



Report to

City of Edmonton

Edmonton Combative Sports Commission

Independent Review

Sierra Systems Group Inc.
10104 - 103rd Avenue • Suite 1300 • Bell Tower
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H8 Canada
www.SierraSystems.com

Contact: Michael Langstone
Phone: 780.424.0852
Fax: 780.426.0281
Email: MichaelLangstone@SierraSystems.com

Date: October 22, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary.....	1
2. Background Information and Methodology	2
3. Key Findings - Responses to Council’s Questions	5
4. Conclusion & General Observations	9

Appendices

APPENDIX A.	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED
APPENDIX B.	KEY STAKEHOLDERS
APPENDIX C.	INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
APPENDIX D.	LETTER FROM THE ASSOCIATION OF BOXING COMMISSIONS, JANUARY 2010
APPENDIX E.	ASSOCIATION OF BOXING COMMISSIONS CERTIFICATE OF ECSC MEMBERSHIP (JULY, 2010)
APPENDIX F.	ASSOCIATION OF BOXING COMMISSIONS, MINUTES OF A CLOSED MEETING HELD JULY 2010
APPENDIX G.	RELATIONSHIPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Confidentiality/Validity

This document has been prepared by Sierra Systems for the sole purpose and exclusive use of the City of Edmonton. Due to the confidential nature of the material in this document, its contents should not be discussed with, or disclosed to, third parties without the prior written consent of the City of Edmonton.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Edmonton's Office of the City Manager engaged Sierra Systems in June 2010 to assist with the independent review of the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission (ECSC) with respect to five key questions asked at City Council and outlined below. Sierra Systems has completed its review and presents the overall findings in the following report.

By way of background, the ECSC was incorporated by the City in 1920 and was previously called the Boxing and Wrestling Commission. The organization has recently initiated changes to support a more sound operating position that is more closely aligned with City of Edmonton standards and practices. As the ECSC is increasingly trying to formalize their business, they are in the process of defining and separating both operational and governing activities. Many processes have been undertaken such as policy development and adoption, development and interpretation of rules and regulations, and formalized hearings processes where ECSC decisions have been challenged. Other aspects of the business remain to be fully developed, such as the financial reporting process.

Sierra System's independent review was a comprehensive process consisting of a thorough documentation review including ECSC policies, processes, practices, Commission minutes, and financial documentation (a list of the documents reviewed appears in Appendix A). We also carried out one-on-one interviews with appointed Commission Members and the President of the Association of Boxing Commissions for additional insight and first-hand feedback to help answer and confirm the five (5) questions.

Following our review process, and as further elaborated on in the report to follow, we objectively conclude that, with respect to the five (5) questions being asked of Council, the ECSC and its Executive Director have conducted themselves in a fair manner and in accordance with approval processes and administrative practices of the Commission. The ECSC continues to move towards a formalized and accountable business model and states continued intent to incorporate positive changes.

Questions	Answers
1. Whether the rules and regulations approved by the Commission are being enforced as required	Yes
2. Whether the ECSC Executive Director has the authority, within the bylaw or the rules and regulations duly approved by the Commission, to alter or revise existing rules and regulations, or create and implement new rules and regulations, without approval of the Commission.	*No
3. Whether any rules or bylaws have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.	*No
4. Whether any administrative practices have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.	* ¹ No
5. Whether the reputable "Association of Boxing Commissions" threatened to cancel the Edmonton Commission's membership for adopting rules or regulations which they consider to be highly dangerous.	No

¹* While the Commission retains responsibility, it has delegated certain authorities within these areas to the ECSC's Executive Director.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND METHODOLOGY

On February 17, 2010 Councillor R. Hayter brought a notice of motion, which Council subsequently discussed with the result that, a motion was passed by City Council to carry out an independent and transparent review of the current operations of the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission (ECSC), specifically to answer the following questions:

1. Whether the rules and regulations approved by the Commission are being enforced as required.
2. Whether the ECSC Executive Director has the authority, within the bylaw or the rules and regulations duly approved by the Commission, to alter or revise existing rules and regulations, or create and implement new rules and regulations, without approval of the Commission.
3. Whether any rules or bylaws have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.
4. Whether any administrative practices have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.
5. Whether the reputable “Association of Boxing Commissions” threatened to cancel the Edmonton Commission’s membership for adopting rules or regulations which they consider to be highly dangerous.

