport and recreation, the majority at the community level for capacity issues (equipment purchases, team travel to the next community for competition, operating expenses to hire staff in community clubs, small capital grants to upgrade facilities).

However, more recently, there are examples where provinces are returning to ‘sport lotteries’ to direct assistance to sport.

British Columbia SportsFunder Lottery - Over the next six years leading to the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games, it is expected that this lottery will provide $20 million for amateur sports in British Columbia. Funds will be directed towards sport programs for financially disadvantaged children; for high performance sport (support for athletes, coaches, sport technology and equipment); coach training programs; and regional travel assistance for athletes to attend competitions and to access training facilities as needed.
Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation - In January 2006, the Ontario government, in conjunction with the Ontario Lottery & Gaming Corporation, created a new program expected to generate $2.5 million in direct financial assistance for Ontario athletes by March 2006, and continuing financing thereafter.

Given the rare opportunities of the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games, individual provinces should approve proposals for specific provincial lotteries to support provincial projects in support of coaches and athletes preparing for the 2008, 2010 and 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Are we willing to make the commitment?

The issue of resources cuts across all recommendations, roles, responsibilities, strategies and outcomes for physical activity, sport participation and sporting excellence.

In the end, the choices are always the same: there is either sufficient demand (existing rationale, commitments, political pressure) to allocate (leverage, redirect, raise) resources, or there is sufficient supply (surpluses, a lottery, fundraising) to carry out the work. These are obviously linked – but the real issue is whether we are prepared to get the job done.

Do we have sufficient maturity, trust and collaboration within the sector to work together towards national goals – where leadership is based on what contributions we can each make as opposed to decisions that rely on the lowest common denominator formulas of the past?

We therefore conclude the following.

a) The recommended actions and investments in this Business Plan will make Canada a leading high performance sport nation. However, if the provincial and territorial levels of sport are not significantly engaged in the near future, it will not be enough for the desired success at the 2008 and 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

b) Our national commitment to excellence is an opportunity to make progress on selected areas of provincial and regional responsibilities that contribute to high-performance sport, particularly in the areas of capacity building, coaching, competitions and high performance facilities.

c) The federal government must lead with targeted policies, bilateral agreements and investments to strengthen provincial and regional capacities around sport and recreation in a manner that aligns with provincial priorities.

d) Individual provinces and territories should approve proposals for provincial lotteries to support provincial projects tied to the 2008, 2010 and 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

To move forward, the federal and provincial/territorial governments need to come together immediately (2008, 2010, 2012 needs) to discuss high performance sport and the need for collaboration and additional resources to address the issues outlined in the Business Plan.
The BC government stepped forward in 2005 by contributing $10 million to the COC for the preparation of the national (not provincial) winter and summer Olympic and Paralympic teams.

### 3. NATIONAL SPORT ORGANIZATION READINESS

#### BACKGROUND

This year, the Canadian Sport Review Panel used the notion of ‘Organizational Readiness’11 (OR) to help them determine a sport’s ability to develop athletes and teams capable of achieving podium results on a consistent basis. Indeed, this Business Plan has a section called “Games Preparation” which emphasizes the plan for organizational readiness of the Canadian Olympic Committee, the Canadian Paralympic Committee and the NSOs to support athletes prior to and during the Games period.

**NSO Organizational Readiness and Critical Success Factors**

In their deliberations, the CSRP gave a score for OR to each NSO following their review meeting. The overall OR assessment was based on the cumulative scores of identified critical success factors that are considered necessary to have a healthy NSO with an ability to create a high performance training and competition environment for their athletes. The factors would indicate the relative likelihood of the sport’s capability of producing Olympic, Paralympic and World Championship medalists.

The critical success factors are (but not limited to):

**a) Coaching**

- world class coaching in place at all levels
- technical staff are evaluated according to clear criteria and accountabilities
- appropriate and leading edge professional development for coaching staff
- effective coaching development/education, mentoring, succession programs in place
- clear decision making authority and responsibility to make technical program decisions
- enough expert coaching provided at all levels
- administrative support provided for coaches.

**b) Athlete Development**

- effective LTAD – vertically integrated training and competition with all stakeholders in the system (i.e. clubs, schools, provinces, national, international). Everyone understands their role and is able to implement it.

---

11 The meaning of the term “Organizational Readiness” may be better served with the term “High Performance Capacity”. However for the purposes of this paper it will be referred to as “Organizational Readiness”
critical mass of athletes to draw from (includes talent ID and recruitment programs)
appropriate training and monitoring in place
appropriate competition opportunities available
clear and effective team selection policies in place
ability to provide world-class training environment (i.e. access to facilities, equipment)
world-class national team programming

c) Pets, Sport Science & Medicine, CSCs
- effective/integrated use of PETs
- sport science - use of appropriate lab and field tests, ability to do or access innovative applied research to gain or maintain a leading edge
- sport medicine - appropriate monitoring, ability to have timely access to quality physiotherapists, massage, medical doctors, etc.
- effective partnerships with the appropriate CSC

d) Results
- achievement of established performance benchmarks
- international opportunities, number of Olympic and Paralympic events
- number of athletes on the LTAD curve
- competitive edge
- future podium potential

e) Organizational Structure
- overall strong, sustainable leadership – clear roles, responsibilities and accountability of all staff and volunteers
- effective governance structure
- willingness of the NSO to support and prioritize high performance
- effective strategic and business plans in place
- effective delivery of all programs, including athlete development model
- financial and human resource capacity
- effective Paralympic integration at both NSO and PSO level, ensuring required resources are provided and technical knowledge is shared amongst a sport’s Olympic and Paralympic programs.
The OR score process provides the following benefits to the NSO.

a) Evaluation and planning tool - Using the individual scores and comments for each of the critical success elements, the NSO will be given a SWOT analysis. From this analysis, they can make more effective plans to maximize strengths and to minimize/eliminate weaknesses.

b) Benchmarking - Benchmarking of performance is generally a weak area in Canadian sport. With improved evaluation and planning via their OR assessment, NSOs will be better equipped to determine appropriate benchmarks to help them measure and calibrate their journey to ever higher levels of performance.

c) Follow-up and monitoring - The individual scores and assessment for each of the critical success factors will provide key information to Podium to engage in discussion/consultation with each NSO and to identify their follow-up and monitoring needs.

Paralympic Sport

The readiness of Paralympic NSOs to administer and implement programs varies greatly. A few have the capacity to develop plans and implement them, some only at the national level and not at the developmental level, and some not at all.

One answer for some sports is for athletes with a disability to fall under the able-bodied sport mandate and develop under the more mature NSO. This might be particularly necessary for the high performance elements of their program. This would also be cost efficient, eliminating the need for each sport to reinvent protocols, or duplicate staff, leadership and office expenses that are already in place elsewhere.

All of the Paralympic summer sports that have an able-body equivalent have already been officially integrated. However, in many cases, few resources and little attention is devoted to developing unique Paralympic program requirements that fit with Olympic models (e.g. there is need for enhanced recruitment initiatives, programs for athletes with more severe disabilities, etc.).

Integration has not occurred at the PSO level, and is a major barrier to development. We need to clearly define roles and responsibilities of all partners at the provincial/regional level to strengthen Paralympic organizations (LTAD should be a mechanism to drive this process and form required partnerships).

In summary, assigning a score for OR based on the critical components needed to create a successful high performance environment for our Olympic and Paralympic athletes is the single most important undertaking in the effective evaluation and targeting of sports.

Podium itself must be organizationally ready - it is a critical first step in showing the way for NSOs.
### Timelines and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium &amp; NSOs</td>
<td>Prepare an OR evaluation template.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium &amp; NSOs</td>
<td>Conduct the NSO evaluation reviews.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Link review to ranking/categorization of sports.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Assist sports in identifying priorities and developing strategic plans that will increase their capacity for high performance.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Implement needed change.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Evaluate OR.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Considerations

There are no direct financial costs with implementing the OR strategy, however there will be very significant savings from the efficiencies achieved by the NSOs if they are well organized and address the critical success factors.

### 4. Canadian Sport Centres

#### Background

Sport Canada established and supported the first Canadian Sport Centre in Calgary in 1994. Other funding partners (e.g. COC, CAC, Provinces, corporate groups) contributed over time and today, nine centres exist – in Halifax, Quebec City, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Regina, Calgary, Vancouver and Victoria.

The CSCs have been created to provide services to national and regional team athletes and coaches living and training in various regions across the country. These services include access to sport science and medicine, career and personal counseling, assistance in finding jobs and housing, and access to training facilities. In practice, a few of these Centres (Victoria, Vancouver, Calgary, and Montreal) are active with a good number of national teams or athletes, while others support a few.

In the following chart, funding for both the Montreal and Quebec City centres is amalgamated under “Quebec”. Funding for the Vancouver and Victoria Centres is amalgamated under “BC”. The Sport Canada base funds have remained constant in recent years, and the increases in 2004-05 and 2005-06 are the result of the OTP-2010 and summer sport ‘excellence’ funding being added to the base, mostly for sport science, medicine and research equipment purposes.
### Sport Canada Funding History to CSCs ($ 000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>95-96</th>
<th>96-97</th>
<th>97-98</th>
<th>98-99</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sask.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>7,648</td>
<td>10,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the years, a variety of sources of revenue have been generated for the Centres and the following chart identifies the sources for 2005-06. As a point of comparison, two of the best Australian state sport institutes (Brisbane and Melbourne) each have annual budgets of approximately $2 million. As seen from the table below, the revenue to all nine Canadian Centres in 2005-06 totaled $15 million.

### Total Revenue from Various Sources to all Nine Canadian Sport Centres in 2005-06 for both Winter and Summer Sports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada Base Funding</td>
<td>$3,564,598</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada-Sport Science</td>
<td>$3,693,800</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>$819,351</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>$352,997</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial</td>
<td>$3,727,881</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Legacy</td>
<td>$1,447,872</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Generated</td>
<td>$1,353,970</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$90,892</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funding - All Sources</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,051,361</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. The Sport Canada sport science funding is one-time only.
2. The great majority of the provincial funding is from BC and Quebec.
3. The Games legacy funding is primarily for the Victoria Centre as a result of the Endowment from the 1994 Victoria Commonwealth Games.
The Centres serve both national and provincial athletes and coaches. The federal contribution is almost double that of the provinces, despite the fact that the majority of the programming from most Centres is provincially oriented. The provinces need to understand the opportunities for regional development that these Centres present and to use them accordingly.

**Program Considerations**

**Provincial Involvement**
Provinces have a unique jurisdiction, and in our minds, mandate, to develop the base of high performance sport. We will never develop the depth of talent and expertise in Canada without very strong provincial programs as the foundation. Their Sport Centres are a key mechanism for them to do so, assisting with talent identification, training and competition facilities, support of regional coaches, athlete services, and various training/educational programs.

Sport Canada and Podium, guided by the national performance targets and the expressed needs of the sport’s LTAD and high performance strategic plans, needs to establish a dialogue with the P/T governments, to create the vision and strategies, to clarify roles, and to agree on and develop baseline programs for the Centres.

**Leadership Issues**
The financial partners of the Centres, and indeed the Centres themselves, do not have a common vision of the purpose, responsibilities and standards for the Centres. Each of the nine CSC President’s report to their own Boards, each of which has its own approach.

Without national leadership (Podium), the effective coordination of CSCs is not possible. The Presidents of the CSCs have requested that they report directly to Podium to achieve a national approach. This is best done by having the Sport Centres contract to Podium for high performance services for their athletes and coaches, using common national policies and approaches. The CSC Presidents agree with this approach.

Thus, there would be no need for national representation on their Boards (COC, CPC, Sport Canada) as these funding partners are Podium’s funding partners. They would approve CSC funding from Podium’s recommendations, and Podium would contract with and monitor CSC performance. These changes would have implications on Board makeup and responsibilities and thus a Centre by Centre consultation process is required.

The CSC Presidents would report to regional partners for regional programs.

To meet the desirable goal of creating a common vision, a coordinated national network, focused national leadership, uniformity in policies and programs, effective communication and a commitment to high standards, Podium would hire a full-time CSC Coordinator to work with the national centres, their NSO partners and their programs.
Sport Canada Funding to the Centres

Currently, Sport Canada provides approximately $3.4 million of base (SFAF) contributions to the Centres, as described in the charts above. It is recommended that this base amount be allocated by the CSRP process as ‘excellence’ funds and be directed to high performance purposes. This would create a more flexible pool of funds and the better coordination of the additional PET funding that is provided to the Centres.

This Business Plan supports grants to selected Centres for some of their administration, but such grants would be determined in light of provincial commitments to these Centres, and the number of carded athletes using them.

Coaching

All eight Presidents of the Centres discussed a number of issues at their retreat in mid-January 2006. They decided on the following:

♦ They do not want their Centres to subsidize the costs (including compensation) for National Coaches. They believe this is the full responsibility of the NSOs as these are their key technical leadership positions.
♦ The CSCs would consider supporting coaches at the regional level in partnership with PSOs.
♦ The Centres believe that they should not be responsible for the operation of the National Coaching Institutes, but would continue to support them until a transition can occur to others in the community. However, they believe they can assist the training and development of higher level coaches working with national teams.

Support of Athletes

The Centre Presidents believe they have a responsibility to assist registered carded athletes in their community in non-targeted sports by providing basic services valued at $500 per athlete per year. However, the priority is to support the athletes in targeted sports with greater services. Similarly, support to national teams, junior national teams and national development groups should be selective. A strategy for effectively supporting athletes from targeted sports in decentralized situations needs to be clarified.

Sport Institutes

The COC definition of Sport Institutes is that they:

♦ provide world-class sport-specific training facilities
♦ offer full-time world-class caliber coaches
♦ provide medical and applied sport science research to athlete training groups through PETs
create synergies between athletes and coaches from different sports, as best practices are shared and athletes are motivated by the proximity to other champions

increase efficiency by having large numbers of athletes, coaches and support staff working out of the same facilities.

provide coaching education courses and hosting of conferences

link to high schools, colleges and universities to assist athletes with their education

are venues for hosting provincial/ national/ international events

are a focal point for media and community awareness of high-performance sport

have the capacity for direct or enhanced access to athlete accommodation and nutritional requirements

provide life services and counseling support to athletes and coaches

foster a sense of pride and affiliation for athletes and coaches connected to something special in support of their goals.

The nine Canadian Centres embrace this concept, but for financial and other reasons, they vary considerably in the services and programs that they offer, in the number of national and provincial team athletes that they serve, and in their ability to provide facilities.

With appropriate funding and planning, two Canadian Centres could be quickly developed into the more comprehensive Institute model, including delivering expanded services and programs, hiring and managing coaches with the PSOs, and providing world-class training and competition facilities. Both have facility legacies from Olympic Games that greatly facilitate the establishment of an Institute. Their challenge is to knit together the required partnerships and to secure provincial funding.

- The CSC Calgary already has affiliation with CODA and their facilities and with the University of Calgary (the CSC and several national teams are housed there, extensive sport science and medicine resources are delivered, and considerable OTP-2010 ‘Top Secret’ research is undertaken there). These partnerships provide a comprehensive training and competitive environment for almost all winter sports and some summer sports. The recent winter OTP-2010 funding has significantly developed this partnership towards Institute status, and this could be the Canadian prototype model. This Institute concept needs to be developed and formalized by the Calgary partners.

- Montreal also uses Olympic facilities to assist its programming and services, and the proposed development of a sport Institute at the Olympic Park in Montreal for sports such as swimming, diving, synchronized swimming, water polo and short track speed skating needs to be pursued.

Depending on provincial government commitment to establishing major facilities and operating resources, other regions could establish Institutes.
The Vancouver sport Centre has an opportunity to expand their programming and services as a result of the 2010 Olympic Winter Games. Discussions are being held to establish a sport Centre at the Richmond speedskating oval.

Victoria already has a number of Institute elements as a result of the 1994 Commonwealth Games and further initiatives of CSC-Victoria. A half-dozen national teams train year-round in that temperate climate, using the Commonwealth Games Aquatics complex in Saanich as a base for the CSC and some sports. CSC– Victoria is pursuing relationships with the university and Camosun College to further enhance their services and programs and access to facilities.

If Halifax is awarded the 2014 Commonwealth Games in 2007, there is an opportunity to strengthen the Centre in Atlantic Canada, both from a facilities and an endowment (ongoing operating and program funding) standpoint. Indeed, the development of sport Institutes or Centres should be a legacy requirement as a consequence of hosting major international multi-sport Games.

A most useful new development would be to establish a major multi-sport Institute in Toronto to service that region’s many athletes and teams. Canada’s largest city has very inferior (or non-existent) international training and competition facilities. There is need for additional investment from national sources to support national objectives, including a billion dollar federal/provincial/territorial/municipal infrastructure program for sport facilities (that can be used by all citizens for health and recreation). This may be the vehicle to get facilities-based Centres or Institutes developed.

It would be very helpful to establish a Paralympic Centre of sport science with the mandate to develop testing protocols, equipment research and human performance measures for Paralympic sport and athletes with a disability.

This topic of facilities-based Sport Institutes and Centres should be discussed with Ministers at F/P/T meetings and at other forums. It is essential for the provinces to be involved in establishing the Institutes as they require major facilities, and the programming would be to support their citizens.
### Timelines & Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium, SC, Provs.</td>
<td>Evaluate provincial and national involvement in existing Centres.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Establish a new financing plan for national and provincial partners.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium, CSCs</td>
<td>Identify national responsibilities for each CSC via a contract with Podium.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Hire a CSC Coordinator in Podium.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium, SC, Provs.</td>
<td>Create the CSC national communications network, common policies, etc.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium, CSCs, NSOs</td>
<td>Co-ordinate the goals, objectives, activities and needs of the sports with the CSCs programs and services.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Determine clear performance guidelines and benchmarks for CSCs, and evaluate their performance.</td>
<td>annual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Financial Considerations**

In 2005-06, $10.272 million was spent on nine Centres for both winter and summer sports, including sport science and medicine support.

**Sport Canada and CSRP Funding to CSCs in 2005-06 (000$)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSC Core Contribution</th>
<th>Atlantic</th>
<th>Quebec</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
<th>Manitoba</th>
<th>Sask.</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
<th>BC</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Summer NSO</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Winter NSO</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Innovation</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC Core Upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET Allocations - OTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET Allocations - COC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,909</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>10,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted below, for 2006-07, we are recommending that an additional $4.7 million be spent on the CSC network, exclusive of the costs for sport science and medicine services, coaches’ compensation, and talent identification. These items are outlined and budgeted in other parts of this Business Plan.

**Proposed New Funding 2006-2011 (000$)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full support (2-4 Centres)</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program support (4-6 Centres)</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development programs</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility development</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposed New Funding</td>
<td>4,700,000</td>
<td>5,650,000</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>7,300,000</td>
<td>8,450,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Full Support - With the concentration of training groups primarily focused on two to four Canadian Sport Centres, additional resources are required to ensure that a world-class environment is achieved. The centralization of services creates more efficiency but results in more costs in areas such as individual athlete services, sport science/medicine coordination, human resource management, administration and high performance coach education. These centres will become the most comprehensive multi-sport training centres in Canada.

2. Program Support - The remaining recognized CSCs will have more limited expenses for athlete services, sport science/medicine coordination, high performance coach education, administration and leadership. Each of these CSCs will be able to provide support for all carded athletes consistent with the national team programs from their respective sports.

3. Development Programs – For many years, a perceived weakness of the CSCs has been the lack of a coordinated and common approach in programming by the federal and provincial partners. The Centres have the potential to provide critical coordination for programs such as shared coaches’ salaries, talent identification, recruitment, training and education courses, promotion of Paralympic sport, implementation of the LTAD programs, links of provincial teams and competitions with national projects and others. Thus, there needs to be discussion between national and provincial/territorial funding agencies to take advantage of this opportunity, and particularly in the context of creating provincial/territorial links to national high performance athlete and coach development.

