

# Target Shooting New Zealand Inc



## New Zealand Shooting Federation Report

As NZSF rep this portion of my report is difficult and lengthy, but have based my comments only on the documented facts. There are two main issues that I have undertaken to fight for, both of which I wouldn't be discussing now except for an unsolicited report being circulated that now needs my comment.

Explanation; NZSF is made up of Chairman, Treasurer, SDM and one representative from each affiliate who have the voting power of, NRA 1, PNZ, CTNZ and TSNZ 2 each, with the chairman having a deciding vote only if required. The SDM and Treasurer are paid employees not entitled to vote but must follow the instructions of the board, as must the Chairman.

During the course of the last two years, I have had issues with the board and the dysfunctional aspect of this organization, proven beyond all doubt over the Olympic selection fiasco and just recently the Commonwealth games selection documentation.

### (1) Appealed the Olympic nomination against NZSF/NZOC and won, why?

SDM failed to nominate the athlete as instructed, failed to clarify scores and placing's relevant to the "Olympic Context" as stipulated in the criteria, failed to "signify the variability of the scores to the NZOC selectors clearly, (a material factor) and failure to stress the importance of Internationally obtained qualifying scores relative to "Olympic Context".

Used ranking list obtained from World Cup/World Champ which is not articulate in the NZSF criteria or relevant to the required "Olympic Context".

NZOC declined athlete, based on incorrect information supplied (all documented thru NZOC correspondence) NZSF then turned their back on the highest qualified athlete within the Olympic Criteria and against the discipline who held the quota as per NZSF portion of the criteria.

If NZSF had submitted all the correct information as should have been expected in support of our athlete, then an appeal would not have been necessary.

Simple explanation, if I hadn't been on the NZSF board, had a complete understanding of the criteria, already completed the calculations (prior to 28<sup>th</sup> May NZSF meeting) that proved our athlete had qualified in the top sixteen/ potential top eight as required, not one person in TSNZ, including our athletes, would have known that NZSF failed due diligence that would have completed a miscarriage of justice to our only qualified athlete. This was the very reason I stated (28<sup>th</sup> May meeting) that I would take NZSF to the sports tribunal myself if they tried to transfer quota. It has taken eighteen months for NZSF to refuse a mediation request from our athlete.

An unsolicited report suggested that the athlete take his appeal costs on the chin, even though documentation proves unequivocally that NZSF failed this athlete.

SDM statement 10<sup>3</sup> July, Quote, "the process we have just been through has to have been the biggest waste of time and resources (let alone the stress on all concerned) I have seen in this sport. As a sport in whole, we can never allow this to happen again. Unquote.

He complains, yet he was the instigator of supplying incorrect supporting information. The SDM has already stated on two occasions at NZSF executive meetings, Quote, "given the same situation, I would do the same again with regards the selection process" Unquote.  
Extraordinary!

## (2) Appealed on the Commonwealth Games criteria and won, why?

NZSF's Failure to document the correct procedure to clarify the number of match's in conducted events. I requested additional items to be installed in the criteria but was told by SDM, NZOC refused further input into our criteria document. NZSF then allowed NZOC lawyers to document criteria who have very little knowledgeable understanding of our sport, what other information given by our SDM through phone calls is unknown. My request for a clarification was simply for the athletes to know that the criteria was being followed, meticulously without fear or favour as should be expected.

On this particular issue I received no support from other members of board except accusations that I would benefit personally. This clearly shows this board have little understanding of, not only the criteria they are responsible for, but due process. It has taken four months for NZSF to arrive at a decision, absolutely unacceptable to any athletes, and still not posted (at time of writing) on NZSF website so all athletes are informed.

Another unsolicited report states that athletes always 'assumed' that only the first match counted and that this was the "intent" of the wording in the criteria. Let me paraphrase, while drafting the original criteria before NZOC took over, no documented programs produced, no discussion on multi matches, therefore, no "intent". Assumption is not part of these documented criteria. Further comment that all disciplines have equal events is only partially correct, I suggest they look up the word "event" in the dictionary, and I Quote, "event (esp. sport) item in programme, unquote. "Events" are clearly documented in the criteria. Further comment that "multi Events" and "score of interest" have been documented within this Com Games or any other recent criteria is in fact, incorrect. This shows clearly the author of the unsolicited report is clearly misinformed with only a narrow personal viewpoint.