To address the questions pertaining to current operations of the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission, Sierra Systems was asked to assist the City Administration with the independent review process.

To address the five (5) specific questions being asked of the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission, Sierra Systems has undertaken a two-part review process; the first being a comprehensive documentation review of all pertinent Commission related information, and the second being a key stakeholder interview process with related individuals who could provide feedback relating to the questions being posed by Council (a list of stakeholders engaged in interviews is listed in Appendix B).

By way of providing a context leading up to this inquiry, we provide our understanding of some the key dates, decisions, and changes involving the ECSC, as noted in the following chart.

Dates	Activities
2006	Audit done by the Office of the City Auditor.
2007	Community Services Committee passed a motion that allowed for a Consulting Report to address the Audit concerns for bylaw implementation activities, as well as an appropriate governance model for the Commission.
2008	Sierra Systems Report to City of Edmonton – Edmonton Combative Sports Commission, Project Management Support. This report outlined organizational change recommendations to clearly distinguish ECSC operations and governance.
2009	The Community Standards Branch of Planning and Development (Branch Manager: David Aitkin) became involved in providing City Administration supports to the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission.
August 4, 2009	The City hires a new Executive Director for the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission.
November, 2009	Bylaw 14308, Boxing, Wrestling and other Combative Sports is Consolidated
November 2009 to April 2010	Sierra Systems engaged to develop draft policies for the ECSC on behalf of the Executive Director, for approval by the Commission

Documentation Review

The documentation review of the ECSC includes documentation that existed prior to August 9, 2009 where relevant, to mark the new Executive Director position having been implemented. This date is important, as many changes have occurred within the ECSC in terms of governance and operations since. Documents dating from August 4, 2009 forward to Sept 21, 2010 (and some prior documents) have been reviewed and cross referenced to ensure accuracy of both documented governance and operations. How the decisions for governance were made and how these decisions have been put into practice and reinforced have been examined, compared and contrasted within this review.

A comprehensive review was completed of all pertinent and relevant documentation related to current and past rules, regulations, bylaws, meeting minutes and administration. Appendix A holds a listing of the documents that were reviewed with considerations for content, timing, correspondence to decisions and documentation of those decisions and their relevance to the five questions asked by City Council.

Stakeholder Engagement

As part of the review process key stakeholders were engaged to inform the review process and fully explore the five questions of City council. All of the current 6 Council appointed Commission Members were interviewed using the Interview Protocol (Appendix C). The interviews were conducted with a defined protocol in order to: uncover any discrepancies; and find any variation between documentation and experiences, or between interviewee's experiences. As with the documentation review, the engagement process was looking to compare and contrast information from key members of the ECSC.

Consistent feedback was heard from each of the Commission Members with respect to their understanding of operational and governance roles. More importantly, their understanding of the division of these roles, responsibilities and duties between the Commission Members themselves and the Executive Director were also consistent. The interviews supported the documentation review when compared and examined for contrast.

A member of the Association of Boxing Commissions (ABC) was contacted and interviewed via email to ensure clarity in regard to the concerns identified in the five questions and to verify the outcome of the documentation and interview process relevant to the ABC and its relationship to the ECSC. The ECSC Commission Member understanding of the relationship between the ECSC and the ABC was further supported by an interview with the President of the ABC. As each interview was cross referenced by the documentation review, there were no discrepancies found to report.

3. KEY FINDINGS - RESPONSES TO COUNCIL'S QUESTIONS

***“Unless we change our direction, we are likely to end up where we are headed. “
- Old Chinese Proverb.***

Throughout the review process, we have worked to obtain the full range of information required to provide the most objective and accurate responses to Council's questions. Sierra Systems has outlined the key activities and findings for both the Documentation Review and Stakeholder Engagement Feedback in the following sections. This review process was conducted by a Senior Consultant with Sierra Systems who had no prior history with the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission.