4. Facility Development - To fund the development of facility-based national and regional sport institutes, Podium and its partners need to explore various mechanisms for creating international-standard training and competition facilities (see Facilities and Equipment section of this Business Plan). These mechanisms include federal/provincial government infrastructure programs, and the hosting of major international competitions to create facility legacies. A review is already underway by a F/P/T Working Group and this should be coordinated with the survey of high performance sport facilities.

Another approach is for the Canada Games to be awarded to communities where there are a large number of high performance athletes, and to plan to leave a regional sport centre. The Canada Games hosting rotation and funding framework, among other aspects, are being reviewed by a F/P/T working group.
SECTION 4 – PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

1. Coaching and High Performance Directors
2. Athlete Support and Incentives
3. Competition
4. Team Sports
5. Sport Science and Sport Medicine
6. Facilities and Equipment
7. Innovation and Research
8. Talent Identification and Recruitment
9. Games Preparation and Environment
10. Media as a Performance Issue
1. Coaching and High Performance Directors

Background

The need for improved working conditions and salary support for coaches has been well documented over the past years. Virtually all of the reports have identified that a major discrepancy between the Canadian system and our competitors is that we have not been successful in establishing a sufficient number of full-time coaching positions to develop and support our athletes.

Andrei Rodionenko, once the leader of the Soviet women’s gymnastics team and then head coach in Australia, and with experience with Gymnastics Canada, states:

"I’m familiar with pretty much every existing coaching system in the world, but I can’t think of another country where it is more difficult to work as a coach. A coach’s life in Canada is a hundred times more difficult than in any other country. In Canada, the coaches must work for their own livelihood, then for the existence of the club and only after that can they start thinking of achieving results.”

A study of Canadian Olympic coaches following the 1996 Olympic Games states:

"There appears to be very considerable stress on coaches, many of whom are working under senseless conditions (long hours, little pay, sacrificing personal and family life, inadequate resources). One coach, who developed medalist athletes put it succinctly by saying that he came from a third world country that provided better support for coaches than in Canada.”

We will not achieve either significant or consistent international results with our current approach to the employment of coaches. The federal government must provide full compensation at competitive international rates to all senior and junior national coaches in order to create sustainable, guaranteed funding. Otherwise, coaching support will be restricted to the high-income sports, and we will never come close to achieving the technical leadership required to achieve the international results that we desire.

Assistance for athletes was established as the priority several years ago and this has resulted in an increase in the athlete assistance program to its current level of $27 million per year. In order for this investment to be maximized, the system needs to provide expert coaching.

Sport Canada indicates its current investment in coach salaries is approximately $13 million a year. We need to undertake a survey to verify how this federal government support is being utilized, and to identify other support (NSO, PSO, corporate, provincial) to better plan this area.

---


Critical Need to Improve Technical Leadership

It is absolutely essential that the technical leadership (coaches, high performance directors) in Canadian sport be considerably strengthened – in both numbers and quality - in order to achieve increased international success.

The current situation is a result of various factors, some of which are:

- inadequate financial resources to hire the appropriate technical people
- inability and/or unwillingness to compensate them properly and/or to offer a career path or employment security
- limited highly qualified Canadian technical expertise and/or limited training or education programs
- inability and/or unwillingness of NSO’s to give their technical leaders the responsibility and authority to drive the high performance programs
- NSO roadblocks to improve the technical leadership where necessary.

Return on Investment

Appropriate coaches’ compensation and working conditions are essential. The return on this investment is the enormous impact that highly qualified and dedicated coaching professionals will have on Canadian sport. This will be measured by an increase in the number of Olympic and Paralympic medals, consistency of Canadian performances over successive Olympiads, an increased depth of performance, and the strengthening of the delivery system, indicated by increased participation and stronger clubs.

The specific benefits of establishing a full cadre of highly qualified coaches includes:

a) Accountability - Each sport would have dedicated full-time technical expertise with the authority and responsibility for preparing athletes for international high performance success. This expertise would be accountable for athlete development.

b) Effective leadership of the high performance system - Along with the sport’s High Performance Committee, the HPDs and head coaches provide leadership for high performance sport.

c) Multiplier effect - Each of these coaches directly influences dozens of athletes, other coaches and the supporting system of PETs, CSCs, PSO programs, etc.

d) Setting international standards – National coaches drive the sport system to achieve international standards and conditions for training.
Program Considerations

Business Plan for Coaching Positions

We need to create and adequately fund a significant number of coaching positions that are essential to support the Canadian high performance sport system. This requires increasing coaching support from the existing 2005-2006 base of approximately $17.5 million ($13 million for salaries and $4.5 million in coaching education) to an expenditure of $26.8 million in 2006-2007, growing to $33.5 million over the following five years.

Objectives

The objectives of this investment in coaching support are to:

a) increase the number of medals and the ranking of Olympic and Paralympic athletes at the Olympic and Paralympic Games and at senior and junior World Championships

b) qualify teams sports for the summer Olympic and Paralympic Games

c) expand the pool of high performance athletes and coaches and keep then in Canada

d) increase the number and quality of coaches, particularly at the development/provincial level (This group is virtually non-existent in the Paralympic system and are absolutely critical to Paralympic athlete recruitment and development.)

e) recruit foreign coaches where necessary for knowledge-sharing and coaching

f) strengthen the technical leadership and accountability of high performance sport, and thus strengthen the Canadian sport delivery system.

Position Descriptions and Rationale

The positions needed for the coaching/technical system are described as follows.

High Performance Manager/Director – the roles and responsibilities for this position would determine whether it would be a manager or director position.

♦ High Performance Manager (HPM)

A HPM would provide administrative/managerial support to the sport’s national team programs. This could include acquiring appropriate training facilities, providing administrative support to PET’s, and ensuring all criteria for team selection/carding etc. is established and communicated. This person would need a strong understanding of high performance sport but would not oversee the coaching staff or take responsibility for the appointment or evaluation of technical staff.
♦ **High Performance Director (HPD)**

The HPD would have leadership responsibility and authority over the national team program. This person is a technical expert and has the authority to determine long and short term strategies and direction for the high performance programs. The coaching staff would report to this person. In cases where discipline coaches are required, it makes more sense to have a HPD driving the program and overseeing the coaches in the disciplines.

**Head Coach** – The roles, responsibilities and accountabilities of the Head Coach will depend on the specific needs of the sport. Some Head Coaches would report to and take direction from the HPD – e.g. a Head Coach with day-to-day responsibilities coaching athletes via a centre or club would report to a HPD. In other cases, the Head Coach would also take on the HPD role, and would be responsible for determining and implementing the strategic direction for the high performance program and overseeing all of the coaching staff.

In the case of some team sports, the Head Coach might take on the HPD role as well as be responsible for coaching the national team. In this circumstance, a HPM or Operations Manager would be hired to take care of the operations/administration side of the program.

Head coaches would be fully funded by the NSO and report to the NSO. Every priority sport must have this arrangement.

**Discipline/Assistant National Coaches** – Discipline coaches are necessary in many sports. An example would be Athletics where coaches are needed for throwing, jumping and running events. A Discipline Coach would be responsible for designing and implementing the appropriate training program for their specific discipline. In collaboration with the Head Coach or HPD, they would provide advice as to the effective integration of their discipline with the overall national team program. Assistant Coaches would be under the direction of the Head Coach.

**Junior National Coaches** – The majority of sports have some form of Junior World Championships and other junior international competitions. We need to recognize the specific skill set and contribution these coaches make. To that end, by structuring the salary levels as we have (see later), we are addressing the problem of coaches feeling they must move up the ranks to Head Coach positions if they want to see increased prestige, recognition and financial benefit. We must recognize these world-class coaches, and remunerate them as appropriate to keep them coaching at the level where they are most effective.

For Paralympic sports, this position has been more appropriately labeled as **Junior/Development Coach**. Very few Paralympic sports have a Junior World Championship (wheelchair basketball does have a Junior Worlds, and a handful of other sports are in the process of developing them). Adding qualified coaches at this level is a strong priority in order for Canada to sustain its current level of international podium success.

**Centre/Regional Coaches** – The role of the regional and/or centre coach is critical to building a stronger, highly prepared base of athletes feeding into the national team. This is a critical priority for both Olympic and Paralympic sport.
Some sports are currently establishing a network of regional centres and staffing them with NSO coaches. In other sports, training groups and coaches of key national team athletes are often not the official national team coaches. Their positions are often primarily supported by clubs.

Some believe that regional coaches should be managed by Canadian Sport Centres and supported through federal and/or corporate and/or provincial funding. Until recently, this has been the case with Pacific Sport - Victoria, and is the usual arrangement at the Australian state sport institutes.

As there are different methods of paying regional coaches (part-time or full-time, and shared funding with universities and colleges, provincial or national governments, NSOs and/or PSOs) management responsibilities need to be individually determined to ensure various needs are met. It is important that the coach does not get wrapped up in jurisdictional or political issues that detract from the job at hand.

**Guiding Principles for the Support of Coaching Positions**

a) Dedicated funds - The funds allocated by funding agencies for coaching compensation can only be used for this purpose and not transferred to other program areas.

b) Full time coaching positions - If a full-time position cannot be filled, the funding will be held until a suitable candidate can be found, or transferred to support a position in another sport.

c) Need for world-class coaches – As this Plan is about winning medals at the highest international level, coaches who have the potential to work at this level must be recruited and trained.

d) Volunteer and part-time coaching - There will remain the need for a strong volunteer corps of coaches. The development of full-time coaching positions is not intended to negate the value of these dedicated volunteers. The time demands of high performance sport, and the availability of athletes to train full-time, make it difficult for a volunteer coach to contribute at the highest level. Volunteer coaches play a critical role at the development end of the continuum and in unique cases where a sport doesn’t require heavy contact time; e.g. road cycling, open water swimming, and race walk. Without volunteer coaches, sport would become prohibitively expensive, beyond the financial means of many talented developmental athletes.

e) A career path for coaches should be defined so that a volunteer coach with the proper skills and desire can move into the professional coach stream.

f) Single employer - Presently, many coaching positions are “shared” positions, funded by a variety of different organizations, resulting in broad and often conflicting demands. Ideally, each coach should be employed by a single organization, or, if there is shared financing, reporting to only one manager.

g) NSO employment of national coaches - In the following table titled “Proposed Coaches’ Salary Scale”, the Head Coaches/HPD’s, Discipline and Assistant National Coaches, and Junior or Age Class National Coaches are employees of the NSO. No national Head Coach should also be a provincial or club coach.
h) CSC employment of regional coaches - The Centre/regional coach group could be employees of the Canadian Sport Centres, under agreement with the NSOs and Clubs. (See description of the Consolidation and Build Up phase below). NSOs are often centered hundreds of miles away from many of these regional coaches in their sport, and there might need to be local supervision.

i) Coach responsibilities to the national system - In addition to the NSO, PSO or CSC designated responsibilities of the position, each coach is expected to participate in national planning and assessment conferences, presentations to other sports and talent identification programs. Coaches will be expected to act as a mentor, master coach or evaluator for NCCP coaches. Specific responsibilities will be written into the coach contracts each year.

j) Qualifications - Supported coaches are required to be certified in the NCCP. Some coaches may qualify for equivalency or exemptions, or may meet the requirements by playing a leadership role in program delivery, as per the policies of the NCCP. There is a need for the CAC to work with Paralympic sports (beginning with priority targeted sports) to ensure that required certification levels exist.

k) Junior development - Sports, or events within a sport that are under-developed should have junior and development coaches to begin building for 2012 if there is a realistic potential for podium results. Specific objectives for success at the junior level are to be determined and monitored.

l) Team sports - The targeted Canadian team sports should receive support for coaches who are key to their planned athlete development system initiatives. Paralympic team sports would implement similar structural recommendations, to ensure they can maintain their international podium status (wheelchair basketball, wheelchair rugby, goalball).

m) Adequate program funding for coaches – It is imperative that when coaches are hired that they have the resources (and the working conditions) to implement their programs.

**Paralympic Overview**

There are several key areas that need to be addressed in order to improve the quality of coaching for Paralympic athletes.

a) Paralympic coach education program – needs to be developed and implemented and aligned with long-term athlete and coach development. This must be part of the new NCCP rather than a separate program.

b) Integration of coaching certification for Paralympic coaches - developing a collaborative relationship between the CPC, CAC and the NSO is necessary to ensure equity and integration with able-bodied coaches.

c) Recognition of experienced coaches - through pay equity for coaching positions of equal value to those of able-bodied counterparts, taking into consideration the scope of the position.

d) Raising awareness – creating interest and involvement of current able-body (Olympic) coaches in the Paralympic system; coaches who already possess strong technical background in the sport are the primary target for Paralympic recruitment.
e) More Paralympic junior/development coaches – having development coaches link with club/regional coaches to promote and educate their involvement as coaches with Paralympians has been shown to be a most effective recruitment device. The number of coaches needs to bear some resemblance to the number of athletes in the sport’s system - smaller sports (bocce) may not warrant the same level as larger sports (wheelchair basketball).

f) Coach network - formalize relationship and increase contact between personal/regional coaches and Paralympic national team coaching staff.

On-going Training and Professional Development of Coaches

Training and professional development programs will be crucial if we are to reach our performance objectives. Outlined below are a number of possibilities for improving our capacity to provide world-class training and development to our Olympic and Paralympic coaches.

a) Expanded apprenticeship program - Give promising coaches long-term, on-site coaching opportunities with national coaches and national team programs. This would include identifying coaching talent in Canada and "fast tracking" them into apprenticeship programs. Such recruits might be former international athletes who show a propensity for coaching, or young coaches currently working in domestic development programs.

b) Professional development programs - Custom design professional development programs for our national coaches such as Guest Coach and International Intelligence programs. The former would bring distinguished coaches to Canada to give presentations, and coach and consult with our coaches. The latter would send technical experts around the world to gather “best practices” information and share it with our coaching community. Programs must be individualized and provide World Class experiences for our top coaches.

c) Mentoring opportunities for coaches – All levels of coaches should be mentored by world-class coaches from Canada or abroad.

d) 'Cross Sport' programs - Provide opportunities for top coaches to come together and share ‘best practices’, and when appropriate, work with athletes and coaches in another sport.

Phases of Development

Phase 1: Consolidation and Build up - April 2006 to March 2008

This 24-month consolidation and build up period will enable the NSOs to complete the hiring processes and adjust to supporting their coaches as single employers.

In addition, the CSC’s will facilitate the hiring and support of Regional Coaches in partnership with NSO’s and PSOs. This represents a new level of high performance collaboration between the club and provincial programs and the national team program. In some sports, hiring Regional Coaches would be a more advanced level of training for athletes when they are not training with the national team program, as well as a training opportunity for the top developing athletes.
Reviews would be undertaken in Oct-Dec 2007 to determine allocation of Phase 2 resources.

**Phase 2: Adjustment and Expansion April 2008 – March 2010**

Once the initial coaching positions are in place from Phase 1, additional coach salary funding would be provided in December 2007 to allow for adjustments and expansion of the program.

**Phase 3: Re-assessment April 2010 – March 2013**

Adjustments to priority sports would be based on 2008 and 2009 results.

---

### Timelines & Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/CAC/SC</td>
<td>Clarify the exact number and quality of NSO coaches currently in the system, the conditions of their employment and their funding sources.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/NSO</td>
<td>Identify the numbers and quality of coaching/technical personal required for each sport.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO</td>
<td>Identify current coaches, experienced athletes and foreign coaches that could help fill the need.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/NSO/CAC</td>
<td>Create a multi-sport system-wide coach identification and recruitment plan.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Educate coaches of able-bodied athletes about coaching needs and opportunities within Paralympic sport.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment, Compensation and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/CAC/NSO</td>
<td>Develop a broad-spectrum compensation &amp; benefits plan and policies for high performance coaches and the HPD.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/CAC/NSO</td>
<td>Develop coach and HPD review/evaluation guidelines and tools.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSO</td>
<td>Evaluate individual coach and HPD performance.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC/NSO/Podium</td>
<td>Identify training and professional development needs.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC/NSO/Podium</td>
<td>Evaluate coaching education system for effectiveness and revise accordingly.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC/CSC</td>
<td>Develop and implement professional development program for the highest level coaches.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Considerations

Coaches Compensation

In order to determine the cost of hiring coaches for the summer NSOs, a salary scale was developed as expressed in the following table. Depending on the experience and competencies of each individual coach, and their value in the international marketplace, the NSO may want to supplement this base level with their own discretionary funds.

In some cases, the salary of a national junior or discipline coach could be on par or greater than the head coach. In the case where you have a world-class coach working at the developmental level, and it is in the best interests of the athletes and program for them to be there, they need to be remunerated appropriately. We want coaches to coach to their strengths. We also do not want to have the case where a coach feels that in order to progress; they have to take the position as Head Coach or as an administrator.

The following coaching requirements were identified from the 2005-06 CSRP review of each sport, based on their capacity to provide high performance programming to their athletes.

Proposed Coaches Salary Scale, and Numbers of Coaches and Related Positions needed for 32 Olympic and 18 Paralympic Sport Disciplines, as proposed by the CSRP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>National Team Operations Manager</th>
<th>National HPD</th>
<th>Head National Coach</th>
<th>Assistant/Discipline National Coaches</th>
<th>Junior National Coaches</th>
<th>Centre or Regional Coaches</th>
<th>Total Numbers Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>70K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>70K</td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>70K</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>110K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>80K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using both the proposed salary scale and the coaching requirements for the national system, a budget was developed to estimate the magnitude of this cost. Included in the budget are costs for training, education and administrative costs for the coaches.
Projected Costs for 358 Coaching and Related Positions (2006-2011) for Olympic and Paralympic Sport Disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coach, Manage and HPD salaries Individual Sports Phase 1 (185 positions)</strong></td>
<td>12,790,000</td>
<td>13,045,800</td>
<td>13,306,716</td>
<td>13,572,850</td>
<td>13,844,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coach, Manager &amp; HPD salaries Team Sports Phase 1 (68 coach positions, 7 mgr)</strong></td>
<td>5,090,000</td>
<td>5,191,800</td>
<td>5,295,636</td>
<td>5,401,548</td>
<td>5,509,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coach, Manager &amp; HPD salaries, Paralympic sports Phase 1 (58 coach positions, 2 mgr)</strong></td>
<td>2,735,000</td>
<td>2,789,700</td>
<td>2,845,494</td>
<td>2,902,404</td>
<td>2,960,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2 growth: 20 for individual sports 15 for team sports 10 Paralympic positions</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,150,000</td>
<td>3,213,000</td>
<td>3,277,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits at 20%</strong></td>
<td>4,123,000</td>
<td>4,205,460</td>
<td>4,919,569</td>
<td>5,017,960</td>
<td>5,118,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Salary and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>24,738,000</td>
<td>25,232,760</td>
<td>29,517,415</td>
<td>30,107,762</td>
<td>30,709,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training and Development</strong></td>
<td>1,520,000</td>
<td>1,520,000</td>
<td>1,520,000</td>
<td>1,520,000</td>
<td>1,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paralympic Coach education development</strong></td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coach Honoraria support</strong></td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative salary subsidy for 45 head coaches @ 20k</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>26,838,000</td>
<td>28,552,760</td>
<td>32,337,415</td>
<td>32,927,762</td>
<td>33,529,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Existing funding for summer sports** | 10,000,000

**Estimated New Funding Required** | 16,838,000 | 18,000,000 | 22,000,000 | 23,000,000 | 23,000,000

Notes:

1. As shown above, the total cost for summer Olympic and Paralympic coaching is estimated at $26.8 million, growing to $33.5 million in 2010/2011.

2. Currently, it is estimated that $13 million is spent on both summer and winter coach salaries, and we estimate that about $10 million of this is spent on summer sport. Thus, for summer sport, there is a need of about $16.8 million ($26.8m - $10m) of new funding for hiring and training summer national and regional coaches, for Olympic and Paralympic disciplines.
3. Of this $16.8 million, $6.6 million is earmarked for “Centre or Regional coaches” (from the previous charts, 120 coaches at $55,000 average salary = $6.6 million). The financing of these positions should be a shared responsibility between federal and provincial governments. This would imply a financial commitment of $3.3 million from provincial governments and the remaining $3.3 million from the federal government.