General suggestions from these unsolicited reports are, that I' as ISSF delegate representing our athletes and that the TSNZ executive have no right to challenge NZSF on any matter that pertain to our athletes, that we ignore past mistakes and allow the NZSF to move on so they are not bought into disrepute in the public eye, and ignore our athlete's interests, all because I may have "a conflict of Interest". Comment In regard Com Games criteria and "I quote", 'complainants about the need to include extra score are the ones who will benefit from a decision to include them', of course all athletes expect accurate due process to be followed within the criteria. How forthright, ignore the facts, allow NZSF to continue making mistakes that could affect other athlete's dreams and aspirations that could deny them the highest honour they can achieve in this sport. My comments are based on fact, not assumptions, hypothetical claptrap or on retrospective thoughts and ideas.

After fifteen years involvement with NZSF, I personally find suggestions from these unsolicited reports absolutely abhorrent

I have on the desk in front of me (only) two of many documents in support of the two

athletes involved with the Olympic nomination process sent to NZOC by NZSF, and I challenge anyone in this room to read sometime and then tell me who has "conflict of interest". Bearing in mind these were stated as "not being for public view" by SDM in telephone conference with QC, but were sent to NZOC in support of athlete nominations. There has been a very notable lack of documentation from NZSF board, answers to many queries being documented without questions being recorded to coincide with those answers, phone calls are not a requisite to important issues, we have no idea what has been asked of NZOC, lawyers or any other important departments related to our sport, and I believe this allows a connotation of perceived 'Conflict or Bias' whichever is relevant.

Let me reiterate to this AGM, as your delegate to NZSF my role has been, and still is, and always will be, while I am involved, controlled by two factors;

- (1) To make sure your investment of \$10,000 plus GST is used according to the NZSF Constitution and that our organization is represented in the best possible light domestically and internationally and that NZSF is held accountable, unreservedly.*
- (2) To make sure that our athletes have the correct and full support of NZSF, meticulously, without fear or / favour.*

QUITE FRANKLY I DO NOT CARE WHETHER OUR ATHLETE'S NAME'S ARE LINDSAY, JENNA, SALLY OR RYAN TO NAME A FEW, I WILL FIGHT TO BRING THE NZSF TO TASK FOR ANY ANOMALY THAT EFFECTS OUR ATHLETES, FROM THIS STATEMENT, I WILL NEVER DEVIATE, "PERIOD".

No TSNZ athlete has received any peg grants in the last three years, even though Jenna and Ryan both achieved internationally, but shotgun did thru a non ISSF event. I received a comment exactly three years ago from Sport NZ GM that NZSF is dysfunctional and argued against his comment as we were in a rebuilding phase; however I now withdraw my rebuttal as he has proven to be correct. TSNZ commit \$10,000 annually, we have received some funding, but only thru normal NZOC and Sport NZ thru their own funding initiatives and most too Youth, Coaching and Olympic programmes, none whatsoever thru NZSF's SDM's contractual obligations,(except some instigated by others) for our internationally representative athletes.

After our 2<sup>nd</sup> September meeting and the tirade of emotional abuse I received, I fail to have any confidence in the current NZSF board whatsoever while they continue down this path. I don't, and never will trust NZSF again to administer the international support roll in the best interest of our athletes until we have an independent SDM and Chairman.

Consequently I am no longer available to be a board member as of today, as I am not prepared to continue wasting my precious time on a dysfunctional unit that clearly do not have the interests of our international athletes in sight, even while they sit on \$420,000 of assets, but of course no funding for our international athletes. Disappointingly, this simply means that our athletes will not have the fighting support they are entitled to. However that is not my call. Executive member Robbie Gilchrist has been involved with NZSF for the past twelve months and will be our NZSF representative from this date forward.

*Grant Taylor*