Historical Overview

While the ECSC and its predecessor Commission has been in place for some time the organization recently developed more formal governance and operational controls. Implementation of recommendations from the 2008 Sierra Systems Governance Report and the development of bylaw 14308 have added significant positive structure to the ECSC in the past two years. The ECSC is an organization undergoing significant continuing change: including the development of formally approved rules, policies, bylaws, staff, governance and operational procedures, financial reporting, industry alliances and more.

Prior to August of 2009, there was a loosely documented framework in place; the majority of transactions would occur without foundational procedures to support them. This historic lack of accountability, transparency and active controls within the ECSC with respect to governance and operations created vulnerabilities for the then Executive Director and Commission members to be challenged and questioned on many occasions.

The ECSC has traditionally maintained a range of formal and informal relationships within the industry. The ECSC currently has one such formal relationship as an “Associate” member of the Association of Boxing Commissions (ABC). The ECSC also engages in other informal affiliations with organizations such as the Ontario and Manitoba Commissions. These organizational connections are built upon collaborative relationships. The ECSC does not require any affiliation with such organizations to operate successfully. The ABC provides supports and services to the ECSC and vice versa, where an exchange of information and best practices occur. The ECSC / ABC relationship while it is mutually beneficial, it is directed by both parties independently.

Summary of Document Review & Stakeholder Engagement Interviews

The ECSC is an organization in transition. The ECSC is governed by Edmonton Bylaw 14308, holds authority only within Edmonton, and is accountable to Edmonton City Council. No other body including the ABC has the authority to direct ECSC decisions. However, the ECSC may choose to establish relationships with other bodies that can assist with the ECSC's own organizational activities.

ECSC is undergoing a fundamental change process to a business model where the Executive Director is accountable for sound financial and operational practices (including dealing with

promoters and fighters, staff for events, working with affiliated memberships, and other administrative duties) and the Commission is responsible for all governance decisions (including decision making, policy making, strategic planning, and direction to the Executive Director). The Executive Director and Commission Members continue to work together towards this new model of effective governance and operational effectiveness.

The Executive Director and the Commission with the support of City Council and the City Administration have made significant headway in establishing the new governance and operating model. It is clear through both the documentation review and supportive interview comments by Commission Members that ECSC process and policies have improved significantly.

The ECSC is continuing to update its policies, rules and regulations to support consistent and effective governance of the Combative Sports industry within its jurisdiction, in turn supporting the interests of the City of Edmonton.

Responses to Questions asked by City Council

1. *Whether the rules and regulations approved by the Commission are being enforced as required.*

For the time period under consideration from August 4, 2009, the Rules and Regulations of the ECSC have been evolving and are being enforced as required. In 2010, there have been several occasions where the rules and regulations have been challenged by external parties to the ECSC and we can objectively conclude that they have been upheld accordingly by both the Commission and the Executive Director.

The following example demonstrates how the Commission has taken on a challenging enforcement situation:

In March 2010, the Commission Members moved, seconded and carried a motion concerning a breach of the Code of Conduct by an existing Commission Member. The Commission then moved, seconded and carried a motion to suspend this person from all business of the ECSC until such time as Council has ruled on Section 5.2(J)(v) of the Code of Conduct. Full disclosure of this occasion can be found, well documented, in the ECSC meeting minutes dated, March 8, 2010.

2. *Whether the ECSC Executive Director has the authority, within the bylaw or the rules and regulations duly approved by the Commission, to alter or revise existing rules and regulations, or create and implement new rules and regulations, without approval of the Commission.*

As per the bylaw and rules and regulations, the Executive Director *does not* have the authority within the bylaw or the rules and regulations to revise existing or create new rules or regulations without the approval of the Commission Members. We can objectively conclude that proper authorities and approvals between the Executive Director and the Commission have taken place.

In March 2010 the record shows that, the Commission passed a resolution to delegate authority to the Executive Director: to establish rules and regulations for specific respects; provide for a system of licensing; establish forms for the purpose of rules and regulations; conduct hearings for specific respects; and establish requirements for a performance bond participation fee.