4. Thus the needed federal commitment would be $13.5 million of new funding for coaches per annum. This would bring the total federal government expenditures on coaching salaries and education to a similar level to the current support for athletes ($27 million).

5. Paralympic growth may need to be more substantial, particularly in the junior/development coaching area which is virtually non-existent currently. It will be a key requirement for replenishing the athlete pool and making future international success possible when our current stars retire by 2008. Paralympic sports will primarily be focusing on firming up national team staff and adding core development coaches in the initial implementation period, then with increased capacity and technical leadership they will be in a position to expand the roster of development coaches in Phase 2.

6. The cost of a Paralympic awareness/education program to Olympic sport coaches is reflected in the Table.

7. Phase 2 growth is budgeted at an additional 20 positions for individual sports and 15 positions for team sports and 10 for Paralympic sports, valued at $70,000 each, beginning in 2007.

8. Annual coach honoraria support is budgeted at $400,000 to provide for coaches who are identified as crucial members of the preparation team but cannot take on a full-time coaching role.

9. To ensure coaches are able to coach and have the administrative support they require, beginning in April 2007, part-time secretarial positions will be supported.

10. The financial data in the Table does not include coach education programs ($4.5 million per year by the CAC), which is part of the Sport Canada core budget.

2. Athlete Support and Incentives

**Background**

The majority of direct financial support provided to national team athletes is provided by Sport Canada’s Athlete Assistance Program (AAP). The 2005-06 AAP budget ($27 million) has tripled since 1999-2000 ($9 million).

In the 2004-05 fiscal year, there were 1542 summer and winter carded athletes (including 200 Senior cards for Paralympians) which is a significant increase over the 919 in 1996-97.
There are currently two levels of support for the AAP - Senior cards at $18,000 per year and Development cards at $10,800 per year. These levels of support are more than double the amount provided to athletes in 1999-2000. Athletes are also eligible for tuition and deferred tuition support of up to $10,000 per year. These funds are tax-free, thus increasing their value.

This increase in support could be a factor in Canadian athletes remaining in the sport system for a longer period of time. The average age of carded athletes ranked in the top 16 in the world has increased from 24.3 in 1990 to 28.3 in 2004, while the average number of years carded has increased from 3.7 yrs in 1991-92 to 5.7 in 2003-04.

The minimal personal support provided by most provincial governments to athletes at the developmental level is viewed as a significant weakness in our system. In recent years, at the urging of NSOs to help fill this gap, the AAP has been providing support to a greater number of ‘development’ athletes who are either junior national team members or aspiring senior team members. This has resulted in an increase in the number of development cards from 71 in 1996-97 to 468 in 2004-05.

In 2005-06, for the first time, 50 Paralympic Development cards were awarded, a strong first step in filling a massive void in the system that limited the progression of Paralympic athletes from the club to national team level. With the strong focus on recruitment/development initiatives, the demand for Paralympic D cards will increase significantly above the current level.

**Current Financial Situation of Canada’s High Performance Athletes**

According to the 2004 athlete survey, the biggest concern for athletes remains the level of financial support and recognition they receive. (Note: This survey was prior to the $4,800 annual increase in September 2004). In addition, the media have portrayed high performance athletes as being practically destitute, with 75% of carded athletes living below the poverty line. However, as depicted in the 2004 survey, the financial picture of carded athletes is far better than that. The recent annual increase of $4,800 in AAP stipends has significantly increased carded athlete potential incomes to approximately $32,000, which exceeds their average annual expenses. The AAP stipends are provided tax free to athletes, thus increasing the benefit. Furthermore, older athletes (27 years plus) and athletes carded at the senior international level have potential incomes of approximately $40,000 (with the $4,800 increase). This is well above the Canadian average wage.

The information from the 2004 survey tells us that student athletes in particular are doing very well compared to their peers. Student athletes report an average annual personal income of over $20,000. Combined with additional support to cover tuition costs (generally $4-5,000), this compares favourably to the personal income of $12,200 reported by Canadian post-secondary students in 2001.

---
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However, given additional expenses incurred by high performance athletes, the question remains as to whether their incomes are adequate to allow for the level of preparation that is necessary to get to the podium. The 2004 survey shows that carded athletes believe that adequate financial support is the most important factor in their achieving their full potential. Despite the above financial picture, 40% of carded athletes indicated low satisfaction in the level of financial support, and 67% indicated that funding provided by the AAP was insufficient to meet basic needs. (This was before the $4,800 increase in stipends). Senior card athletes still were able to train an average of 37 hours per week, and Development card athletes reported training an average of 32 hours per week.

Specific Paralympic circumstances should be addressed such as their unique increased training/competition costs due to limited domestic training/competition opportunities, increased equipment and transport costs, cost of pilot/guide/attendant to train and travel with athletes in some classes, and more limited exposure and sponsorship opportunities.

**CSRP Report**

In the 2005-06 fiscal year, the CSRP did recommend changes to Sport Canada (who administer the AAP) and excerpts from the CSRP report\(^{15}\) on this matter are as follows.

"*In an attempt to address the lack of strong linkages between AAP and the SFAF excellence programs noted above, the CSRP was asked to provide recommendations to Sport Canada for the allocation of up to 200 senior equivalent cards to those targeted Olympic sports demonstrating a need. In addition, Sport Canada has an objective for the number of Paralympic cards to reach 200 and has asked the Panel to make recommendations on the distribution of approximately 20 unassigned cards. The Panel has examined the new Sport Canada AAP Quota system and made recommendations for additional cards using the new individual sport quotas as a baseline."

"Recent AAP developments have also been very encouraging for Paralympic sport. The Paralympic community has consistently lobbied for the introduction of development cards for Paralympic athletes, as their absence has frustrated the efforts of many sports to retain developing athletes within their programs and to properly develop a broader talent base. The CSRP was asked to allocate 50 new Development cards targeted exclusively to Paralympic athletes, and has submitted recommendations for the allocation of these cards based on the results of NSO interviews and the Panel’s analysis of where the cards could be best utilized in order to support the high performance programs of priority sports."

"In addition, the Panel has made targeted recommendations for a limited number of increased senior national card allocations to athletes who have demonstrated potential for podium performance in 2008."

"The maintenance and eventual expansion of Paralympic-specific development card allocations is recommended as NSO development team programs and initiatives continue to expand."

---

\(^{15}\) Canadian Sport Review Panel, *Report of the Canadian Sport Review Panel to the National Funding Partners on Summer Olympic and Paralympic Sports*, April 30, 2005
Athlete Support other than from the Federal Government

While direct support to high performance athletes from the federal government has increased significantly, the support provided by most provinces has decreased, with the exception of Quebec which provides $3.5 million for athlete support each year, and the newly announced Ontario program.

The Canadian Olympic Committee has had an athlete rewards/incentive program since 1997 when 315 athletes were awarded cash for performances based on finishing in the top eight in the world rankings. Since 2002/03, the COC has provided cash for performances in the top five in the world.

COC Excellence Fund Payments to athletes in summer and winter sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># athletes (Winter)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># sports (Winter)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># athletes (Summer)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># sports (Summer)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># athletes (Pan Am)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># sports (Pan Am)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># athletes (Total)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># sports (Total)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>$609,853</td>
<td>$925,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$970,002</td>
<td>$870,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the 2004 athlete survey, 16 lack of support and recognition from corporations is one of the biggest disappointments to athletes. Direct support from corporations is limited to endorsements and sponsorships which are usually negotiated by agents. Less than 45% of athletes indicate that there are commercial or professional opportunities in their sport. and only 15% have agents. Any significant sponsorship is usually limited to Olympic medalists after they have achieved success.

Furthermore, while there are a number of corporate or foundation contributions that support athletes (e.g. COC fund, the Dairy Farmers of Canada, the ‘See You In’ program, the AthletesCAN Investors fund, La Fondation d’excellence des athlètes de haute performance, the Petro-Canada Torch Scholarship fund, Rona, HBC), the amount of support and/or the numbers supported may be limited, and there is no coordination or communication between these programs. This can result in the same athletes being supported by multiple sources. Add to this the disparities between provincial and university programs in funding athletes, and one can easily see the value in creating a coordinated national system that more appropriately distributes the available resources.

---

16 The Status of the High Performance Athlete (2005), Ekos Research Associates Inc. for Sport Canada and AthletesCAN
## Strengths and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Direct support to high performance athletes has increased significantly over the past 10 years to the point where the average income of carded athletes is $32k a year (with the $4,800 stipend increase).</td>
<td>♦ A significant gap exists in support at the development level. Most provinces do not provide direct or adequate financial support for athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ The current support programs are allowing athletes to stay in the sport system longer.</td>
<td>♦ There is lack of recognition and reward for performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Educational program support is offered through the tuition/deferred tuition system. Carded athletes are more highly educated than the general Canadian population.</td>
<td>♦ Corporate support is low; it comes too late: it is not coordinated; foundations double up on support of athletes; nothing is targeted at younger athletes who are not carded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Lifestyle support is provided to athletes (from CSCs) in preparation for life after sport. This is one area where Canada has a relatively strong performance compared to other nations.</td>
<td>♦ Support programs do not discriminate between different situations: university students; high school athletes living at home; single athletes; married athletes with income and not living at home; enhanced needs of athletes with disabilities; and significant differences in incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ The support system has been revised to allow NSOs the flexibility to allocate their card quota as Senior or Development cards based on the needs of their sport. This allows NSOs to direct support to junior and development athletes</td>
<td>♦ The inadequate financial capacity of many NSOs has led to several organizations assessing athlete fees as a means to expand their programming capacity, thus undermining athlete support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Direct athlete support from the federal government is targeted to provide more support to those sports with successful performance records at Olympic &amp; Paralympic Games.</td>
<td>♦ There have been reports from athletes, coaches and high performance directors in various sports that some athlete’s goals are geared to meeting carding standards, not international medals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ In some cases, athletes view direct financial support as an entitlement and not as a means to support improved performance. It has been suggested in the survey that some athletes view AAP support as more related to payment for services rendered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Some NSOs are reluctant to place higher demands or accountability on their athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Some athletes, who do not have potential to get to the top 16 remain on AAP far too long and therefore deny needed support to up and coming development athletes. This is mostly due to the inflexibility of AAP in de-carding, sharing cards, having athletes receive cards when training overseas, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Some NSOs have difficulties under the current AAP to de-card athletes who are not performing. If an NSO is unable to re-allocate a card, there is little incentive to go through the required process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Some NSOs feel that there is too much funding to athletes and some of this should be diverted to other needs such as coaches’ salaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Considerations for the AAP

Direct support to young developing athletes - Direct support for potential high performance athletes (not necessarily direct funding, but perhaps other opportunities) must start at a younger age and be accompanied by training program support and supervision. Carding more developmental athletes without adequate programming does nothing to improve future potential. The current system which allows NSOs to allocate AAP resources to both senior and junior national team athletes should be continued. However, we need to identify ways to provide adequate support to deserving developing athletes below national senior and junior team level. For long-term sustainability, this support should come from the provinces, and be coordinated with the national program.

In Quebec, “excellence” athletes recognized by the Québec sport governing bodies and by the Secrétariat au loisir et au sport, receive up to $6,000 per year:

a) for personal support for their commitment towards high performance goals
b) to motivate the next generation of Québec athletes to continue in sport
c) to confirm high performance athletes’ status, and to highlight, through visible commitments, the importance Quebec attaches to these athletes
d) to facilitate these athletes’ transition when they retire from high performance active competition.

In January 2006, the Ontario government, via the Ontario Lottery & Gaming Corporation, created a new program expected to generate $2.5 million in direct financial assistance for Ontario athletes by March 2006, and continuing financing them thereafter.

These models of provincial athlete support need to be established in all provinces, and they need to be coordinated with the federal governments AAP.

Policies and Issues That Need to be Addressed

Improved coordination of funding programs – We must encourage the corporations and foundations that support high performance athletes to eliminate the duplication that exists in their programs and assist them to participate in a more coordinated way. The COC and CPC might best be the agent to coordinate non-government contributions.

Elimination of athlete fees – The inadequate financial capacity of many NSOs has led them to assess athlete fees as a means to expand their programming. The CSRP felt that AAP dollars should not be an alternate way of paying NSO program costs.

Revisions to AAP criteria– Sport Canada should consider increasing the flexibility within the AAP criteria for athletes who have the potential to achieve medals but currently are ineligible because they participate in events with a limited size of field. The impact is most significant for female athletes and athletes with a severe disability.
Paralympic cards - The AAP must develop an objective allocation process for Paralympic cards. With the requirement for an increased focus on carding Development athletes, the Paralympic demand will far exceed the current supply of 200 Senior card equivalents and 50 D cards (combined totals for winter and summer sports).

University students – Should university athletes continue to receive better support (i.e. the same level of carding support plus up to $10,000 in tuition) than full-time athletes?

An incentives based AAP – In the course of the CSRP reviews, the incongruity of pursuing a performance-based excellence program while retaining a universal AAP approach that gave the same privileges to non-priority sports was mentioned several times. Many NSOs have suggested that Sport Canada should return to an incentives-based AAP to be consistent with the new excellence approach.

Enhanced support to potential medalists - We must provide additional support to potential medalists to allow them to train full-time during the year prior to Olympic/Paralympic Games. Only athletes with medal potential would be eligible. Applications must be endorsed by the NSO and funding would come from existing resources.

Athlete incentives – An incentives/reward program should be put in place (see suggestion later in this section) such that medalists at World Championships and Olympic/Paralympic Games are motivated and rewarded. This could include the COC revising its Athlete Fund to support medalists only, and/or the COC/CPC working directly with corporate sponsors and foundations to enrich such a program.

Performance monitoring - There needs to be increased monitoring and consequences for athletes who are not progressing, such as losing their support, which would allow support of more development athletes. There are cautions, however. The potential de-carding and thus possible loss of athletes may weaken the athlete development system because these athletes “support the system” as reserves, role players, sparring partners and competitors at domestic events. Furthermore, there is presently no incentive for NSOs to enter into a complex and time consuming process to de-card an athlete when it does not allow for the card to be re-assigned to another athlete.

**Athlete Incentives**

In a market economy like Canada’s, pay scale and bonuses are an incentive for high performers. Many believe that there should be an aspect of athlete compensation that is based on accomplishment – a reward for performance. Both economic theory and empirical evidence would suggest that the structure of a compensation/incentive plan serves to send a strong market signal to athletes and coaches about the level of performance that is expected. If the goal is to win, then at least some of the money given to athletes should be tied to progression and achievement – and to winning at the international level.
Canada should adjust its athlete compensation program to include performance-based incentives as a message to athletes that podium performances are important and that finishing among the top three at major international events will be rewarded.

**Canada’s Podium Problem**

The following chart indicates the Canadian performance problem at the Olympic Games:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold Medals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Medals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 8 finishes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 12 finishes</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Medal Sports</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, Canadian athletes have to meet the ‘top 12’ standard to make the Olympic team and to reach the highest levels of AAP support. Many are achieving at the level needed to receive the maximum financial reward available, but they are declining in their ability to reach the Olympic podium. There are a numbers of finishers among the top eight and top 12 but Canadian athletes are not able to take that final step into the top three. There are many more fourth to eighth place finishes than medals.

It is interesting to compare the distribution of finishes among the top eight of countries offering Olympic performance incentives vs. Canada (Athens Games 2004):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These countries are usually winning more medals (top three finishes) than they have 4-8th place finishes. For example, Russia at Athens in 2004 had 92 medals and 72 finishes fourth place to eighth place.

The Canadian Olympic Committee has had an athlete rewards/incentive program since 1997 when 315 athletes were awarded cash for performances based on finishing in the top eight in the world rankings. Since 2002-03, the COC has provided cash for performances in the top five in the world (see the COC Excellence Fund table earlier in this section).

Incentives are not the only factor at work here. However, they cannot be ignored as a strategy to send a strong message to Canadian athletes and coaches of the importance of getting on the Olympic podium.
Norman Bellingham, Olympic Gold Medalist in K2-1000 Kayak in 1988, studied the effectiveness of athlete incentives as part of his senior thesis at Harvard University. One of his conclusions was that:

"Athletes need to be induced to take on the risk required in devoting so much of their human resources in preparation for the Games. Too much comfort can exist for an athlete if the benefits and prizes that are given are not contingent upon a top level performance. The athletes will be strongly tempted to prepare to perform only up to the minimum level required to achieve the benefits."

In this case the benefits are attendance at the Olympic Games, and financial compensation.

Obviously some balance between funneling all or none of the available money into performance-based incentives needs to exist. This balance probably lies in providing national team athletes with adequate programming dollars, an adequate basic living entitlement and then rewarding them with incrementally larger bonuses the better they perform.

The incentive program, if significant enough, will send the message to athletes and coaches that podium performances are important enough to take the ‘risk’ – to commit their personal time and resources – to accomplishing that goal.

### Program Considerations for Athlete Incentives

The following are the awards for Olympic Champions from different Olympic teams at the Torino Olympic Winter Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Prize</th>
<th>CDN $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>130,000 euros</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1 million koruna</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>3 million yen</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>20,000 francs</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>10,000 AUD</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Canadian athletes at future Olympic Games, significant awards might encourage top athletes to strive for a medal. As a minimum, the following might be considered.

- Olympic Champion $25,000
- Silver Medal $15,000
- Bronze Medal $10,000

A policy for team rewards would need to be established. One idea would be to provide teams (pairs, quartets, larger teams) with $50,000 for winning any medal, to be split between the players.

Performance awards should also be made available for World Championships or similar events in the other years of the quadrennial period. These awards should be significant but not of the same magnitude as for an Olympic podium result, and they should be more broadly distributed to cover the most obvious future Olympic contenders.

- World Champion $ 10,000
- 2nd Place $ 7,500
- 3rd Place $ 5,000
- 4th Place $ 2,500
- 5th Place $ 2,000

Based on results of world competitions in 2005, and using the financial scale for world events presented above, the minimal costs for such a program are estimated as follows. If teams (rowing, waterpolo etc.) win medals, there would be even greater cost because of the increased number of participants.

As an example, based on the assumption of finishing 16th at Beijing in 2008 with 17 medals (8 gold, 6 silver, 3 bronze), the cost for individual medalists (not teams) would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Summer Sports</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Summer Sports</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Summer Sports</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Summer (Olympic Year)</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Quadrennial</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,170,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an example, based on the assumption of finishing 12th in London in 2012, with 27 medals (9 gold, 7 silver, 11 bronze) the cost for individual medalists (not teams) would be

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sports</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Summer Sports</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Summer Sports</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Summer Sports</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Summer (Olympic Year)</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for 2012 Quadrennial</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,640,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the budgets suggest a level of performance beyond the current level for Canadian athletes, experience in other top Olympic sport nations suggests that a clear and significant incentives program will result in a 25-50% increase in the performance of the ‘top eight’ level performers.
For these reward systems to be effective, communication of the opportunity has to be good, levels of awards have to be significant and payment of the incentive bonuses has to be immediate.

Funding for this program should be developed by the COC and their corporate partners.

Importantly, an incentive program should be put in place for coaches of medalist athletes. Their motivation is and industry is critical.

**A Paralympic Rewards/Incentives Program**

Unlike the COC, the CPC does not have an incentive/rewards program. Decades of minimal federal and provincial funding and lack of recognition has left the Canadian Paralympic athlete development system in a weak situation. The CPC has an annual budget of $1.5 million of which half is provided by the federal government. Thus, the idea of CPC’s limited non-governmental resources going to reward performances over other basic system needs would receive little support.

Indeed, such an incentive program modeled after the Olympic incentive program described above would be infinitely more expensive than the Olympic program. There are about three times as many medals at the Paralympic Games than at the Olympic Games. To finish in the top three nations, Canada would have to achieve about 25 gold medals and a total of 100 medals. For the Olympic team to meet its goal of a 12th place finish, it would need to achieve a total of 25 medals.

Thus, in the Financial Considerations section below, $625,000 has been identified to provide $25,000 for each of 25 single gold medals at the Paralympic Games. As expressed above for Olympic teams, perhaps an incentive for Paralympic teams would be the same, being $50,000 per team for winning a gold medal, to be split between the players. There would be no funding for incentives for competitions between Paralympic Games.

**Initiating the Program**

The COC has a reward-for-performance program in place for the Olympic Games. But the rewards are probably too small ($5000 for a gold medal performance) to send a strong enough message to athletes about the importance of performance or to induce them to prepare more intensively to achieve podium performances. Nonetheless, the COC is probably the best organization to manage the podium rewards program, ideally coordinating the funding of corporate contributors with a common program.

It would be desirable to get this program in place for World Championship performances in 2006 and 2007 so athletes are aware of the opportunity and have a chance to adjust their approach.

It is essential to discuss this matter with a wide selection of top athletes to determine their interest in such a program, and the types and scope of incentives that should be meaningful.
**Timelines and Responsibilities**

A study on athlete support across Canada needs to be undertaken to identify all existing athlete support programs, including lifestyle, job creation and other development programs (often run by Canadian Sport Centres), and to use this information as a base for developing a new, coordinated and fully financed national/provincial/corporate AAP.

There needs to be a particular effort to encourage both the provinces and the corporations to participate as described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC/Podium/NSOs</td>
<td>Conduct a comprehensive review of the federal AAP program that will address the identified issues, and bring the program more in line with the ‘excellence’ thrust.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/universities Podium/NSOs</td>
<td>Undertake a national study identifying all existing athlete support, and identify how to create a coordinated national program.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC/CPC/Podium</td>
<td>Identify and begin discussions with foundations and corporate groups concerning coordinating and focusing their support to a national program.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F/P/T govts &amp; Podium</td>
<td>Begin discussions with provinces concerning their funding of provincial athletes and coordination with a national program.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC/CPC</td>
<td>Develop a new framework for a revised athlete incentives program.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>Raise funds for the athlete incentive program &amp; launch program.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provinces</td>
<td>Initiate standardized provincial AAP.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Implement the revised AAP program.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC or COC/CPC</td>
<td>Provide enhanced financial support to potential 2008 Olympic medalists if required.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>Evaluate and measure athlete incentive program’s effectiveness.</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Considerations**

The Table below outlines both responsibilities and estimated annual costs to run a comprehensive athlete support program. It supports 10,000 athletes for about $65 million annually. About $36 million of this funding already exists, such as the federal AAP, the COC rewards program, some university and college scholarships and foundation or corporate programs.

Thus, it is estimated that $29 million of new athlete support needs to be added to the Canadian system, $20 million from the provinces, $6 million from corporate sources, and an additional $3 million from the federal AAP program.
Whereas one need is to generate additional funds (such as the extremely important provincial government support for developing athletes), a primary challenge would be to coordinate (and standardize) various funding initiatives already in place so that there is a comprehensive and uniform pan-Canadian approach.

**Proposed Funding Responsibilities and Estimated Annual Requirements for a Coordinated AAP for Summer Olympic and Paralympic Athletes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Senior &amp; Junior Team AAP</th>
<th>Special Assistance for Potential Medalists</th>
<th>Provincial Level Athletes</th>
<th>Athlete Incentives &amp; Rewards</th>
<th>University &amp; College Athletes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Canada</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provinces</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Costs</td>
<td>$30 million¹</td>
<td>$2 million²</td>
<td>$20 million³</td>
<td>$4 million⁴</td>
<td>$9 million⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Resources Required</td>
<td>$3 million</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>$14 million</td>
<td>$4 million</td>
<td>$6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. $27 million is currently provided by Sport Canada for 1600 athletes in 2005-06; $3 million of new funds are required for future additional Paralympic and other adjustments.

2. This amount considers 40 athletes receiving on average up to $50,000 extra for special assistance, with funds provided via non-governmental sources.

3. $20 million considers 4000 provincial athletes receiving on average $5000 annually. It is estimated that about $6 million of provincial athlete funding exists, requiring the provinces to contribute an additional $14 million of new athlete funding.

4. $4 million includes up to $3 million annually for Olympic athletes for Olympic and World Championship results, and $0.625 million every four years for Paralympians for Paralympic Games gold medals (25 medals x $25,000). These funds would come from corporate or COC sources.

5. $6 million supports 2000 college and university athletes receiving an average of $3000. The provinces would fund these. It is unclear at this time what is currently being provided, so the ‘need’ is an estimated total cost.
3. Competition

Background

The Brisson report\textsuperscript{8} stated that "Successful sporting nations have well-structured competitive programs with ongoing international exposure".

Due in part to Canada’s geography and relatively small population, and limited resources, Canada’s potential medalists are given less than optimal exposure to quality competitions at home and abroad.

We do not have the necessary critical mass of highly competitive elite leagues for almost all of the team sports, be they senior clubs, universities, colleges or provincial teams. Men’s junior and professional ice hockey is the notable exception.

Thus, in order to remain competitive with other nations, Canadian athletes are often required to reside in countries that have top level competition circuits and professional leagues and/or to undertake costly travel to achieve this.

The Canada Games is our most important multi-sport domestic event. Many feel that the four-year cycle is too infrequent, with some junior athletes missing the opportunity to compete because they were not the right age at the right time. The Games have an important domestic purpose to involve all provinces and territories but they have a variety of eligibility rules which limit their contribution to high performance development. Several feel that all Olympic sports should be in the Canada Games program. These and other matters are currently being discussed by the Canada Games Council.

Paralympic Competition

There is no national or provincial multi-sport, multi-disability Paralympic Games in Canada, and it is time to establish this as a key incentive to encourage provinces and territories to develop Paralympic sport.

In a few Paralympic sports, athletes with a disability are sometimes integrated into the able-bodied club systems. There, they train and compete as any other athlete and follow the typical able-bodied athlete progression. These individuals tend to have an increased opportunity to compete and will typically go through a transition to Paralympic sport. However, this is not the norm. Such integration tends to produce athletes only in the least disabled classes. Athletes with greater disabilities often have little support. Canadians only competed in 26% of the medal events at the 2004 Paralympic Games in Athens, almost completely ignoring the opportunity for medals in more severely disabled classes.

There are few competitive opportunities for athletes with disabilities. It is a huge jump from the local club to the national/international level, and there is very little support along the way. As there is no system or existing strategy in place to rectify this situation, there is need to develop a LTAD model for recruitment, development and competition. The provinces and territories are key to this happening.

In the very few instances where there are provincial or regional competitions, events usually include the recreational athlete, the local event athlete, the up-and-coming athlete and occasionally, high performance athletes. Thus, the recreational or entry-level individual has the opportunity to see the high performance athlete and to assess their own interest in pursuing the sport to that level. There is, however, very little value for the high performance athlete to compete in these competitions.

National competitions provide the opportunity for senior coaches and development coaches to work together in a mentoring process, and for senior coaches to observe up-and-coming talent. Leading Paralympic sports have just begun to hire national coaches but there are still too few competitions.

**Canadian Sport Review Panel Findings**

In their response to the recent survey by the CSRP, NSOs raised remarkably consistent concerns regarding the high performance competitive environment in their sports.

- Almost universally, NSOs identified a serious shortfall in the number of appropriate domestic and international competitive opportunities throughout the year, for all potential junior and senior medalists, in priority sports.
- Most sports indicate that increasing the number of planned and appropriate high-level competitions for their athletes is the most important change required to achieve better results.
- It is doubtful that sports could successfully introduce a doubling of first-class competitive opportunities without additional coaches, support staff, medical staff, administrators and other support.
- A few sports identified the need to refine or build a new national competition model for their high performance programs, including elements within the LTAD model.
- It was also clear among the team sports that professional leagues – the strength of most top nations – were universally absent in Canada except in men’s ice hockey.

**Policy and Program Considerations**

The following points need to be acted upon.

a) Too many sports have weak training and competitive transition strategies to bring talented junior and intermediate level athletes up to the senior national and international levels. The competition structure for both senior and la relève athletes must be identified within the LTAD model.

b) Qualified coaches must have the authority to determine the number and quality of competitions required for their athletes.

c) When the competition load is increased, there will be need for additional personal resources beyond those provided by the AAP so as to free up more of the athlete’s time.
d) Team sports need to build the case for more international competitions in Canada by first achieving results in competitions abroad. Unless our teams are highly rated, foreign athletes/teams won’t incur the costs of coming to Canada. Most Paralympic team sports have already achieved this status. (e.g. wheelchair basketball, rugby, goalball) and thus are ready for increased hosting support.

e) National coaches must be assisted by performance specialists to monitor their athletes’ and key foreign athletes’ performances in competition and then to incorporate lessons learned into the sport’s LTAD model and into individual athlete’s preparation programs. This would be particularly beneficial for Paralympic sports because of the less developed International Federations, weaker ranking lists, and less frequent opportunities to observe international athletes in competition.

f) Provincial and territorial Ministers of Education should support the renewal of inter-school sport as an essential element in the development of Canadian youth. Strategies should be developed to facilitate the best competing against one another more frequently.

g) We need to explore establishing foreign training bases to provide a stable environment during extended competition tours abroad (Europe and Asia) by Canadian athletes. While some of these costs could be offset by reducing international travel, additional costs would be incurred through increased numbers of athletes on extended tours and the need to equip and staff these tours.

h) To raise the public profile of Canadian athletes and teams, we need to ensure that there is a national communications program, part of which is centered around Canadian performances in competitions held in Canada and abroad.

i) We should utilize the Pan American, Para-PanAmerican, FISU and Commonwealth Games, and Junior and Senior World Cups as an opportunity to provide international competition experience for junior and developing athletes. This would mean that team selection criteria would need to permit the participation of these athletes.

j) We need to discuss areas of greater collaboration with Canadian multi-sport Games agencies (Commonwealth Games Canada, Canada Games Council, Canadian Interuniversity Sport, CPC and COC) to determine how they might collaborate more effectively, specifically in the areas of quality of Games Missions, athlete selection policy, and providing opportunities for national team and PET officials.

Federal Government

In 2004, the F/P/T governments endorsed the policy paper Strategic Framework for Hosting International Sport Events. This provides a blueprint for governments and the sport community to work together to maximize sport benefits. The federal Hosting Policy is now being revised based on this strategic framework. As part of its Hosting Policy, the Government of Canada should encourage coordinated and strategic bidding for major multi-sport events (Olympic/Paralympic Games, Commonwealth Games, FISU Games, Jeux de la francophonie) and major single-sport World Cup or World Championships, in priority sports and in priority locations where high performance training facilities can be developed.
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All of these hosting initiatives that leave facility legacies should include legacy funds for facility upkeep, access for HP athletes and for programming at the national and local level. Podium should be part of the legacy discussions on all major international events hosted in Canada where high performance sport legacy opportunities are possible.

The Sport Canada Hosting Program should give priority to those sporting events which are seen as critical to providing a competitive edge to Canadian athletes/teams to achieve their Olympic or Paralympic athlete qualification and performance targets.

The Government of Canada should include competition events in bilateral agreements with other countries, and to follow up with resources to allow them to occur.

**Canada Games**

The Canada Games should become more significant in the overall LTAD model for participating sports. A four year cycle is too infrequent, and the quality of participants (because of age, provincial selection criteria and other restrictions) is less than it should be. For the Games to be more helpful to national sport development (and provincial/territorial sport excellence), the following policy changes should occur.

a) The athletes should be top developmental athletes striving for national team selection. We need to establish what the right age is for each sport and their LTAD model.

b) Remove various policies restricting ability; the athletes should be the best young athletes in the country.

c) ‘Wild cards’ should be allowed to ensure that the best athletes are included, despite numbers restrictions (e.g. if each province is allowed to enter six gymnasts, but the eight best in the country are in Ontario, Ontario could enter an additional two wild cards. The competition would be strengthened, and the best would be present.

d) The summer Canada Games should be held every two years. The current four-year cycle Thus, every year, there would be either a winter or summer Canada Games.

e) The Games should reinforce talent identification needs.

f) The Games should leave needed facility legacies that are of international standard.

g) There should be operating policy guarantees after the games to ensure priority access for high performance training and competition.

h) The sports selected for the Games should include all the priority national sports.

i) The Games should be in communities where the greatest legacy benefits will accrue for high performance sport and for community needs.

j) The provincial Mission staff and Village arrangements should be of the highest quality to give the athletes the best conditions and experiences.

k) Building the brand of the Canada Games, and thus attracting greater corporate support, would be enhanced with a higher quality national Games.
Thus, a basic question to answer is whether the Games are relevant as currently staged or should they have a new purpose, such as being the junior equivalent of the Olympic Games.

We believe that the Canada Games should be about excellence and our next generation of national team athletes. Changes (such as what we have suggested) need to be made to position them effectively in our sports system.

None of the changes suggested above compromise the fact that the Games will also always be about nation building and community engagement.

**Paralympic Games and Competitions**

Repeating the recommendation in the Own the Podium - 2010 report on winter sports, consideration should be given to create a Canada Paralympic (summer) Games. This initiative would serve as a key stimulus to increase PSO commitment to Paralympic sport and athlete recruitment, filling a huge void in the current system and being a crucial step to the achievement of Canada’s performance goals at future Paralympic Games.

As expressed in the CPC 2005 policy document:

“Canadian Paralympic Championships [Games] would help achieve Canadian Sport Policy goals, namely:

*Enhanced Participation - by increasing access and equity in sport for under-represented groups*

*Enhanced Excellence - by identifying and recruiting talented athletes into the sport system and provide for their systematic and holistic development towards internationally competitive levels*

*Enhanced Capacity - by developing a sustainable and diversified public and private resource base for the ongoing Paralympic sport development. Increasing the level of organizational “readiness” by PSO’s, so current national team programs can be populated by the higher quality up-and-coming Paralympic athletes. Also, the level of support to Paralympic sport, by provincial governments which is currently very low, would increase.*

*Enhanced Interaction - by fostering stronger relations between national and provincial/territorial sport organizations and multi-sport organizations to maximize their contribution to their members*

The Canadian Sport Policy challenges all stakeholders to open sport to every segment of Canadian society. The Canadian Paralympic Championships would help meet this challenge. The Canadian Sport Policy welcomes and seeks to involve all those who do not currently consider themselves a part of either the sport community or the sport system, but have the potential and the desire to contribute.

---
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Currently there are a few Paralympic sports and events in the Canada Games (summer & winter). However, for the Canada Games to integrate ALL of Canada’s targeted Paralympic sports is not feasible for a number of reasons. The major reason is simply that the Canada Games do not have the capacity and are not frequent enough to optimize Paralympic athlete development.”

Other issues to be considered for Paralympic sports include:

a) Too few athletes with a disability are in the system, which limits opportunities to achieve the competition histories that are needed to allow athletes and teams access to important international events.

b) A requisite component of any new development strategy for Paralympic sport must include growing the number of events. This may involve a Canada/USA initiative, as this is often a cost effective option and it provides a larger pool of athletes to compete against. This also will allow more involvement from parents and other volunteers who strengthen and promote the sport.

c) Local events, although not of direct impact to the high performance athlete, are very important to the development structure in Paralympic sport. These may be run as recreational events, but should have a distinct competitive component where possible. These events are often held as a “learn to” opportunity and provide opportunities for talent identification and recruitment.

d) Inviting leading international competitors to participate in Canadian events is another cost-effective idea, but again it is rarely implemented (wheelchair basketball has been successful with their Spitfire Classic).

e) Rio 2007 will host the first official ParaPanAms, following the Olympic/Paralympic model (joint organizing committee, two weeks later, same Village/venues, etc). This event is a major step toward filling the needs for enhanced international competition experience for AWAD and it fills a huge void in the LTAD pathway. However, for the foreseeable future, CPC is not in a financial position to be able to fund a third Games mission every quadrennium – to attempt to do so would jeopardize the level of Games services provided to Canadian summer and winter Paralympic teams. CPC estimates a scaled-down ParaPanAm mission (providing all required services but no extras) would cost approximately $2.5 million to support a team of approx 150 athletes and 90 officials.
**Timelines & Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Establish a LTAD competition structure for each sport.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Develop a hosting element as part of the NSO LTAD model that would complement the activities identified in the competition model.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSRP/NSOs</td>
<td>Determine the required international competitive opportunities for priority sports/athletes.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Create a specific hosting program for each of the team sports.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/Canada Games Council/CPC</td>
<td>Establish a Canada Paralympic Games, and pan-Canada provincial championships for Paralympic sports.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/MSOs</td>
<td>Review MSO Games selection criteria and indicate how they might be modified to assist national programs.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/MSOs</td>
<td>Review how the MSOs can collaborate more effectively to achieve national goals.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/CSRP/NSOs</td>
<td>Establish strategies for using major events in Canada to prepare athletes or facilitate their Olympic/Paralympic qualification.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/SC</td>
<td>Review the implications of establishing a &quot;Canada House&quot; training base in Europe and/or in Asia.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/Canada Games Council/Podium</td>
<td>Review Canada Games Council strategy and collaborate to ensure that these Games support athlete recruitment and development models.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC/Podium</td>
<td>Review Sport Canada’s Hosting Policy relative to high performance needs (facility development, junior and senior, Olympic and Paralympic international competition, legacies from hosting, locations for needed facilities etc.).</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Considerations**

The following Table estimates the annual funding required for targeted Olympic and Paralympic sports, and to establish Canadian Paralympic Games and championships. The Table does include some additional funding for non-targeted sports for 2006-07 as some of these could become targeted. Additional funding has been added to the targeted sport needs for subsequent years to accommodate such needs.
### Estimated Costs for Competitions for Summer Olympic and Paralympic Sports (millions $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005 CSRPR Request</th>
<th>Future Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targeted Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-targeted Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Paralympic sports</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paralympic Canadian Championships (winter and summer)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paralympic Canada Games (every two years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ParaPanAm Games Mission</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Need</strong></td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Funding Level</strong></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated New Funding Required</strong></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Through the 2005-06 CSRP process, the targeted priority NSOs requested competition support of about $10 million per year and $3.7 was provided.
2. Non-targeted sports requested $5.3 million and $0.553 million was provided.
3. We are estimating the annual competition needs of the Paralympic summer sports would cost $3 million.
4. Thus, there is an estimated cost of $18.3 million per year for all sports with $4.2 million being currently available, leaving a difference of $14.1 million.
5. Hosting events such as multi-sport Games and major single sport championships would involve budget figures in excess of the amounts indicated above.
6. The CPC has estimated the cost to stage an annual Paralympic Canadian summer sport Championships to be about two million dollars and about $1 million for the winter sports. The CPC would pay for additional expenses such as the transportation costs of all out-of-town athletes, coaches, and team support staff, and provide the Organizing Committee with a hosting grant.
7. Participation in the 2007 ParaPanAm Games in Rio de Janiero would cost a minimum of $1.5 – 2 million, and full participation is necessary for preparation for the 2008 Beijing Paralympic Games.
4. Team Sports

Background

More Canadian youngsters play team sports organized by communities, schools, colleges and universities than play individual sports. Hockey has 600,000 and soccer 800,000 registered members, while other sports like basketball, volleyball and baseball have large participation numbers but most are not members of their NSO. These latter sports have numerous governing jurisdictions and there is little integration or coordination of objectives or programming, which is a major problem.

Canada has had success in women’s team sports, notably hockey, soccer, softball and waterpolo. Men’s ice hockey has a very large participation base, a reasonably well integrated development system and a pyramid of competition from grassroots to the professional level. This mirrors the successful team sport systems of other top countries.

Because of the tendency for the media and Canadian public to identify with team sport success – witness the Torino Olympic women’s hockey team and the men’s curling team, and the junior hockey champions in Vancouver at Christmas 2005 – we can and should improve team sports to be more successful internationally.

Paralympic Teams

Canada has generally performed very well at the international level, thanks to a government social policy decision to invest in sport for athletes with a disability (AWAD) and to promote the concept of ‘inclusion’- having AWAD train with their able-bodied counterparts and/or having the mainstream NSO manage the high performance AWAD program. As a winter sport example, sledge hockey has a very small participant base and has not been well organized historically. However, its recent integration as a program under Hockey Canada should lead to improvements, and indeed they did win the Gold medal at the recent Torino Paralympic Games.