In our review there has been no evidence of changes being made without Commission approval.

3. *Whether any rules or bylaws have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.*

We can objectively conclude that no rules or bylaws have been added or altered without the approval of the Commission. Specifically, many policies have been developed, reviewed, and approved by the Commission. The Commission will typically discuss a topic for consideration to add to the current rules or policy repertoire. The Executive Director will create an original draft of the policy; the Commission Members will then comment on, revise and improve it accordingly. The policy comes into effect once the Commission Members formally approve it in final form during a Commission meeting.

4. *Whether any administrative practices have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.*

We can objectively conclude that no administrative practices have been added or altered without the approval of the Commission

Specifically, administrative practices fall under the day to day operational activities and responsibilities of the Executive Director with support provided by the Community Standards Branch. The ECSC holds a unique technical mandate which influences the administrative practices. Typical administrative responsibilities include: training and support for Commission Members, hiring and training of staff to attend to various roles at events, record keeping processes (fight records, medical records, financial records, meeting minutes, etc), providing support to the Commission for Bylaw changes and facilitating licensing for promoters, officials and participants.

Commission Members are responsible for strategic planning, policy making, approval and oversight of the organization.

Two significant administrative practices have been adopted with the onset of the new Executive Director role and with the approval of the Commission. They are: the use of traceable cheques for financial transactions; and the conduct and recording of Commission Meeting minutes by Community Standards Branch staff according to Roberts Rules of Order

5. *Whether the reputable "Association of Boxing Commissions" threatened to cancel the Edmonton Commission's membership for adopting rules or regulations which they consider to be highly dangerous.*

The ECSC continues to be an associate member in good standing with the Association of Boxing Commissions. In January 2010, the President of the ABC, Mr. Tim Lueckenhoff, raised written concerns about alleged rule deviations with respect to fight rules for scheduled ECSC matches to occur in 2010. The ABC outlined the anticipated changes they had expected to be utilized which would have created a compliance concern for the ABC. The ABC provided the ECSC with an opportunity to address this concern in person at their annual conference held in New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, July 17-22, 2010, which they have done. Attached is a signed certificate of the ECSC's membership in good standing with the ABC as of July 21, 2010 (Appendix E). Also attached are copy of the original letter of concern dated January 20, 2010 (Appendix D) and corresponding minutes from an ABC closed meeting (dated July 17-22, 2010) at which the ABC addressed and dismissed the said concerns (Appendix F).

In the case of the ABC concerns: the concern noted in the question is invalid as the relationship between ECSC and the ABC is robust and strong. Any concerns regarding this relationship that may have existed were based on miscommunications between many parties. The ECSC has

developed a supportive partnership with ABC. The ECSC has looked to the ABC for guidance and support. In turn, the ECSC has provided the ABC with reciprocal support and guidance. Both parties have demonstrated this mutual respect through a sharing of practices, policies, and rules, knowledge and understanding at both the Executive and the membership levels.

During interviews with ECS Commission Members, the relationship between the ECSC and the ABC was described positively, including comments describing the relationship as: “functional, cooperative and collaborative”, “good and productive relationship with no concerns”, “incredible”.

4. CONCLUSION & GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Conclusion

Following our review process, and as further elaborated below, we objectively conclude that, with respect to the five (5) questions being asked of Council, the ECSC and its Executive Director have conducted themselves in a fair manner and in accordance with approval processes and administrative practices of the Commission.

The ECSC continues to evolve and move towards a much more formalized and accountable governance and operating model, and states a continued intent to incorporate further constructive changes.

General Observations

Throughout the independent review process we acknowledge the degree of work that has taken place to get the ECSC to where it is today - to a place that demonstrates more formalized and accountable business practices. While much has been done it is understood that there is still more work to come. As is Sierra Systems practice on many projects, we have gathered some general observations along the way that we provide to the City and the ECSC for future consideration

Based on our general observations we have identified the following areas where further enhancement and improvement should be pursued.