Inclusion has generally not had a great influence on wheelchair basketball, wheelchair rugby or goalball as these disciplines either remain independent from mainstream sport or do not have a mainstream equivalent.

Whereas inclusion has focused significant attention and resources on the senior national AWAD teams, it has provided little or no support for developing athletes.

Paralympic team sports need to focus primarily on the recruitment of new participants and the creation of a stronger development system. This is beginning to be addressed via the 2005 CSRP process but by no means have all solutions been found. We are already starting to see consequences to the lack of development programming, such as Canada finishing 6th at 2005 Wheelchair Basketball Junior Worlds after having won gold at the previous two Paralympic Games. Situations like these need immediate attention but the CSRP did not have the resources to completely address this matter.
SWOT Analysis

To identify the general issues that need to be addressed, a SWOT analysis was undertaken. Different sports will have different emphasis on these points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ good participation numbers – soccer, basketball, volleyball, hockey, baseball</td>
<td>♦ to date, no clear, long term vision based on LTAD principles have been developed that outlines the training volume/intensity, competition requirements, athlete development pathway, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ large club-based membership structure – hockey, soccer</td>
<td>♦ weak domestic competition system in almost all team sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ wheelchair basketball’s national league permitting able-body athletes to fill out rosters to make viable teams; wheelchair rugby’s recruitment program</td>
<td>♦ lack of junior team structure and opportunities, limited participant numbers, cost of equipment at junior level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ large school programs – elementary through CIS – basketball, volleyball</td>
<td>♦ small club/team based membership structure – basketball, volleyball, softball, baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ governance/jurisdiction over the entire sport in the country – soccer, hockey</td>
<td>♦ training volume and intensity in development system at club, school and provincial team levels – all sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ good level of discretionary financial resources – soccer, hockey</td>
<td>♦ training to competition ratio – all sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ good international performance level – women’s soccer, softball, waterpolo, men’s and women’s hockey</td>
<td>♦ fragmented jurisdictions – basketball, volleyball, baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ strong pyramid of competition – soccer, hockey</td>
<td>♦ small participation numbers – waterpolo, field hockey, team handball, women’s softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ presence of elite/professional leagues or teams in Canada – men’s hockey, men’s and women’s soccer to a lesser degree</td>
<td>♦ few full-time qualified coaches employed in the system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ improve structural fundamentals (governance, membership, revenue generation)</td>
<td>♦ absence of coherent LTAD models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ improve system development and coordination – LTAD, coaching</td>
<td>♦ multiple jurisdictions – schools, regional associations, PSOs, NSOs, P/T governments, municipal governments, federal government, multiple ministries within governments, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ improve pyramid of competition; sport school leagues, post-CIS leagues, elite club leagues</td>
<td>♦ magnitude and complexity of the task has resulted in an unwillingness on the part of NSOs to address the issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ improve training environment</td>
<td>♦ sport schools, sport academies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general terms, there are two categories of weaknesses in Canadian team sports that prevent them from achieving international excellence. These are the structural organization of the sport, and technical shortcomings in the developmental system. It is incumbent on each team sport NSO to identify its weaknesses and propose strategies to deal with them. Soccer, for example, is relatively strong in its national organization structure, but needs work on the technical issues.

These matters may well be complicated to resolve because many require the cooperation of several separate jurisdictions for the sport, including the NSOs, clubs, PSOs, federal, provincial or territorial governments, communities, schools, colleges and universities. However, there are some common areas that can begin to be addressed to facilitate the sport specific solutions.

**Structural Fundamentals**

Structural fundamentals that are necessary are:

a) clear goals and commitment from all partners in a sports development system
b) adequate critical mass of members at the local, provincial and national levels
c) adequate discretionary revenue generation
d) optimal system to support the implementation of technical fundamentals to coaches and athletes.

Few of the team sports have agreement on national team goals by those in their sport development system or various jurisdictions. This weakness is expected to be addressed by the Long Term Athlete Development process currently being promoted by Sport Canada and others.

Organizational fragmentation and revenue generation issues are closely linked and are particularly difficult for the high participation, low membership, school-based team sports. Sports like basketball and volleyball must develop strategies to expand their membership to include both schools and recreational participants so as to increase membership fees and sponsorship opportunities. Softball and baseball must address the same issue in their club-based system.

To involve school-age athletes in a unified and progressive competitive and developmental structure, ways must be found to strengthen sport in the educational setting, to abandon it in favour of strengthening the club system, or to better coordinate the two systems to contribute to common goals. The most probable solution is to better coordinate the two systems, which will likely require a ‘top down’ and ‘bottom up’ approach from educators, NSOs, PSOs and clubs.
**Technical Fundamentals**

Technical fundamentals that are necessary are:

a) adequate volume and intensity of training and competition in the development system

b) presence of adequate numbers of quality coaches and referees working with young athletes throughout the development system

c) presence of quality, full-time coaches providing leadership and development to the athlete development system at the club/school level

d) presence of open competitive leagues of sufficient quality and intensity to continue athlete development beyond the age group/school system (e.g. playing in an elite university league.

Only men’s ice hockey realistically achieves the technical requirements required for excellence. Other club-based sports like soccer, baseball and softball have significant work to do with their membership and clubs to achieve all the technical requirements.

Coaching employment and quality is a significant weakness in team sports. If the membership structure can generate more revenue at all levels (club, schools, PSO/TSO and NSO), more coaches can be hired at the club and regional levels.

The competitive structure and skill development needs should be addressed by the LTAD model.

The new approach to the NCCP should lead to an increased quality of coaching at all levels over the longer term. A key Paralympic issue is to develop coaching education/certification resources, and to get national and local coaches all working from the same plan and teaching core skills early.

Refereeing is an area of which Canada can be proud, however, it, like coaching, faces significant issues of recruitment and retention, especially in the large team sports.

The focus of the Paralympic team sports is on recruiting athletes and operating multi-level national team programs. Of the Paralympic team sports (goalball, wheelchair basketball, wheelchair rugby, soccer, rowing) only wheelchair basketball is likely able to implement similar solutions to those of able-bodied sports. Their focus will remain on developing the existing Canadian wheelchair basketball league. The other sports will likely have to be content with increasing their high performance participant base, or explore other models for development based on more analysis of their challenges and opportunities.

**Program Considerations**

**Long term athlete development** – this new initiative from Sport Canada is underway with 21 sports having started and another 10 having come on stream in 2005-06. The development process and LTAD models that are constructed will hopefully serve to unite jurisdictions to reach a common goal with clearly identified objectives and responsibilities. Each sport needs to engage all partners and jurisdictions in the development of the model for their sport.
Improvements to the national competitive structure - There is a need to increase the quantity and intensity of training in team sports as well as to provide a higher level of competition for the top athletes. This matter is particularly important for Paralympic team sport as competition is the key to getting individuals involved, and for developing them. They do not have the privilege of introducing Paralympic sport to youngsters via school or municipal programs and their competitive leagues and support infrastructure.

Sport school leagues – the Sport Étude program model in Quebec is being promoted and considered by other provinces, primarily to support ‘individual’ sports. The new idea is to incorporate team sports into a number of sport schools that permit a compressed school day, allowing athletes to focus on training and competition in a variety of sports – both team and individual. There are examples of some team sports taking advantage of this, but only with small numbers of players. Canada Basketball is proposing a centralized Junior National Team program and Quebec Basketball have had a provincial team in being for a couple of years.

An issue with these ‘teams in being’ is that other high schools will not compete against them. These initiatives would seem to be good interim solutions as we work toward the real objective of establishing a network of sport schools in every major center that could host the best team sport athletes in higher quality leagues.

Sport schools might only be involved with individual sports, or may find competitive opportunities outside of school leagues, and more directly involved with national team programs.

In Calgary, the sport school placed 20 graduates on the 2006 Canadian Olympic Team for the Torino Olympic Winter Games. In addition Kyle Shewfelt and Blythe Hartley, both Olympic medalists in summer Olympic sport, graduated from the school.

This topic needs to be discussed with the F/P/T sport Ministers. A top-down approach is perceived to be the only means to enact policy to systematize this approach. This proposal requires the endorsement of the education sector and the provincial school sport associations.

Elite club leagues – Because of their large numbers, hockey and soccer have developed extensive pyramids of competition that include provincial elite leagues at several age group levels. An example in soccer is the Ontario Youth Soccer League that operates in age groups U14 and up. The weakness of these leagues is that most teams do not have the training frequency and intensity or the emphasis on skill development to achieve the success of our top competitors. They do not have adequate numbers of high quality professional coaches.

We need to initiate this type of league in basketball and volleyball at a minimum, as a broader-based, longer-duration, local alternative to short-lived provincial teams. The jurisdiction lies with the sport sector and not the educational milieu. Costs here could be considerable. In large membership sports, some support could be provided by club membership fees with the balance being ‘user pay’.
**Strengthening the Canadian university (CIS) and college (CCAA) team sport programs** – Canadian university and college sport programs often provide the highest quality of team sport competition in the country. Other than professional teams, they are usually the best in basketball, volleyball, field hockey, soccer, hockey, field hockey, swimming and other sports. They are the most immediate feeder system to national teams. Their coaches are often fully paid, and are often the national team coaches. Thus, there should be a review with the colleges and universities as to how their programs and coaches could be strengthened for national team purposes. Such a review should also consider how to extract more value from the American university and college systems.

**Post-CIS/CCAA leagues** – Virtually all countries that experience success in team sports have professional leagues at the top of their pyramid of competition. Men’s ice hockey is the only team sport in Canada that has this. Soccer has attempted to develop Canadian professional leagues based on a North American professional model, but to no avail. Recently, they have begun developing 4-6 franchises in the men’s and women’s tier two leagues in U.S. Soccer. They are hoping to land a Major League Soccer franchise in Toronto in order to participate in the top U.S. pro league. Their objective is to have their top young players participate in these ‘developmental’ leagues as a stepping stone to participation in foreign professional leagues, primarily in Europe.

Options need to be explored to create open elite leagues with significant training demands and high level competitive opportunities. Ideally, there would be some remuneration to players, however, it is not envisioned that these leagues would be on a par with other professional leagues, at least not initially. Canada would probably still depend on foreign professional leagues for the development or maintenance of its top players.

Each team sport will identify their needs and propose the appropriate mechanism to meet these as part of their LTAD process. This could include partnerships with CIS or CCAA institutions, or involve the development of a European-like club system with the open elite team comprising the top of the competitive pyramid for both options.

There may be a requirement to inject some new resources to support the development of these leagues depending on the model selected. Sports should, however, be encouraged to utilize existing structures as much as possible to achieve the most cost effective economic model for implementing these leagues. The North American professional sport model should likely be avoided as various ventures in soccer and basketball have failed when using this approach.

Jurisdiction will also depend on the model selected. However, it is essential that the NSO retain some leadership and influence over the league. In all likelihood, a partnership will be required to ‘govern’ the league.

**Interim Strategies**

**a) Enrichment training** – While putting in place the Sport School and Elite Club Leagues proposed above, it will be important to create enrichment opportunities for promising young athletes in both school and club sports. Successful examples of this are soccer’s regional training centre program where young athletes at age 14 are identified to participate in enrichment training opportunities at centralized locations at both the provincial and national levels. Basketball is initiating its
new ‘Be One’ program that will provide enrichment opportunities at different levels. They will also gradually increase their centralized Junior Team Centres for Performance, and their Regional Training Centres programs.

b) Centralization – This approach has been used with varying levels of commitment and success by several sports. Volleyball has been employing variations of a full-time, year-round centralized national team training center approach since the 1980’s, but with limited international success. Women’s hockey has centralized for several months prior to the Olympic Games to prepare the national team, with success. The great success of the men’s and women’s rowing teams is very much due to centralization under world-class coaches. Quebec Basketball has formed centralized provincial teams that attend a sport school and Canada Basketball is pursuing a junior team centralization/sport school approach this year.

These approaches need to continue as the new elite leagues are phased in and then decisions will have to be made on the need for or degree of centralization required to achieve the desired goals. There is a caution however, and that is that full centralization pulls the best athletes out of the club system, weakening the clubs and the league.

c) Coach development and employment – There is a tendency in team sports for coaches of young athletes to focus more on winning games via the teaching of team tactics and less on developing the fundamental skills. The LTAD process should help to address this and it will need to be a central tenet of the new developmental leagues proposed above.

The employment of coaches at club or provincial levels is also a challenge for team sports. Some individual sports, like swimming, have established club-based economic models that support the employment of professional coaches. They tend to coach the top athletes and also to train part-time coaches. There is a trend in the larger membership sports, like soccer, to employ full-time staff to operate the clubs and this is now expanding to the hiring of head coaches for the clubs to perform the same duties as seen in the swimming example. These coaches are engaged based on the membership fee structure for the sport, that sees a significant portion accrue to the club, a smaller portion to the PSO and a still smaller portion to the NSO. High participation sports like volleyball, basketball and baseball must find ways and means to develop a membership program that will permit a similar approach to that of soccer.

d) Eliminating fragmentation – For the sports with jurisdictional fragmentation, there is need for significant organizational and policy change to create a unified national membership structure and the resulting fee structure.

Volleyball, basketball and other sports have significant work to do to overcome the fragmentation problem that exists at the local, provincial and national levels.

A F/P/T Task Force should be established to develop policy to assist sports to present viable membership strategies that can meet the financial requirements to engage coaches and sustain the elite league operation.
The Way Forward

a) The main approach to improve these matters is to develop and implement the sport-specific LTAD model, followed by addressing the structural and technical weaknesses of their respective development systems.

b) Sports can begin immediately to assess the nature of any structural weaknesses they may have, followed by an assessment of their technical weaknesses.

c) There should be a national team sport colloquium to involve all team sport NSOs to discuss key issues and solutions. On the assumption that there will be some commonality on how to improve the competitive structure, efforts could begin to alert the F/P/T Ministers of Sport of potential solutions.

d) The Sport School leagues need to be discussed at a provincial level, and will require policy consideration by P/T Departments of Education and/or local school boards.

e) The Elite Club leagues require direction from the LTAD model to guide their competition structure, followed by an extensive education campaign of clubs to secure the ‘buy in’ to a new approach.

f) The post-CIS/CCAA open elite leagues require a strategic business plan and ultimately may require some financial assistance to help them become operational. Ultimately, however, sports will have to develop a viable economic model to make the leagues a permanent fixture.

g) The interim strategies are extremely important for the foreseeable future until the longer term solutions are implemented. These will likely include the engagement of some additional full-time coaches and may include some sort of centralization. Some negotiation will be necessary in order to determine the contribution requirements from the sport and the funding partners.

h) The recommended strategies need to begin immediately and operate concurrently.
**Timelines & Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC/NSOs</td>
<td>Develop and implement sport specific LTAD Models (emphasis on competitive structure).</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs/Podium</td>
<td>Conduct an assessment of structural and technical weaknesses of each team sport, and identify solutions.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs, SC</td>
<td>Organize a national team sport colloquium for team sports to review developmental issues.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Review with F/P/T Ministers of sport potential solutions for structural and technical weaknesses; seek their commitment to assist.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Develop a business plan for competitive structures for long term domestic high performance athlete development including post-CIS open elite leagues.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financial Considerations**

The overall ‘ask’ from summer Olympic team sports in the CSRP exercise was $5.1 million. The CSRP awarded team sports $2.2 million.

Only one sport, basketball, addressed the long-term system development needs. They requested $800,000 for the interim solutions of establishing Junior Performance Centres and for Regional Training Centres. Five hundred thousand dollars was allocated.

If one extrapolates the cost to put in place similar interim strategies for all team sports as those for basketball, the requirement would total $6.4 million on top of the upgrades to their existing high performance programs. These kinds of system development costs cannot be supported for all sports under the current funding envelope.

It is also unrealistic to attempt to support all the team sports without fully adequate resources for all. For 2005-06, the CSRP has only recommended support for women’s softball, soccer and waterpolo, and for men’s volleyball and baseball, and for both genders of beach volleyball and basketball.

The remaining summer Olympic team sports comprised of women’s volleyball, field hockey, team handball, and of men’s soccer, field hockey, waterpolo and handball are not eligible this year for ‘excellence’ funding but are eligible for basic support from Sport Canada.
For Paralympic sports, requests for additional funding were focused primarily on national team program expansion to increase the numbers involved and the quality of competition. There is an urgent need for the recruitment of new athletes to the system and a further engagement of provincial disability groups and governments.

The Paralympic team sports requested $1.8 million and the CSRP provided $850,000. The sport’s requests were focused almost entirely on new national team programming and did not address the myriad of system needs that will doubtless appear from the LTAD process.

**Olympic Team Sports Needs as Compared with the ‘Ask’ in 2005-06**

As noted above, $2.2 million was invested in 2005-06 in Olympic team sports, approximately $3 million less than the ‘ask’. Assuming an increased need starting in 2006-07, based on increased junior national team activity and inflation, it is estimated that there is a shortfall in 2006-07 of at least $4-5 million for existing targeted sports. Baseball and softball will not be on the 2012 Olympic program, and thus may not be ‘targeted sports’ after 2008.

Without firm NSO plans, it is only conjecture as to how much the new system-oriented solutions will cost. However, we have estimated that a minimum of $2 million annually for sports to plan their approach will be required.

### Need for New Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball (M)</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>455,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>782,000</td>
<td>1,222,000</td>
<td>1,622,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball (W)</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td>480,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Handball</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>365,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,425,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterpolo</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td>1,360,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,107,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,172,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,572,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,495,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,965,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,965,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,200,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortfall</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,907,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,972,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,372,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,295,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,765,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,765,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New System Solutions</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Funding Olympic Teams</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,972,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,372,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,295,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,765,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,765,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,765,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paralympic Team sports needs as compared with the ‘ask’ in 2005-06

In 2005-06, the Paralympic team sports ‘asked’ for $1,777,000 and $850,000 was provided by the CSRP review process. The shortfall was $927,000. Thus, there is an estimated need of at least one million dollars for 2006-07. However, there were no requests from soccer and rowing and these sports have commenced Paralympic team activities. In addition, the CSRP felt that all the Paralympic sports submitted low and/or inadequate requests to build a national team program. They did not request support for sport science, PETs, talent ID and recruitment and adequate coaching and competition.

Need For New Paralympic Team Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair Basketball</td>
<td>820,000</td>
<td>875,000</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td>925,000</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goalball</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelchair Rugby</td>
<td>607,000</td>
<td>672,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,777,000</td>
<td>2,607,000</td>
<td>2,755,000</td>
<td>2,830,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td>2,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Funding Paralympic Teams</td>
<td>1,757,000</td>
<td>1,905,000</td>
<td>1,980,000</td>
<td>2,050,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, for 2006-07, adding the additional annual financial need for Olympic team sports with those for Paralympic team sports, the total new annual funding required is $7.729 million.

5. SPORT SCIENCE AND SPORT MEDICINE

Background

In Canada, we have not established sustainable and comprehensive first-rate sport medicine and science services for most national team athletes despite the presence of many experts in the country. The reasons are mostly financial and organizational. Canadian sport depends mostly on volunteers from the medical and science communities and, as a result, has not developed capacity and sustainable support from this expert base. Professionals at universities and in private practice are not involved in providing services to sport because of academic priorities, limited interest, and limited financial support for such projects. Yet their resources of facilities, equipment and personnel are highly valuable assets to sport.
The creation of the CSC network in the mid-1990s has increased sport science and medicine services from some of these Centres, but most are not of the same scope or standard, nor are they coordinated. The further development of these services from the CSCs is necessary to support the NSOs in delivering needed services to their teams.

The creation and exceptional financing for the winter OTP-2010 program has given the winter sports the opportunity to each develop Performance Enhancement Teams (PETs), often with the guidance of the CSCs. This collaborative and comprehensive approach is what is needed for the summer sports. The enhanced funding ($12 million) in 2005-06 from Sport Canada for summer sports allowed for limited expansion of sport science services this year.

The Presidents of the Centres desire a national network approach with common standards, policies, programs and scope of services.