1. **Financial Policies & Procedures**

Historically the ECSC utilized undocumented cash transactions. The Commission transactions are now planned and purposeful. With the onset of the new operational roles of the Executive Director and Commission procedures, cheques are now being used for financial transactions to help track expenditures and collect information that will help to create a budget. The goal is to align the ECSC financial processes with those of the City, although the “after hours” nature of events and the limited ECSC staff complement create challenges. A budget has now been developed and will soon be presented to City Council. While there is currently no specific ECSC financial policy in place, the ECSC is trying to align ECSC practices with those of the City of Edmonton. There is an inherent challenge in that the ECSC is a “round the clock” business that frequently deals with on-site financial transactions.

The Finance and Treasury Department of the City of Edmonton and the Community Standards Branch have been working on developing and establishing effective and appropriate financial processes and controls for the Combative Sports Commission. The implementation of these changes is a joint effort involving the Executive Director of the ECSC and the Manager and staff of the Community Standards Branch of the Planning and Development Department. This work started in 2009 and the objective is to create adequate controls and processes that ensure proper separation of duties exists. This work is ongoing.

Council may wish to consider recommending further City Administration support to ECSC in order to support their efforts in creating well defined financial processes.

2. **Administrative Policy**

The ECSC should consider development of an “Administrative Policy” for tasks that include the processes required to administer or manage: medical records, fight records, financial records, documentation storage, etc. so that the responsibilities of the various parties involved are specifically described.

3. **Internal Communications Policy**

The ECSC should consider development of formal processes to monitor and manage the Executive Director’s performance of his duties. The ECSC should also develop a formal mechanism whereby individual Commission members can raise (and have addressed in a timely fashion) concerns about operational matters that they may observe. The ECSC may also wish to consider a process to drive continuous improvement such as a formalized “lessons learned” process.

4. **Jurisdictional Policy**

There is a requirement for clarity and formal definition by the ECSC of which parties (i.e. Executive Director, Commission Members, ECSC Event Staff, City of Edmonton, and contractual resources) are responsible in which geographic jurisdictions.

An example of where this could apply might involve a request from another municipality for services from Edmonton’s Commission that would provide for the requesting community to host a combative sports event. While the ECSC members, the Executive Director and the Community Standards Branch are clear about their own responsibilities and authority (in Edmonton alone) – many other parties involved do not appear to have similar clarity of understanding

5. **New Commission Member Orientation Policy**

A complete orientation manual is required and should outline what information and experiences are required of a new Commission Member in order that he/she could perform his/her duties as expected.

6. **Meeting Minutes**

A process of status reporting on follow up action items within the meeting and minute taking process should be adopted. The follow up mechanism should indicate what task has been assigned, to whom and an expected completion date. The follow up mechanism would allow for regular status review during subsequent Commission meetings to highlight progress as well as outstanding items.

Closing Remarks

It has been a pleasure to work with the ECSC and the City of Edmonton Administration in carrying out the independent review of the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission. We trust our processes, findings, and conclusions provide the City with a meaningful resolution to this inquiry. Sierra Systems would be happy to discuss our findings or answer any questions you may have.