**International Observations**

Canada can gain insight from other’s experiences. In the Australian model, many research initiatives are concentrated at the national Institute (AIS) and the practical application of science and medicine is provided to athletes in the training environment at both national and state Institutes. New Zealand has a national program coordinated between the New Zealand Academy of Sport and the university community. Japan has created the Japanese Institute of Sport Science which provides centralized service and research to targeted athletes and teams. The United Kingdom offers some sport science and medicine services through their Institute networks. The staff hired by the Olympic Training Centre network in the United States coordinates both research and athlete monitoring services to selected NSOs. China has raised the standard for sport science by hiring hundreds of experts in preparation for 2008 Beijing Olympics. Countries such as Germany, Great Britain, Australia and Japan have made investments in innovation, technology and human performance research.

From these foreign examples, important considerations for our Canadian system include:

- having a national leadership team to oversee sport science delivery and practical research
- having active collaboration with other countries’ experts
- investing in research and innovation
- establishing active collaboration between coaches, athletes and high performance directors and the sport science and medicine community.

**Program Considerations**

The goal is to have healthy, fit athletes with a strong psychological base to perform at the highest level. These athletes will require first rate sport medicine and science support to achieve training and competition goals in combination with quality training and top level coaching.
Some of the issues to be resolved include:

a) establishing both national leadership and a national network of quality science and medical providers

b) redistributing existing resources to better match the distribution of targeted sports across the Centres

c) providing more resources for sport science and medicine

d) establishing national protocols and standards for sport medicine and science activities

e) creating career paths with adequate compensation to encourage individuals to pursue this career

f) encouraging colleges, universities and other research institutes or groups to engage in both applied sport science and applied sport technology for high performance sport

g) establishing PET support to Paralympic sports so as to develop training protocols, gather data, and conduct studies to develop a base of knowledge of benefit to multiple sports

h) strengthening the partnership between NSOs and CSCs in the coordinated delivery of PET support

i) creating PET committees with the NSO HPD and national coaches to plan services for the athletes

j) developing effective evaluation of monitoring mechanisms to continuously improve the quality of sport science and medicine services.

Creating a National Leadership and Network

a) The first step is to appoint a Coordinator of sport science and medicine in Podium to work with partners to create and implement a national plan and policies.

b) A national plan would ensure that all priority sports can access services over a several year period. It would suggest strategy, priorities, policy and programs to meet the recruitment, retention, training, communications and other needs of establishing a network of professionals. It would require adequate funding and national leadership.

c) The Podium sport science/medicine Coordinator would identify a national coordinator in each discipline (e.g. sport psychology) to provide national coordination and leadership. Each coordinator would work with the others in their discipline to strengthen their skills, to identify and recruit others to become involved, to set standards of service, to set qualifications to be involved, to plan education programs as well as to monitor international developments in their respective field.

d) The NSOs, with the assistance of the CSCs, would be responsible for forming their PETs, consisting of the head coach (the leader), a lead sport scientist, a lead medical person, the HPD and others as needed. The leadership group determines the needs and philosophy of the PET for the particular sport.
e) There are a variety of educational and training needs. Many NSOs don't have experience working with PETs and thus it is necessary to explore with them the possible services that can be offered. As well, although medical and sport science specialists might be highly trained in their discipline, they may not have experience with the needs of high performance athletes and their coaches. The collaboration of the NSOs and CSCs will facilitate the development of effective PETs.

f) Applied research should be an important element of the sport science and medicine program so that we can find the best solutions for specific issues. These initiatives will require central coordination and leadership through Podium.

g) Financing of the sport science and medicine area needs to be strategic, long-term and stable.

h) The CSCs need to be strengthened to provide an integrated delivery of sport science and medicine services on a multi-sport basis. For many sports, they will be of greatest assistance in providing the needed PET services.

i) In addition to establishing knowledgeable PET services for the Paralympians, it would be very helpful to establish a Paralympic centre of sport science expertise, with the mandate to develop testing protocols, equipment research and human performance measures for Paralympic sport and athletes with a disability.

---

**Timelines & Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Appoint a full-time Coordinator of sport science and medicine.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Develop a national plan (strategic and financial) for the delivery of sport science and sport medicine services.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Appoint national coordinators for each discipline (e.g. psychology).</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/CSCs</td>
<td>Increase NSO knowledge of PETs through consultation, education and training.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs/Podium/CSCs</td>
<td>NSOs to form PETs with the collaboration of CSCs when required.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Make funding recommendations for annual science &amp; medicine program.</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Considerations

For the 2005-06 fiscal year, the sport science and medicine requests to the CSRP were:

♦ the summer NSOs requested $3.8 million and $2.0 million was provided.
♦ the Canadian Sport Centres requested $2.6 million for senior and junior full-time staff, equipment, research as well as operating costs and $1 million was provided.

Thus $5.8 million was requested and $3 million provided. (This is less than the $3.7 million provided to half as many winter sports through the OTP-2010 program where about 28 sport science/medicine FTEs were employed).

Future Expenditures

In order to estimate the costs to implement the needed programs for the summer sports, a salary grid was developed.

Salary Grid ($) for Four Levels of Expertise (full-time annual rates).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomechanics</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Mental Trainer</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Analysis</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength &amp; Conditioning</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition/Dietician</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massage*</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy*</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

The above rates do not include benefits for those full-time: add 20% if required
I = basic certification/ minimal experience; II = masters level/ minimal/moderate experience; III = PhD/moderate experience; IV = PhD/ extensive experience

These rates were then used along with the suggested sport medicine and science personnel for Priority 1 sport disciplines (8) and priority 2 sport disciplines (19) to estimate annual costs.

Presented below is a budget to acquire about 115 FTE sport science and medicine specialists to assist 27 summer sport disciplines. It includes the costs for national leadership of the program, and for Paralympic, education/training and other support. As $3 million is already being provided, the new funds needed in 2006-07 are approximately $8.5 million.
## Estimated Costs ($) to Operate a National Sport Science/Medicine Program for priority Olympic and Paralympic Summer Sports Based on Salary Rates as Proposed Above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 1 sport disciplines</strong> (8):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Science</strong> - 0.5 physiologist, 1 psychologist, 1 strength coach, 0.5 biomechanist-performance analyst, 0.25 nutritionist; ($200,000/sport)</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Medicine</strong> - 1 physiotherapist, 1 massage therapist, 0.3 physician, 0.25 other services ($185,000/sport)</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority 2 sport disciplines</strong> (19):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Science</strong> - 0.3 physiologist, 0.5 psychologist, 0.5 strength coach, 0.25 biomechanist-performance analyst, 0.20 nutritionist ($127,000/sport)</td>
<td>2,413,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sport Medicine</strong> - 0.75 physiotherapist, 0.75 massage therapist, 0.2 physician, 0.20 other services ($122,000/sport)</td>
<td>2,318,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralympic special additional support</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Totals</td>
<td>8,311,000</td>
<td>8,700,000</td>
<td>9,200,000</td>
<td>9,700,000</td>
<td>10,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits at 20%</td>
<td>1,662,000</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>1,840,000</td>
<td>1,940,000</td>
<td>2,020,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Salary and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>9,973,000</td>
<td>10,440,000</td>
<td>11,040,000</td>
<td>11,640,000</td>
<td>12,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians/equipment/operations</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET Coordinators – honoraria, travel costs</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Director salary &amp; benefits &amp; travel</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training – all groups</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: System Needs</strong></td>
<td>1,525,000</td>
<td>1,900,000</td>
<td>2,300,000</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Needs</strong></td>
<td>11,498,000</td>
<td>12,340,000</td>
<td>13,340,000</td>
<td>14,240,000</td>
<td>14,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Investment</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated New Investment Required</td>
<td>8,498,000</td>
<td>9,340,000</td>
<td>10,340,000</td>
<td>11,240,000</td>
<td>11,270,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

BACKGROUND

World-class athletes require unhindered access to excellent training and competition venues. They need to train with state of the art equipment. The CSRP’s 2005 questionnaire of summer NSOs did review their facility needs, and this sport-specific data has guided this review.

The recent report on Performance Priorities for British Columbia\textsuperscript{22} outlines numerous principles for the design and establishment of high performance facilities. This is an important report because provincial governments through their financing play the pivotal role in establishing most of the sport facilities in Canada. From this BC report, and the Brisson\textsuperscript{23} and CSRP\textsuperscript{24} reports, the following have been identified as important considerations regarding national team needs:

a) Competition and training facilities and equipment must be specific to international sport requirements, and be accessible to both able-body athletes and those with a disability.

b) Athletes and coaches need priority access to facilities and equipment on an exclusive basis at proper times.

c) Venues should accommodate year-round training.

d) Venues should include extensive athlete services (therapy, video services, rest areas, etc.).

e) Facilities should create an environment of excellence.

f) A government capital infrastructure program is needed to build needed sport facilities.

g) NSOs need to partner with exiting facilities to obtain priority use.

h) Canada and the provinces should host more games or events which create facility legacies, be that new facilities or upgrades to existing facilities. An example of this in 2005 is the Alberta government spending $23 million at the Canmore Nordic Centre to upgrade the 1988 Olympic course and facilities to meet International Ski Federation requirements to host the December 2005 World Cup.

i) Hosting events should occur where these special facilities would best serve Canadian training centres.

j) We need to build a facility-based Canadian Sport Centre/Institute network.

k) The Canadian high performance sport system needs to develop a strategy for accessing specialized training facilities (e.g. altitude, warm weather and cold weather training) in other countries where it would benefit Canadian athletes.


\textsuperscript{24} CSRP (2005) Report of the Canadian Sport Review Panel to the National Funding Partners as Summer Olympic and Paralympic Sports, Sport Canada
I) The summer sports need funding to support research for innovative solutions to equipment, clothing, and training environments.

Providing world-class facilities for our Olympic and Paralympic athletes and coaches has not been a high enough priority in our sport system. We often find adequate facilities unavailable and/or inaccessible at needed times, or too expensive to rent. All too often when we build proper venues for high performance sport, we have not done a very good job in operating them as world-class training venues. Some of the Olympic and Commonwealth Games facilities would be examples. On the other hand, the Calgary Olympic Oval has been exceptionally well used for high performance sport, university programs, and public use. Several Olympic medalists have been developed there since 1988 including those who won a dozen medals at the 2006 Olympic Winter Games in Torino.

**Training and Competition Facility Needs for Paralympic Sport**

The availability of basic training facilities for high performance athletes with a disability is typically quite good. Access standards for facilities are often municipally or provincially defined and as a result, full access is available more often than not. However, athletes at entry level and often at the provincial level do not always have access to sport facilities that are cost efficient.

There is a lack of accessible multi-sport facilities for athletes with a disability. In Toronto, the Variety Village model, and perhaps the Rotary Park in Calgary model are examples of what should be developed. Ideally, sport facilities should include a residential component (as Variety Village is planning to build) and training facilities, both of which are fully accessible. This would be an ideal location to host training camps and to stage teams prior to international competitions. If several major cities in Canada each had one multi-sport facility for persons with disabilities, this would be a terrific stimulus for recruitment and athlete development.

Transportation to and from a training or competitive venue for an athlete with a disability is sometimes difficult as public transit may not be equipped to deal with their particular requirement, or the athlete may not have the financial means. This is a major barrier to recruitment and thus involvement of those with a disability.

Another major barrier is the cost of acquiring expensive high performance equipment, such as performance wheelchairs or prosthetics. Equipment may need to be customized depending on the degree of disability.

Equipment purchase, repair, and parts are all viewed as the responsibility of the athlete, not the program itself. These issues are magnified at the development level as often competition equipment is unavailable to developing athletes. A plan to both develop and finance new prototypes of equipment and to provide supplies to both developing and elite athletes is required. It may be that there is enough interest from corporations and from technology companies to assist with this project, with either cash or VIK. In researching these avenues, a number of enthusiastic responses were garnered from technical staff wishing to become involved in the process of finding new alternatives to equipment or to assist in equipment modification or repair. This program is happening with the winter sports (OTP-2010) and its ‘Top Secret’ research program.
As sports for those with disabilities are in the process of integrating with national sport federations, equipment sponsorship opportunities may be of benefit to athletes with a disability through awareness with existing funding partners and through enhanced media awareness of Paralympic athlete requirements.

**Program Considerations**

Canada needs a national comprehensive sport facilities development plan, a commitment of resources to build and renovate and a complimentary on-going operations and maintenance program that is supported by sport, governments, educational institutions and private business.

This is a critical matter for the provinces and territories to discuss with the federal government and the sport communities. To some extent, this topic is currently being discussed by a F/P/T working group on infrastructure.

To clarify the need for facilities for national high performance sport (Olympic and Paralympic), we need to:

a) undertake a national needs-assessment of what facilities are required for high performance training and competition for various Olympic and Paralympic sports

b) with the provinces (and the F/P/T working group on infrastructure), undertake a national facility audit of what exists in Canada that has the potential to fill to fill high performance needs, whether by increasing access, renovation or modification, or creating new facilities

c) engage the provinces and municipalities to determine what their needs are, and their future plans for recreation and sport facilities, and how joint interests might be best served

d) determine where new sport-specific high performance training and competition facilities should be placed and the preferred timeline for their development

e) identify the cost of the needed facilities and a cash-flow requirement over 10 years; establish priorities and strategies over the long term with the end goal of having at least one exceptional high performance training and competition venue for every sport

f) determine what federal and provincial infrastructure or other programs (such as provincial lotteries) could be available to assist financing needed structures

g) determine where there could be better use of existing university, college, community and private facilities, and where there is mutual benefit in partnering

h) review issues concerning access to facilities that exist but are not available for high performance training, and recommend solutions

i) determine the requirements for national and regional sport centres to become more facilities-based than at present

j) determine current international federation standards for facilities and make them available to those planning facilities
k) identify opportunities for hosting major games and international events for sports needing new international standard facilities, so as to encourage the creation of such facilities in the correct locations.

As well, a survey should be undertaken to determine the need for specialized equipment for the development of both Olympians and Paralympians. Following this, a strategy needs to be developed to outline how this equipment could be achieved not only for national level athletes, but for developmental athletes in the Paralympic sports. Included in this review should be a research and 'Top Secret' program for developing specialized sports equipment.

**Outputs**

a) A facilities and equipment plan would be created for each sport, including requirements, time-lines, financing and location.

b) The need for regional or national facilities-based sport institute(s) would be explored in detail and conclusions drawn.

c) The municipalities and provinces would participate in this survey so that they would have an understanding of the needs in their jurisdictions, and others would understand what they are already planning.

d) Importantly, such information would lead to discussions with governments and institutions about providing the resources for sports facilities and equipment.

e) All the data from the surveys and other information gathering would be compiled in a national database.

f) There would be a registry of international sport facility standards to assist municipalities, universities and colleges and others to include these standards when designing these facilities.

g) New prototypes of training and competition facilities and equipment would be created.

h) Both the federal and provincial governments would reconsider their hosting policies in light of the identified facility needs.
Timelines and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium, F/P/T &amp; municipal governments, NSOs</td>
<td>Conduct national facilities audit and identify the needs, strategies and the financing models to acquire needed facilities.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium and NSOs</td>
<td>Conduct national equipment audit.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium, F/P/T governments, NSOs</td>
<td>Develop national facilities/infrastructure Business Plan for high performance sport.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSOs</td>
<td>Explore with universities and colleges &amp; municipalities to determine if HP programming can be implemented in their facilities.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Review SC’s Major Games Hosting Policy and encourage SC to focus its funding the type of facilities and their location where it best suits national high performance development.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Plan and create one or two facility-based Canadian Sport Centre(s).</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Considerations

The cost of facilities and equipment surveys and subsequently creating a national plan could be shared between the provincial and federal governments. It is estimated that $1 million should be budgeted for these surveys and development of national plans for each required facility, the cost being shared between the federal and appropriate provincial governments. The work should be started in 2006/07 as needed facilities must be established for athletes preparing for the London 2012 Games.

7. Innovation and Research

Background

Innovation and leading-edge research can play a significant role in achieving success in some sports. When races are won or lost by a 100th of a second, seemingly small changes in aerodynamics, clothing, equipment or training methods can make the difference.

Funding for applied sport science and medicine research has been a very low priority in Canada in the past. Successful nations in summer and winter sport place significant resources toward this. One major conclusion of the Salt Lake City 2002 Olympic debrief was that Canadian winter athletes rarely felt they had a technological “edge” over other nations. In fact, they often believed that their equipment was inferior.

The Top Secret program for Own the Podium – 2010 is the first sufficiently funded program to address this deficiency. It was designed to give our athletes the best equipment and training methods in the world. This program takes a long-term view to developing new training techniques and equipment. It is coordinated with the NSOs, but not funded through the NSO budgets.
Funding for Top Secret - 2010 is in place, primarily from VANOC sponsors. A multi-million budget has been allocated for the winter program over the next four years. Not only will the Top Secret program increase Canada’s success rate through better training and equipment, but Canadian athletes will have a mental edge over other countries, realizing that they will have the best equipment and technology available. Some of the research for the winter sports is applicable to summer sports.

PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

Program Goals
The overall goals of Top Secret for summer sports are to:

♦ provide Canadian athletes and coaches with the most advanced equipment and training methods available
♦ ensure that Canadian athletes know they have a competitive edge because of this
♦ ensure that athletes from other nations believe that Canadian athletes have the best equipment.

Think Tanks
In order for innovation to occur, new and different ideas must be present, and one way to do this is to create think tanks involving those with innovative minds. NSOs, athletes and coaches bring new ideas from what other competitors are doing and from their own intuition. Performance Enhancement Teams (PETs) bring a perspective from the scientists and professionals who deal day-to-day with the coaches and athletes. Successful business leaders outside of sport can bring another perspective from the commercial world. Such ‘think tanks’ have been created for the winter sports, and the same should occur for the summer sports.

Top Secret Program
A Top Secret program would be focused in two areas: development of technology and equipment and development of human performance, which could be undertaken with university and industry specialists in the following areas:

♦ air friction – body position, suits, helmets
♦ water/rolling friction – boats, bikes
♦ movement enhancement – suits, shoes
♦ training aids – video, position/speed systems, pacing systems
♦ Paralympic – wheelchairs, prosthetics.
Research into human performance would focus on elements such as speed, power and endurance, and new training methods developed to meet these challenges. Areas identified for improvement include:

- physiology – altitude, temperature, strength, speed, endurance, training, recovery
- psychology – preparation for competition
- biomechanics – technique / developing new equipment
- nutrition – specific to each sport/athlete (diet, supplements)
- performance analysis.

**Implementation**

Research and technology innovation will be driven by the practical needs of coaches and high performance directors of the NSOs, by the scientists, and by think tanks. It is critical that the coaches encourage initiatives. Athletes must want to use these new discoveries and feel confident in the improvements. If the athletes and coaches are not enthusiastic, it may take 10 years to adopt a new technology (like speed skating took to adopt the clap speed skate).

The Top Secret team working with Own the Podium – 2010 should evaluate and monitor projects under this summer program. Leaders of the innovation program cannot have a financially vested interest for their organizations. They must be motivated by program goals and be accountable to the innovation goals. The Top Secret program needs to be flexible and able to move quickly with advancing technology and knowledge.

**Intellectual Property**

The ownership of any new discoveries and patents resulting from this program should be the intellectual property of the discoverer and the funding group. When new technology is developed as a result of Top Secret funding, and commercialized, a percentage of royalties from this should be returned to the sport system. The Top Secret program should not be in the business of manufacturing but royalties from new technologies could be used to improve the future investment made in sport technology.

Research results and products should not be published or released until after the Olympic/Paralympic Games. This will maintain any advantages gained through innovation. Non-critical research may be published if it does not affect the medal chances for Canadian athletes, but only with prior approval.

**International Federation Rules**

Any new and innovative equipment/technology must fall within the rules of the International Sport Federations. This can be an uncertain area as new equipment that seemingly falls within existing Federation rules has been disallowed in competition. Therefore, it is critical to understand the requirements and restrictions of the Federations.
Retaining knowledge/expertise in Canada

These investments in innovation and technology must be protected for the benefit of Canadian coaches and athletes.