Appendix A. Documents Reviewed

- A. The City of Edmonton Bylaw 14308, Boxing, Wrestling and other Combative Sports Bylaw., Consolidated on November 24, 2009
- B. ECSC Policies on:
 - a. Drug Testing (April 2010),
 - b. Event License Issuance Criteria (March 2010),
 - c. Approval Dates From Multiple Event Requests on the Same Date (March 2010),
 - d. Medical (March 2010),
 - e. Code of Conduct and Policy on Conflicts of Interest (Policy 1-1, October 19, 2007) and
 - f. Approving New MMA Rules or Modification of Accepted Rules for Combative Events (January 31, 2010).
- C. The City of Edmonton Combative Sports Commission Rules, Regulations, and Operating Procedures, dated February 2009, March 22, 2010 & June 2010).
- D. Correspondence between Pat Reid (ECSC Executive Director) and the Association of Boxing Commissions from September 2009 through to June 29, 2010.
- E. Association of Boxing Commissions findings
 - a. Attachment of letter from the ABC dated January 20, 2010 indicating the ABC's concerns with the ECSC.
 - b. Valid ABC Certificate of Associate membership for the ECSC showing that the ECSC is a member in good standing (July 21, 2010).
 - c. Copies of the ABC Meeting Minutes as they relate to the ECSC and the corresponding review, dated July 17-22, 2010.
- F. Listing of Technical Advisors to the Executive Director for 2010.
- G. Statutory Declarations for Commission members of 2009 and 2010
- H. Job Description for the ECSC Executive Director as provided by the City of Edmonton, August 19, 2010.
- I. ECSC Meeting Minutes for the following dates:
 - 2009 – August 17, September 14, September 28, November 2, November 9, November 30 and December 14
 - 2010 – January 11, January 31, February 8, March 8, April 12, April 28, and May 10.
- J. Financial Documentation titled: ECSC Master Data 2010.xls, September 21, 2010.
- K. ECSC Document titled "RESOLUTION" for delegation of authority resolution March 2010

Appendix B. Key Stakeholders

The following individuals were interviewed with the Interview Protocol (Appendix C).

A. Commission Members:

- a) Mr. Sid Bennett
- b) Mr. Owen Dawkins
- c) Mr. Ron Goltz
- d) Mr. Mark Grotski
- e) Dr. Bryan Hogeveen
- f) Mr. Vang Ioannides

B. Mr. Tim Lueckenhoff; President of the Association of Boxing Commissions.

Appendix C. Interview Protocol



**The City of Edmonton
Edmonton Combative Sports Commission (ECSC)
Internal Review**

**Commission Member Interviews
Interview Protocol**

Project Objectives

To address the questions pertaining to the operations of the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission brought forward by Edmonton City council, the purpose of the project is to provide an independent and transparent review of the current operations of the ECSC specifically to answer the following questions:

- Whether the rules and regulations approved by the Commission are being enforced as required.
- Whether the ECSC Executive Director has the authority, within the bylaw or the rules and regulations duly approved by the Commission, to alter or revise existing rules and regulations, or create and implement new rules and regulations, without approval of the Commission.
- Whether any rules or bylaws have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.
- Whether any administrative practices have been added or altered without approval of the Commission.
- Whether the reputable "Association of Boxing Commissions" threatened to cancel the Edmonton Commission's membership for adopting rules or regulations which they consider to be highly dangerous.

Commission Member Interview Objectives

The purpose of interviewing members of the Commission is to:

- Understand each Commission Member's perspective of how Commission rules, regulations, policies, and procedures are being developed, reviewed, revised, approved, and eventually applied within the Commission.
- Gather the Commission's feedback on how general administrative practices have been carried out to date.
- Understand the Commission Member's perspective on the American Boxing Commission's (ABC) position with respect to the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission.
- Gather feedback on Commission Member's overall understanding of their role and responsibilities as a Commission Member.



Commission Member Interview Questions

Background Questions

1. What prompted you to become a Commission Member and how long have you been a Commission Member?
2. Have you read and do you understand the following documents:
 - a) Rules, Regulations and Operating Procedures
 - b) By Law 14308
 - c) Code of Conduct and Policy on Conflict of Interest
3. What were your expectations coming into the Commission, in terms of your role and responsibilities as it related to the general operations of the Commission?
4. Have your expectations been met through your Commission experience to date? Are there still areas that are unclear to you or areas that you'd like to see the Commission enhance?
5. How would you describe your overall level of understanding of your role, responsibilities, and accountabilities as a Commission Member?
6. Please describe your understanding of the Commission Terms of Reference, specifically:
 - a) What are the roles, responsibilities, and scope of authority of Commission members?
 - b) What are the roles, responsibilities, and scope of authority of the Executive Director?

For those interviewees with tenure greater than 1 year

Please describe your perspective on where the Commission was 2 years ago and where the ECSC is today, with respect to operations, governance and administrative practices

What, if any, are the key differences in being involved with the ECSC now as opposed to then?

Please describe your evaluation of changes to the Commission over the past two years?

What are the greatest enhancements issues and risks (if any) that have been addressed over the past two years? How have Commission Members played a direct role in these achievements?

Commission Member Perspective on ECSC Rules and Regulations

1. Considering the Rules, Regulations, and Operating Procedures that were recently developed, to what extent was the Commission involved in their finalization and approval?
2. Was your level of involvement consistent with your understanding of your role as a Commission member? (e.g. Did the Executive Director inform and engage the Commission at the appropriate points in order to obtain proper approvals?)
3. To what extent do you feel the ECSC rules and regulations are being enforced or applied today?
4. What is your understanding of the Executive Director's authority to alter or revise existing rules and regulations? Create and implement new rules or regulations? (E.g. Does the Executive Director require approval from the Commission to finalize and enforce such rules and regulations?)



5. To the best of your knowledge, has the Executive Director altered, revised existing rules or regulations, and/or created or implemented new rules or regulations without the approval of the Commission? From your perspective, do you know of any rules or by laws that have been added or altered without the approval of the Commission? If so, which ones?
6. Do you know of any time that the Commission approval process has been overstepped, or that decisions are being made without the input of the Commission?

ECSC Administrative Practices

1. Please describe your experience of the orientation process for new Commission Members? How are Commission Members oriented to ensure consistent understanding of roles, responsibilities, scope of authority?
2. Upon approval to become an ECSC member, did you sign a Conflict of Interest Form?
3. Are you aware of the circumstances for which the Conflict of Interest form is necessary for the ECSC?
4. As a Commission Member, please describe current administrative practices and/or policies that are in place that relate to administrative management; specifically records management, financial reporting, budgeting, etc.
5. What enhancements can be made to improve upon current administrative practices?
 - a) What would be the Commission's role?
 - b) What would be the Executive Director's role?
6. Please describe any administrative practices that may have been added or altered without the approval of the Commission?

Association of Boxing Commissions

1. As per Question (5) being asked of Council, please describe your understanding of the statement: "...the reputable "Association of Boxing Commissions" threatened to cancel the Edmonton Commissions membership for adopting rules or regulations which they consider to be highly dangerous."
2. How would you describe the ECSC's relationship with the ABC?
3. Do you have any concerns regarding the ECSC's relationship with ABC?

Closing

Thank you for your time and input into the review process. Please be assured that individual interview comments will not be reported and will be treated as confidential. Aggregate responses only will be reported. Should you have any further comments or questions, please feel free to contact Michelle Farmer at (780) 401-2794 or michellefarmer@sierrasystems.com

Appendix D. Letter from the Association of Boxing Commissions, January 2010

President
Tim Lueckenhoff
 3806 Missouri Blvd
 Jefferson City, MO. 65109
 (573) 751-0243
 tim.lueckenhoff@pr.mo.gov

1st Vice President
Jim Erickson
 777 Lady Luck Drive
 Hinckley, MN 55037
 (320) 394-4941
 jericson2@prcasinos.com



2nd Vice President
Greg Sirb
 2601 North 3rd Street
 Harrisburg, PA 17110
 (717) 787-5720
 gsirb@etato.pa.us

Secretary
Joe Miller
 1000 NE 10th St., Rm. 1213
 Oklahoma City, OK. 73117-1299
 (405) 271-9444 Ext. 57992
 joe@health.ok.gov

Treasurer
Buddy Embanato
 P.O. Box 13126
 Monroe, LA 71213
 (318) 362-4529
 embanato@ccmcast.net

January 20, 2010

Pat Reid, Executive Director
 Edmonton Combative Sports Commission
 Post Office Box 82079
 RPO Yellowbird
 Edmonton, AB Canada T6J 7E6

RE: Mixed Martial Arts "DREAM" Rules

Dear Mr. Reid:

The Association of Boxing Commission, (ABC) to which the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission holds an associate membership is in receipt of a press release which you confirmed the use of the "DREAM" [Mixed Martial Arts] rules during five events regulated by your combative sports commission to be held in calendar year 2010.

This correspondence shall place the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission on notice that the ABC is not in support of these drastic changes to the Unified Rules of Mixed Martial Arts adopted by the ABC.