A central database needs to be established to retain critical information for Canada. Sports have a legitimate reason to keep information within their sport. However, great strides in technology can be made if knowledge is shared between sports. Surprisingly, Canadian NSOs seem to put a large emphasis on keeping knowledge from other Canadian sports (based on Own the Podium - 2010 interviews with winter sports).

Universities, colleges and corporations have a wealth of knowledge which has not been exploited for application to high performance sport. Their willingness to assist should be encouraged through the establishment of research chairs, graduate and postgraduate funding, and through research grants. We need a long-term (greater than 10 years) commitment to such a program in order to launch it successfully and then to appropriately evaluate it.

### Timelines and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Integrate the summer Top Secret program with the existing winter program.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Continue to establish and develop the scope and operation of the Top Secret Program, including developing partnerships with academic and corporate organizations.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium/NSOs</td>
<td>Determine performance and technology requirements for 2008-2012; develop a plan to meet these for each sport.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Create of a central “innovations” database</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Explore with industry and Olympic corporate sponsors their involvement with the research program.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Test prototypes of new equipment/technology.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Partners</td>
<td>Acquire resources for the summer Top Secret program.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Considerations

For continuity, coordination, and efficiency, the summer sport ‘Top Secret’ program should be an extension of the winter ‘Top Secret’ program, managed by Podium. Based on the experience in establishing the OTP-2010 Top Secret program, the summer Top Secret program should budget a minimum of $3 million for 2006-07, and up to $5 million per year in future years for summer Olympic and Paralympic NSOs.
Currently, government agencies do not support applied sport research although in principle they are not opposed to investing in such research. We need to encourage senior levels of government to create sport research chairs and other research incentives (graduate student stipends and fellowships, research funding) that is devoted to applied high performance sport research. This involvement would improve the stability of funding for research and encourage interest from research technology groups.

Currently, sponsor dollars through VANOC are used to fund the winter sport research. Experts from the sponsors’ core teams, such as Bell Canada and General Motors, are anxious to support the Top Secret program, particularly in areas where their technology expertise can be applied. This is an area that needs to be pursued with corporations whose business is research and technology, manufacturing, clothing and other key areas.

8. TALENT IDENTIFICATION AND RECRUITMENT

Background

The great majority of sports in Canada do not have organized talent identification programs, and yet they all need many more serious competitive athletes in their development system.

A few provincial talent identification programs are in the initial stage of development. SportFit was created in British Columbia as part of the 2010 Olympic/Paralympic Games bid process and is a web-based program that includes a battery of physical challenges and a sport preference questionnaire.

TalentFit in BC has been developed as an internet-based generic “test” program which could measure key physical attributes important to high performance sport.

A more targeted approach to identify promising winter sport athletes – “The Playground to Podium Sport Talent Search” - was recently delivered to 100 athletes in six communities across BC using a mobile sport performance lab and similar tests to those used with SportFit.

The Own the Podium - 2010 program has been performing targeted Talent ID and recruitment projects in speed skating, snowboarding, freestyle skiing and other winter sports.

Paralympic programs focus more on recruitment (providing an introduction and first experience in Paralympic sport) than true talent identification and testing. Bridging the Gap (ON, BC) introduces wheelchair athletes to a variety of Paralympic sports, while Ready, Willing & Able (ON) provides a similar introductory program to athletes from a wider range of disability groups.

OTP-2010 has two full-time persons working to assist NSOs, one for able-bodied sport and one for AWAD. A key element of the OTP-2010 program is to provide the NSOs with resources.
**Previous Reports**

The paucity of talent identification activity across Canada has been identified in the Brisson, Own the Podium -2010 and CSRP reports. Key recommendations from the three reports are to:

a) create a nationwide talent identification program in the schools that includes voluntary general athletic ability testing (consider expanding the SportFit program in BC to a national program)

b) develop a sport-specific talent identification and monitoring systems for sports where Canada has multiple medal opportunities

c) create a national database that can store data from all regions and be used to identify and engage athletes with potential

d) search the already existing athlete pool for skill sets that may have a better fit in different sports than the athlete currently participates in

e) identify geographic areas of talent to focus talent identification and recruitment efforts

f) place identified and recruited athletes in a good development environment so they will have the opportunity to develop as top level athletes

g) develop a common taxonomy to describe athlete skills and potential (this is now occurring with the LTAD initiative).

h) involve F/P/T Sport, Education and Health Ministries in the national testing program

i) have PSOs and NSOs establish introductory programs to identify potential athletes and to encourage them to take up the sport

j) consider how to utilize the Canada Games as a means of identifying sport-specific athlete and coach potential

k) establish Canadian Paralympic Games for Paralympic sport development.

There is an urgency with the 2008 and 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games looming, to find talent and get them into the development system immediately.
SWOT Analysis

To assist in developing a business plan for talent identification in Canadian sport, a SWOT analysis has been performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ A successful model for a generic sport talent identification program &amp; centralized database exists (TalentFit in BC).</td>
<td>♦ There is a limited understanding of what is required to implement a talent identification program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ There are key lessons from the OTP-2010 sport specific talent identification initiative.</td>
<td>♦ There is no national leadership for a national talent identification program for summer sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ There is agreement across the sport community that talent identification must be a priority if Canada is to be a leading sport performance nation.</td>
<td>♦ There is no targeted money for talent identification for summer sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Strong partnerships are emerging between Sport, Education and Health and a holistic model for LTAD is emerging with great momentum in Canada.</td>
<td>♦ PSO/NSO’s under-resourced, and do not have talent identification programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Sports are willing to evolve the current system and improve performances in the long term.</td>
<td>♦ There is no national database or dedicated staff for sport performance testing and performance forecasting for summer sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Existing talent identification programs (SportFit &amp; SportMatch) are only offered regionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Advertising and marketing has not been a part of talent identification programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ There is a lack of cooperation between sports to share or redirect talented athletes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Build upon momentum of OTP-2010 initiatives.</td>
<td>♦ Approach talent identification from a public relations vs. performance perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Utilize key learnings from the comprehensive sport reviews completed over the last two years.</td>
<td>♦ Create a talent identification system that becomes futile because of inappropriate talent development opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Build talent identification programs into the Canadian Sport Centre responsibilities.</td>
<td>♦ Dilute impact of talent identification by working across too many sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Encourage provincial Ministries to establish ‘Sport for All’ and school physical education programs to get children involved with sport.</td>
<td>♦ Create distrust between sport organizations because of potential perception of athlete poaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ Underestimate the time, effort and resource required to build a best practice talent identification program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Considerations

There are three critical requirements for a talent identification program:

♦ extensive knowledge of sport-specific performance requirements for international success
♦ accurate assessment and monitoring of athlete capabilities in relation to these demands
♦ the ability to predict future performance levels based upon athlete characteristics.

NSO Initiatives

Each NSO that is interested in achieving international excellence should have its own talent identification program(s) with expert leadership and technical support. OTP-2010 is currently creating the first national prototype with winter NSOs in the search for winter sport talent. There will need to be resources provided to the NSOs to lead their sport’s talent identification and recruitment, and this might involve a full-time program manager. This effort should be directly connected to LTAD initiatives and PSO and provincial programming. It is also critical that once talent is found, that there are programs with first-rate coaching to ensure recruitment and development of the athlete.

Provincial Initiatives

The PSOs and TSOs and their governments, along with the Canadian Sport Centres in their provinces should also play a role, as should provincially oriented events such as provincial games and Canada Games. The BC approach has been to establish talent identification teams supported by mobile and stationary laboratories to undertake both generic and sport-specific talent identification for priority sports. The sport-specific talent identification should also include recruitment strategies for those whose talents might best be expressed in other sports. This approach might best be delivered by the Canadian Sport Centres and the provinces.

Podium

There should also be an initiative by Podium to assist the NSOs and the CSCs to achieve these goals, and this could involve establishing and managing a national performance database. This centre could also keep track of international best-practice in this area.
Paralympic Sport

Many individuals with disabilities are far less aware of the possibilities of being involved in sport than are able-bodied athletes. There are also unique barriers to participating such as cost, availability of programs, accessibility of transport, accessible facilities, and over-protective parents or care workers. Thus, there is a unique need to undertake the following.

♦ Create sport specific awareness of the disability component of the sport - The Paralympic sports and their partners need to develop an educational/promotional campaign directed to every rehabilitation centre, sport/recreation facility, schools and other groups, focused on general athlete development concepts, with a basic introduction of the Paralympic sports. The goal is to educate and inform individuals, or in many cases their parents, of the opportunity to become involved with Paralympic sport. Through OTP-2010 funds and leadership, the CPC launched a national Paralympic winter sport awareness campaign in January 2006, targeting Canadians with physical disabilities between the ages of 12 – 35. This program could be extended to include summer sports and evolve into a long-term program.

♦ Educate practitioners who work with those with disabilities – such as rehabilitation services, specialty groups for specific disabilities, managers of recreational programs and facilities – as to the opportunities offered by sport.

♦ Emphasize the possibility for progression - from a recreational level of the sport to a provincial, national and international level.

♦ utilize the LTAD initiatives - with the assistance of P/T governments and provincial sport and disability organizations, to create a truly comprehensive development system for Paralympic athletes.

♦ Talent identification and recruitment - As an enhancement to the education and promotion strategy, each of the Paralympic sports must establish programs that allow potential athletes to try the sport. For a national talent identification program to be successful, there must be some form of national leadership, and it must work with the NSO’s and PSO’s to deliver programs with a pan-Canadian vision. A likely wider range of partners - disability organizations, medical/rehabilitation community, etc. - all must be involved and working from same “blueprint” to best leverage existing expertise and ensure efficient use of all available resources. Otherwise, the Awareness Campaign will have minimal impact if there is no place for an interested athlete to try the sport in their area.
### Timelines and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Establish the leadership and funding in Podium for a national Talent ID program to be established.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Provide resources to summer NSOs to hire a Manager of Talent Identification, and program resources for their sport.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC, NSOs, PSOs</td>
<td>Explore how the LTAD model can assist talent ID and recruitment; establish clear talent development pathways for identified athletes.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC, NSOs, PSOs</td>
<td>Explore how the Canada Games can assist talent ID and recruitment.</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCs, NSOs, PSOs</td>
<td>Identify priority sports/regions for sport-specific talent identification.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCs</td>
<td>Hire and train core staff with selected Canadian Sport Centres (start with two) for mobile talent identification teams working in generic and sport-specific talent identification programs for PSOs and NSOs.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCs, NSOs &amp; PSOs</td>
<td>Target Provincial multi-sport games (e.g. BC Summer and Winter Games, Canada Games) as key points to find potential talented athletes at the early phases of their sport careers.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Develop an advertising/marketing plan for a generic talent identification program.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium</td>
<td>Expand the national talent identification program from two to four Canadian Sport Centres/provinces.</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Financial Considerations

The talent identification budget focuses on investing in dedicated expertise in the provinces and territories, at sport Centres, and in the NSOs. Four approaches are envisioned and are budgeted for in the following Table. These programs are seen as a shared financial responsibility between the federal government and the P/T governments.

a) NSO/PSO/TSO approach - The NSOs and P/TSOs would be strengthened to undertake their own talent ID and recruitment. The Canadian Sport Centres might help implement these programs with the NSOs and their regional PSO partners.

b) Specialist Team approach - Another approach would be similar to that already underway in British Columbia where there is a small team working with the PSOs and the CSCs that undertakes talent ID across the province for several targeted sports. We are recommending that for the first two years, two provinces would be involved and then in 2008, two additional provinces included. Certain provinces such as Quebec already have a number of initiatives in this area, including sport schools, and the Quebec sport ministry and the Canadian Sport Centre in Montreal are able to provide valuable support.

c) Podium – Podium would support these two approaches, assisting with some start-up costs such as training, construction of mobile laboratories and web-based programming for establishment of a comprehensive national talent identification database. By phasing the program in over the first few years, these start-up costs become more manageable.

Podium would assist with a national communications program. It is necessary to inform as many as possible so that large numbers of athletes will be aware of opportunities.

d) Provincial/Territorial initiatives - Programs that encourage youngsters to participate in sport and lifelong activity and that identify those with special talent should appeal to provincial governments and corporate sponsors. If each province was to dedicate a minimum of $200 – 500,000 to talent identification each year, then the provincial initiatives would be fully funded and very valuable.
### Annual Cash Requirements for the Talent Identification Program up to 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport Science Scholarships (2 then 4 in 2008)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent ID Scientist (2 FTE’s then 4 in 2008)</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologist</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians (1 FTE then 2 in 2008)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Performance Statisticist</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (23% of Salary)</td>
<td>89,700</td>
<td>89,700</td>
<td>135,700</td>
<td>135,700</td>
<td>135,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead (5000/FTE)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Staffing</strong></td>
<td>529,700</td>
<td>529,700</td>
<td>805,700</td>
<td>805,700</td>
<td>805,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Equipment (2500/Lab)</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Performance Lab Time ($10,000/Lab)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle &amp; Expenses (2 then 4 in 2008)</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Laboratory (2 then 4 in 2008)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equipment and Laboratories</strong></td>
<td>99000</td>
<td>59000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>118,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Offices (2 x 200sq ft then 4 in 2008)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Intelligence Centre (1000 sq ft)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development ($3000/Expert)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel ($5000/Expert)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-based Programming &amp; Housing</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Marketing</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>856,700</td>
<td>748,700</td>
<td>1,158,700</td>
<td>1,100,700</td>
<td>1,100,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NSO/PSO personnel (15 persons plus expenses)</strong></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Funding Required</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,856,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,748,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,158,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,100,700</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,100,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Games Preparation and Environment

Background

The environment at the Olympic and Paralympic Games can adversely affect athlete performance. Some coaches and Olympic and Paralympic Committees from other countries have learned how to use the unique aspects of the Games to enhance performance. Their athletes are able to have their best performances at the Games. Canadian athletes are losing ground in performing up to expectations at these events.

Success Rate

The following chart looks at “success rate” – the percentage of athletes among the top eight who win medals at the Olympic Games. Not only is Canada well below the success rate of the top nations, but the percentage is declining as other nations improve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Canada</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below indicates that Canada has more athletes in medal position (top eight) than ever before, but is converting fewer of these opportunities into medals than it has in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Medals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Top 8 Finishes</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success Rate</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports with at least one medal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So, Canada is increasing the number of athletes within striking distance of the podium but converting fewer of those opportunities into medals in the Olympic environment. Canada has to do a better job understanding this environment and develop programs to help athletes achieve at levels they have previously achieved.

Olympic preparation needs to be treated as a four year cycle rather than a one year assault. Program plans for all NSOs need to be analyzed to see if the work densities (volume, intensities, frequency, recovery, rest etc.) and annual plans are too ambitious in the Olympic year in an attempt to make up ground. This is where a dedicated, experienced PET can serve the athlete and coach best. In addition, PET teams should not be changed in the year of a Games. Service providers who work consistently with the teams during the World Cup season should be performing their same role at the Games.
We need to share successful performance strategies. They exist in Canada but need to be compiled, communicated and analyzed. International models also need to be examined and considered, such as the US increase in Winter Olympic medal counts from 13 in 1998 to 34 in 2002. The astounding 21 medal increase was due to their Olympic preparation and use of home field advantage. Strategies may be as simple as less travel, more rest and more carefully considered competition.

**Paralympic Sport**

Paralympic sport faces the very same challenges as Olympic sport and in many cases, the challenges are even more pronounced because of the lack of adequate training and international competition opportunities leading up to the Games. The international sport environment is becoming increasingly competitive because of an increased number of countries participating, increased investment/prestige associated with Paralympic medals, increased international funding to Paralympic sport, and most leading countries now having integrated able bodied sport with sport for those with disabilities. Canada no longer has a system advantage.

The CPC Games focus is primarily oriented to the care of athletes, and further initiatives are required to truly assist athletes and coaches in pursuit of peak performance. Thus, the Canadian Paralympic Committee and its sports are strengthening their pre-games planning, and training and a detailed plan for each sport is being developed jointly by each sport’s Performance Team and the CPC Games staff.

The lessons learned from both the Olympic and Paralympic Games missions to Torino 2006 will be valuable to improve preparations for the 2008 Games in Beijing.

---

**Program Considerations**

The following section is oriented specifically to the Canadian Olympic Committee, however, most of the principles and programs should be applied to Canadian Paralympic Committee Games planning.

**Changing this Trend for Canada**

Because the COC takes the lead in bringing the team to the Games, and because, at the end of the day, the COC is perceived by the Canadian public as responsible for the overall performance of the team, it must take the lead in:

- developing a strong Games preparation plan with each NSO
- supporting Canadian athletes and teams to visit and train at the Olympic venues prior to the Games
- creating a Canadian-friendly Olympic performance environment at the Games.

These three areas of programming can improve the ability of Canadian athletes to win medals at the Olympic Games.
Development of a Detailed Games Preparation Plan

The American study on “Positive and Negative Factors Influencing U.S. Olympic Coaches and Athletes” concluded that:

"Successful Olympic performance is a complex, multifaceted, fragile and long-term process that requires extensive planning and painstaking implementation. Detailed, focused and consistent preparation is needed. Coaches and team administrators need to understand that the process is delicate and can easily be disrupted by numerous distractions. Things never seem to go entirely as planned but teams seldom succeed without following a detailed and carefully rehearsed plan."

The following were identified as critical elements of such a plan:

♦ pre-games training and familiarization
♦ victory management for double/triple medal prospects
♦ family/friends plan
♦ distraction management
♦ media issues and management
♦ optimal physical preparation
♦ sponsor management
♦ mental preparation
♦ team selection and trials
♦ team cohesion and harmony
♦ competition schedule
♦ coaching issues
♦ team residency/training program
♦ performance support personnel
♦ COC support services
♦ NSO/COC performance partnership and expectations
♦ games logistics, i.e. housing and transportation.

The detailed plan for each sport and the overall strategy for the Games should be developed jointly by each sport’s PET and the COC Games Staff. The following activities will get those groups working together toward that end.
**COC and NSO performance partnership** – Coaches, HPDs and COC Games staff should begin meeting the first year of the quadrennial to share information on planning and games strategies and debrief from prior Games experiences. The COC should use these sessions to understand how it can assist the sport’s PET prior to the Games and at the Games. By the end of the quadrennial leading to the Games, there should be a specific Olympic year plan with each NSO, an overall Olympic plan for the COC, and a clear understanding of who is on each of the sport’s Performance Teams and their roles at the Games. This is the foundation plan that needs attention throughout the cycle.

**Rehearsal** – The COC must assist the NSO so that the plan can be rehearsed at least once in the year prior to the Games (bring athletes to their competition site one year out so athletes can prepare for and envision themselves being there in a years time). All PET staff should have adequate opportunities to work together, under the direction of the Head Coach and/or High Performance Director prior to the Games, so that at Games time, they work well together. We thus need to consider four year appointments to allow the training of personnel.

**Sport team leader training** – The Team Leader at Games time should be the High Performance Director or Head Coach. No change in leadership or insertion of new/different people should occur at the Games. Sport team leaders are the most effective link between each sport’s PET and the COC.

A goal of the sport team leader and COC Games staff relationship is to ‘normalize’ the Games environment for the coaches and athletes, taking on the responsibility to handle many of the “unique” aspects of the Games such as tickets, media arrangements, parent, friend and sponsor issues, protocol and COC delegation relations, so that coaches and athletes can focus on their normal routines in preparing to compete.

**Games staff** – They should be carefully selected for their knowledge of performance needs. They can be distracted at a Games but must remain focused on athlete success. Thus, it is desirable that they have previous Games experience and that they be appointed the first year of the quadrennial so that they can be part of the planning process and the Performance Team for all four years.

**Athlete summits** – The COC is providing programs for top winter athletes so that they develop a sense of team cohesiveness going to the 2006 and 2010 Winter Games. The athletes discuss what it takes to win medals and the confidence and commitment to do so. These sessions are invaluable in helping the COC and NSOs understand athlete needs and concerns that can then be addressed in the Olympic plan. This program should be extended to the summer athletes and tailored to their needs in preparation for 2008 and 2012. These athlete summits should be held once each year prior to the Games.

**Athlete support personnel summits** – The COC should also organize general summits targeted at preparing coaches, team leaders and all other personnel for the Games environment.
Recommendations for Pre-Games Training and Familiarization Programs

The NSOs and COC need to ensure that all athletes, coaches and support personnel know the physical environment and the local culture at the host city. Athletes must feel comfortable with the arrangements for housing, eating, transportation, and training. The COC Games staff has already visited Beijing to identify training sites that can be of value to the teams prior to the Olympics.

The following activities are recommended for pre-games activities and familiarization.

**Familiarization trip for team leadership** – The head coaches, HPDs and team leaders need to be familiar with the Olympic and Paralympic sites during the first year of the quadrennial period and to think about the best solutions for pre-Games training and Games-time issues.

**Training in the host nation** – The COC should ensure funding and support for each team with medal opportunities to travel to and train in the host country during the second year of the quadrennial. To the degree possible, this needs to be a dress rehearsal, mirroring the conditions of the Games.

**Attendance at test events** – The COC should encourage athletes and coaches to compete at the Olympic test events during the third year of the quadrennial. The test events would be a rehearsal for the Olympic plan with all performance staff on hand to practice their roles with the COC. If a team is not able to attend a test event, a similar dress rehearsal training opportunity in the host city should be developed by the COC as a test for the sport team personnel and the COC Games staff.

**Pre-Games training during the Olympic year** – Each NSO should have a detailed plan for training just prior to the Games, possibly including training camps in the same time zone as the Games site. The COC should ensure that funding and support is available to create optimal environments for those athletes (and their support personnel) that have the best medal chances at the Games.

**Developing a Games-time Support Environment** – The COC should take the lead in developing a highly supportive environment at the Games and in the Olympic Village. Because the COC is evolving from a ‘logistics provider’ to a ‘performance partner’, some guidelines are necessary for those attending the Games as part of the COC delegation:

a) Everyone on the delegation should be focused on supporting optimal performance by the athletes.

b) The COC staff should be under the direction of the Director of Games Preparation. While many staff team members will have other duties not related to performance support, those should all be secondary to the main goal of winning medals for Canada.

c) The commitment to support athletes should be unequivocal. Any issue that arises should be resolved in favor of optimal preparation and support for athletes and coaches.

d) The Games are not over until the last medal is won. Those supporting the team must be available to assist until the Games are completed.
**Performance Preparation Centers** – The COC should establish a Performance Preparation Center or centres as a base of operation for the PETs. The function will be determined by the Olympic plans of the NSOs but in general, the COC should plan to staff and operate the following:

a) Coaches haven – a place for the Olympic coaches to get away and be together - containing a lounge, a workroom, computer terminals, Games TV feed and media news and updates.

b) Strength and conditioning center – a fully equipped and staffed gym designed specifically to meet the needs of the sports.

c) Sport psychology center – Credentialed and non-credentialed psychologists alike need private workspace to interact with athletes.

d) Performance technology center – primarily a sophisticated video center where Games live feed, training and scouting videos can be made available to coaches under the direction of a technical expert provided by the COC.

e) Athletes lounge – a place for the Olympic athletes to get away and be together just with other athletes - containing computer terminals, Games live TV feed, and refreshments. The lounge should be staffed by COC athlete services personnel who can answer questions and resolve issues for athletes.

f) A medical center – especially for providing work space and oversight for non-credentialed medical personnel, including “approved” (by Team Leaders) physiotherapists and massage providers, who work with the teams or with individual athletes.

g) Work/Training area - for personal coaches so they have access to their athletes.

h) PET support base – to make sure performance support personnel can interact with their teams when needed.

For coaches and athletes to perform well at the Olympics, they must believe that excellent conditions have been established for them so that they can concentrate only on their performance. They must know that they are aided by a well-oiled performance support team. The proposed programs will send a strong message to Canadian athletes and coaches that the Canadian Team is very well prepared for the uniqueness of the Olympic Games, and that the delegation is as well organized and supported as any other team at the Games.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>End Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>COC should develop and circulate to NSOs their Road to Beijing Strategic overview document.</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should develop an overall quadrennium preparation plan for each target group: athletes, coaches, team leaders, sport psychologists, sport scientists, medical, media, etc.</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should conduct Beijing site visit with NSOs and coaches to develop relationships and identify Pre-Games training camp location (2 visits total)</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should meet with each NSO (one-one-one) that has 2008 or 2012 potential for Olympic success to review and assist in developing Olympic Plan. This meeting is part of an annual review (3 meetings total).</td>
<td>Dec 2005 Dec 2006 Dec 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should host a Beijing Planning Session with all NSOs and share learnings, observations, best practices from what NSOs/COC has learned thus far about the Beijing Olympic conditions and environment.</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should host an Excellence Series with athletes, coaches, team leaders, sport psychologists to focus on Beijing preparatory plans/objectives and learning to succeed in the environment.</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should host an Excellence Series in Beijing with athletes, coaches, team leaders, sport psychologists to focus on performance achievement in Beijing.</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC/NSOs should participate in the Beijing test events to conduct Olympic simulation.</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>The COC should stage a Beijing Preparation Seminar for head coaches, team leaders, and mission staff including health care, media attaches, village operations, outfitting and Canada Olympic House staff.</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Financial Considerations

The Games preparation and environment program is a major challenge. The COC and CPC must plan for, lead and manage the large delegations at the Games. It will take a significant amount of resources to do this right, spent over a four-year period. The funding identified below is for planning and communications purposes, and excludes the COC and CPC costs for sending and hosting the team abroad.

The Paralympic sports and the CPC need to establish a similar approach to the lead shown by the COC, but modified for their particular needs. Many of the COC’s programs could be shared with the CPC. A budget of one million dollars for pre-Games preparation for the CPC would allow them to considerably improve their preparation.

## COC and CPC Requirements in Preparation for 2008 and 2012 Games.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>a) COC Initial Investigation of Site</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Team Leader/Head Coach Site Visit (October)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Team Leader/Performance Staff Planning Meetings</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>295,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>♦ NSO training/familiarization trips to China</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ team leader and coaches meetings</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ athlete summits</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>595,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>♦ test event – enhancements only</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ team leader and coaches meetings- in China</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ athlete summits</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2007</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>380,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>♦ team leadership meeting (February – In China)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ pre-Games training camps – enhancements only</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♦ performance preparation centers</td>
<td>540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2008</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,390,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for COC for 2005-08 Quadrennial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,660,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add overall additional cost for CPC for 2005-08 Quadrennial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost for the Quadrennial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,660,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Media as a Performance Issue

Background

The media’s overwhelming attention to the Olympic Games is one of the most significant factors in making it a unique, complex, and sometimes difficult event for athletes and coaches. It brings new challenges for preparation and can disrupt normal routines for competition. On the other hand, it is what makes the Olympics special and interesting to people around the world.

For many of the smaller sports, the Olympics are the only time they will receive substantial media coverage, so it is in their best interest to leverage this attention wisely in order to promote their sport and their athletes to the public and to potential sponsors.

In a U.S. Olympic Committee study on positive and negative factors influencing U. S. athletes and coaches, they concluded that media issues were not major distractions for those teams and athletes that had media training, an effective media coordinator, and a media plan. However, the media were a significant distraction for those not part of such a comprehensive media program. Interestingly, 53% of athletes indicated that media attention was uplifting and motivational. This percentage was even higher (60%) among those who were medalists.

With the dramatic increase in world-wide coverage of the Paralympic Games, this issue is becoming prominent with Paralympians as well.

Program Considerations

The following suggestions for programming should form the basis of the COCs, CPCs and NSOs ‘readiness’ for their teams at major Games. Many of the principles and programs outlined below for the COC can also be applied to the CPC, and many projects could be jointly undertaken by them.

Media coordinators - Each NSO should have a professional media coordinator on staff, part-time or full-time, to liaise with Olympic/Paralympic print and broadcast media. Their role is to serve as a resource to the media to help provide information on the sport, access to athletes and coaches and to establish positive working relationships to help build interest in and knowledge about the sport. There services are needed before and during the Games.

COC, CPC and NSO media plan - Each sport, the COC and the CPC should have a media relations component in their Games plan. Coaches and team leaders need to have input into the plan to balance the promotional needs of the sport with the athletes’ needs for preparation. Early planning will allow each group’s needs to be met and for them to have an understanding of how to work together when they get to major Games.
**Media training** - COC/CPC media staff and Canadian Sport Centres should organize professional training for Olympic/Paralympic athletes and teams that is designed for the Games environment the year before the Games. The goal is for athletes and coaches to understand how to interact with both print and broadcast media effectively and to use media interest as a motivating experience. Some training centres and some teams do their own media training.

**Media coordinator meetings** - COC/CPC should host meetings of NSO media coordinators for both summer and winter sports each year to develop shared learning of their roles and responsibilities and to plan media strategies for each sport and for major Games. They can construct consistent messaging on various topics, and build stronger relationships with Canadian media services and reporters.

**Olympic/Paralympic media association** - We could establish an Olympic/Paralympic Media Association for Olympic/Paralympic sport media to link them to the sport’s media coordinators prior to the Games. It would give credibility to sport in the eyes of the media and establish a direct channel for Canadian media to get sport/athlete information. The COC/CPC may also consider hosting an annual professional development seminar for association members.

**Olympic media summits** - The COC/CPC should host a Media Summit 3-4 months prior to each Games to bring together Olympic/Paralympic print and broadcast media, media coordinators, top athletes and coaches. This engages the media prior to the Games, provides opportunities for athletes, coaches and sports to meet in a more relaxed and controlled setting, provides the media with good information on each of the sports prior to the Games and establishes a productive and supportive relationship with the media that can carry on through the Games.

**Media office at major Games** - COC/CPC should continue with the practice of running a Canadian media office at the main media centre at major Games and invite Canadian media to use it as a home base. It serves also as a home base for each of the media coordinators for the sports.

**Victory management program** - Media coordinators would help manage athletes immediately after they have won medals. They must anticipate success, and know how to get the athletes where they need to go, properly dressed and prepared to interact with media and sponsors, to attend award ceremonies and then get back to the Village for food and rest.
**Crisis management program** - Every Games has its surprises, including disruptive issues that have to be managed. While this is a major responsibility of the Games Team professional staff, any situation involving a sport would also involve their own media officers. The COC and CPC have created a series of scenarios based on real experiences and they can be used for training. It is especially important in crisis environments that the leadership responsible for managing the situation is clear and the roles of those involved are well defined.

**An enhanced role for the COC and CPC** - The COC’s/CPC’s role as a performance partner (Games missions) with NSOs and their athletes and coaches is unique and essential and one that will support athletes to handle the Olympic/Paralympic environment.

It does not appear that any organizational or system changes are necessary for the COC/CPC to take up this challenge. It is simply a matter of defining a more comprehensive approach and applying the resources to undertake new and enhanced programs.
## Financial Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Task &amp; Responsibility</th>
<th>Costs ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Various media activities were undertaken in 2005</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Develop COC and NSO Media Plan Development for Beijing 2008. ♦ COC Media and Games Staff meet individually with each summer sport to develop a media Games plan for Beijing. Hold a media coordinators meeting for Beijing 2008. ♦ Review COC and NSO media plan for Beijing. ♦ Plan development and next meeting of Canadian Olympic Media Association. ♦ Review COC quadrennial media plan. Responsibility: COC Media/PR Staff</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Hold a combined media coordinators meeting with both summer and winter sports. ♦ Share best practices on working with sports. ♦ Address major media/PR issues. Responsibility: COC Media/PR Staff Hold first bi-annual meeting of Canadian Olympic Media Association. ♦ Invite all Canadian Olympic print and broadcast media ♦ Communicate Media Plans for Beijing and Vancouver/Whistle ♦ Establish training/communication groups Responsibility: COC Media/PR Staff</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Hold media coordinators meetings – summer and winter (separate). Summer: Review final plans for Beijing operation and plan Media Summit; complete media training for summer teams. Winter: review planning for Vancouver/Whistler. Responsibility: COC Media/PR Staff Hold Beijing Olympic Media Summit – April 2008 – focus on Beijing Games. ♦ Invite all of Canada’s top sport media from Print and TV ♦ Invite the all medal hopefuls for Beijing, their coaches and NSF leadership coordinated by Media Coordinators. ♦ Communicate Canada’s media and sports performance plan for the Games. ♦ Communicate each sport’s prospects and provide interview opportunities with Athletes and Coaches. Responsibility: COC Media/PR and Games Staff &amp; NSO Media Coordinators Undertake media operation at Beijing 2008. ♦ Continue to operate Canada Media/PR office in Media Centre ♦ Initiate Victory Management program with teams ♦ Initiate Crisis Management Program Responsibility: COC Media/PR and Games Staff</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quadrennial cost to COC** 1,175,000

**Paralympic enhancements** 500,000

**Total Cost for COC & CPC for Quadrennium** 1,675,000
Section 5 - Finance

The Road to Excellence Business Plan estimates that for targeted national sports, and for the needed development of the Canadian sport system to support excellence, there is an annual requirement of new funding of $88.4 million. This amount would be shared between the partners, with $46 million (51%) from the federal government, $12.8 million (15%) from the corporate sector, the COC and CPC, and $29.6 million (34%) to come from the provinces/territories.

This provincial/territorial funding is critically important to complete the high performance development pathways, primarily for coaching and athlete support, talent identification and recruitment, LTAD, regional sport centres and strengthening P/TSO capacity.

Estimated Annual Need of New Funding for the Canadian High Performance Sport System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Additional Annual Need ($ million) 2006-07</th>
<th>Partner Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal ($ million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provincial ($ million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate &amp; COC/CPC ($ million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete support</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Science</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Sport Centres</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Review</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Secret Innovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Identification</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Preparation (COC &amp; CPC)</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media support</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Resources Required</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Projections of New Resources Required for Both NSO and System Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Podium Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athlete support</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Sports</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Science</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Sport Centres</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Review</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Secret Innovation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent Identification</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games Preparation</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media support</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Resources Required</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>115.9</td>
<td>119.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is projected that approximately 50% of these costs would accrue to the federal government, 35% to the provinces/territories, and 15% to the COC, CPC and their corporate partners.

Determination of NSO and System Needs

In 2005-06, the CSRP collected data from all Olympic and Paralympic sports related to their program aspirations and perceived needs. In the following Table, some of the sport’s needs are identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Olympic Sports</th>
<th>6,821,600</th>
<th>6,602,000</th>
<th>9,363,400</th>
<th>3,013,000</th>
<th>3,487,500</th>
<th>2,275,000</th>
<th>31,962,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-targeted Olympic Sports</td>
<td>2,306,620</td>
<td>2,433,675</td>
<td>3,653,389</td>
<td>869,975</td>
<td>457,696</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>10,156,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralympic Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,713,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,832,484</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CSRP was given a target budget of $16.365 million for Olympic and Paralympic summer sport disciplines. (Sport Canada provided $12 million, COC $4.265 million and CPC $100,000.)
After a thorough review and ranking process, targeted Olympic sports received $14.765 million and the Paralympic sports $1.6 million. This was about a third of what had been requested.

As well, the NSO requested funds did not include significant support for other needed items such as program funds for Top Secret research and innovation, talent identification and recruitment, Podium operations, additional athlete support, Games Mission preparation, junior athlete development and needed provincial development programs.

In order to assess this total need, the Business Plan looked at the cost of all required expenditures for both national and provincial elements of the plan – those affecting sport organizations, and those for needed system development.

For 25 targeted summer sports and 14 Paralympic summer disciplines (total 39) the immediate need, as expressed in the Tables above is $58.8 million annually from national (federal government and corporate) sources.

To put this sum into perspective with the winter sport ‘excellence’ funding (OTP-2010), the 13 winter sport disciplines and the four Paralympic sport disciplines (total 17) received additional annual funding of $22 million.

There is the additional system need of $29.6 million of related provincial funding required for junior development.

There is urgency to finance, and thus begin, the implementation of the Business Plan. The 2008 Games in Beijing are two years away. To achieve the goals outlined in the plan, all of the proposed work and new initiatives must begin in fiscal 2006-07.
**The Last Word......**

**Being the best**

Being the best is a choice. We, as Canadians, can choose to attain sporting excellence for summer Olympic and Paralympic sports. What we mean by excellence, however, is not a choice.

It was not so long ago in Canada that we defined winning as the only meaning of excellence. In doing so, we not only lost gold medals, we lost the values that define athletic excellence. To our credit, we have taken past adversity and turned it into leadership. Canada is now at the forefront of fair and ethical sport.

But once regained, these values must be protected, promoted and nurtured. Ethics in sport is not something to be achieved with great fanfare and high fives all around. It must be rooted in the culture of our sport, reflecting and reinforcing our broader societal values.

One of the most telling features of a values deficit is when we feel we must choose between winning medals and our ethical values. We weigh the advantages and disadvantages of ethical conduct as if it were a choice of how to allocate scarce resources. And we also begin to see excellence and ethics as opposite goals – where the pursuit of one at odds with the other. There is even the perspective that a commitment to values and ethics, financially or otherwise, weakens our commitment to excellence.

This Business Plan recognizes that being the best is a choice, but once chosen, being the best in sport means that we are committed to the values and ethics that make excellence worth pursuing. Indeed, without such commitment, it is not excellence we pursue, it is something else.

**True Excellence and True Sport**

During the cross-Canada consultations that led up to Canada’s National Summit on Sport (2001), the desire to have values-driven, ethical sport was a recurrent and dominant theme. Not surprisingly, the subsequent Canadian Sport Policy (2002) said that the goals of excellence and capacity building are founded on an ethically based sport system.

A year later (2003), the Physical Activity and Sport Act received Royal Assent, with its own clear statement that the Government of Canada’s policy regarding sport is founded on the highest ethical standards and values.

In August 2001, the federal/provincial/territorial Ministers responsible for sport adopted the Declaration on Expectations for Fairness in Sport (The London Declaration). The Canadian Sport Policy went even further in the section entitled Making Ethical Issues Central to Sport, calling for a Canadian Strategy on Ethical Conduct in Sport.
In 2002, the Ethics Strategy, a partnership between governments and the sport sector, was adopted by all 14 federal, provincial and territorial governments. It has since become known as the True Sport Strategy. Among other things, the Strategy is founded on the belief that no one owns sport. It is a public trust which Canadians view as second only to the family in its role of transferring values to young people, and as an important part of our culture. The pursuit of athletic excellence is an expression of our collective pursuit of human excellence.

Sport loses its way when it artificially distinguishes between sport for all and sporting excellence. As so clearly argued fifteen years ago in the Dubin Report, the pursuit of excellence (winning) without an ethical foundation does not work. But we also know that ethical sport devoid of the pursuit of excellence does not work either. Winning is a measure of our sporting excellence. Ethical conduct is also a measure of our sporting excellence. Indeed, it is the combination of the two that produces human excellence; it is the combination of the two that we call True Sport.

Canadians know what it is to win and how to do it well. There is a uniquely Canadian kind of sport that is rooted in our values of inclusion, fairness, respect and excellence – where Canadians win when we experience the joy of community sport and physical activity, where we win when sport contributes to the physical and moral development of youth, and where we win when we excel in international arenas.

Canada is a sophisticated enough society to be able to participate on the world stage, and excel. Doing so in sport reminds us of our ability to do these sorts of things in other areas. It reminds us of who we are as we display our national values, our character, to the rest of the world.

Is it important that we should have world class athletes? Yes, in the same way that it is important that we should have world-class doctors, educators, artists and public leaders.

We have education systems within which we include the pursuit of post-graduate studies and world-class research. Indeed, education can also be seen as a public trust, there for the good of all Canadians, within which we can excel.

We have health care systems within which we include the pursuit of optimal health, medical discoveries and world-class practitioners. Indeed, universal health care is a public trust, there for the well-being of all Canadians within which medical excellence is pursued.

The same applies to sport. We have a sport system within which we include the ambition to do well. As world-class researchers are part of our education system, and as highly-trained medical specialists are part of our health system, high-performance athletes are part of our sport system. True Sport is for all Canadians, including those who wear medals of excellence from sport competitions, and those who participate simply for the joy of it. Let us do well, and let us do it well.

Victor Lachance