Below is a summary of the approved changes to the Unified Rules of Mixed Martial Arts implemented by the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission, which deviates from the ABC recommended rules:

- Knee strikes to the head of a downed/grounded opponent are legal.
- Gi and shoes can be worn during a bout.
- Two rounds will be utilized, the first being ten minutes and the second round lasting five minutes.
- Bouts will be judged on their entirety, no ten-point must system will be used.

- Kicks to the head of a downed/grounded opponent are legal when both fighters are down/grounded.
- These changes are new to officials as well as contestants. Both have been trained for the current unified rules which have been in place in many North American jurisdictions for several years.
- There has been no report of any studies done on these rule changes regarding interviewing, contestants, physicians, officials and other involved in the profession prior to the drastic changes in the rules.

As you know, the ABC prior to suggesting changes to the unified rules of mixed martial arts developed a committee which studied changes for entire year. Numerous individuals in the sport provided written feedback regarding suggested changes. Numerous hours of study was done by the committee along with debate over rule changes on several conference calls. The Edmonton Combative Sports Commission appears to be disregarding this research and the importance of uniformity.

The ABC would like to remind the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission that Associate Members are held to the same standards as Full Members pursuant to the ABC Code of Ethics. Members should:

- Adhere to the principles and guidelines of the ABC;
- Display actions that are a credit to combative sports;
- Avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; and
- Uphold and enforce all suspensions and revocation at all times.

The ABC strongly encourages the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission to reverse its changes to the unified rules of mixed martial arts.

Sincerely,

Timothy J. Lueckenhoff
President

C: ABC Compliance Committee

Appendix E. Association of Boxing Commissions Certificate of ECSC Membership (July, 2010)



Appendix F. Association of Boxing Commissions, Minutes of a Closed Meeting held July 2010



**ANNUAL CONFERENCE
July 17 - 22, 2010
ROYAL SONESTA HOTEL
300 BOURBON STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA**

Closed Meeting Minutes July 19, 2010

**Bernie Profato (OH) made a motion to close the forum and go into Closed Session
Bill Colbert (UT) seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.**

Disciplinary Committee Report Edmonton Commission

Vang Ioannides, Chairman of the Edmonton Commission and Pat Reid, Executive Director gave a synopsis of the event regulated by Edmonton that deviated from the unified rules and the reasons why it deviated and steps taken to correct it. The current administration took over in January and the previous administration was the one who actually issued the permit for the February show, in accordance with the rules of the Commission, which at the time, had allowance for rules besides the unified rules. In the end the promoter got approval to use only 4 "Dream" rules besides the unified rules: i.e.: 10 minute rounds, full event scoring, knees to head of a grounded opponent and kicks to the head of a grounded opponent). Approximately 600 spectators attended the event and there were 6 first round stoppages and no serious injuries. The Edmonton Commission has since amended their rules to say that unified rules must be followed. The promoter was fined for having a disorganized event. The promoter currently is not allowed to promote in Edmonton. (The Edmonton Commission is an affiliate member in good standing with the ABC.)

Appendix G. Relationships and Responsibilities

Sierra Systems has developed the graphic below to provide a simple illustration of the roles and relationship of the City of Edmonton and the Edmonton Combative Sports Commission (ECSC).

The ECSC is a creation of City Council, is governed by City Bylaw and has jurisdiction only within City boundaries. The creation of the Commission allows for combative sport “prize fighting” to be conducted within Edmonton, as regulated by the Commission. Without such a Commission in place a combative sports “prize fight” would be in conflict with the Criminal Code of Canada.

City Administration and the Community Standards Branch provide capacity for Council to facilitate and support the ECSC, its Executive Director and the Commission Members.

The ECSC Executive Director reports to the Commission and is a paid employee of the City of Edmonton (Community Standards Branch). The Executive Director manages daily operations of the ECSC and its corresponding events, as well as supporting the governance processes of the Commission. ECSC Members are volunteers who have applied to and been appointed by City Council to govern the Commission and oversee the Executive Director’s management of ECSC operations.

