IHACT Hockey Handbook 2026 – Comments Received on Draft Document **7 April 2026**

ID	Comment	IHACT Response
1	2.6 Forfeits - Can the player number be reduced from 10 for women's to potentially 8 as a minimum number.	XREf: 23, 41, 55 Multiple numbers have been suggested for this. Current RoE states 10 so was carried across. Section 2.6 amended to align with IIHF Rules. Section 5.1 amended to align with this change.
2	4.3 Team Restrictions - Currently states players cannot move between teams in a grade and cannot play for another team as a substitute. - Can we please relax for women's to allow subs between teams	XRef: 35 Agreed as no other league to draw on for subs. Section 4.3 amended
3	5.2 Substitutions - Currently only able to substitute to a higher grade – see comments above.	Only applies to players who are fully registered. If register as a sub can play in that grade. Women's League exception now created Section 4.3 amended
4	To start, I wanted to ask whether the handbook is intended to be reviewed annually. Establishing a regular review schedule would help ensure the information stays relevant and continues to reflect the evolving needs of our organisation.	XRef: 61 Intent is to review as required. Do not want to hard code a time in the document as that is too restrictive for a volunteer organisation. Could put intent to review and an outline process of who to involve. New Section 1.3 Added
5	Another point relates to the absence of the Pirates in the handbook. Although the focus is primarily on the D, C, and B grade teams, the Pirates are closely affiliated with IHACT and hold an MOU with IHACT. Including them would paint a more complete picture of the association structure and acknowledge their ongoing contributions.	This documents hockey competitions administered by IHACT, not individual teams. Plus Pirates play in IHNSW comp independent from this. Could potentially provide reference, but the arrangements are covered by MOU and should not be replicated
6	I also suggest adding a section that outlines IHACT's operational structure, including a list of board members and all relevant positions. This addition would clarify governance arrangements and help both new and existing members understand the club's internal roles and responsibilities.	That is covered by Constitution which is referenced. Information should not be repeated in governance to avoid potential inconsistencies when updates are done.
7	Furthermore, it would be valuable to include information about our annual awards, such as the Senator Margaret Reid Shiel, Norm Holby Award, Dick Thompson Award, and Bear McPhail Award. Highlighting	Agreed this is a good inclusion, serves as reminder to get these organised too New Section 11 added

	these recognitions would not only celebrate exceptional contributions but also reinforce a sense of tradition and appreciation within our club.	
8	Lastly, I recommend specifying in the handbook the maximum penalty minutes that a player or team may accumulate before facing suspension or being referred to tribunal. This area has been ambiguous in the past, and clear guidelines would promote transparency and consistency in the enforcement of rules.	XRef: 51 Was removed for inclusion in separate, more complete disciplinary Policy. As that is not yet ready I will put back in for this year, with note that it would be superseded by any Disciplinary Policy New Section 7.6 added
9	1.3 - The senior delegate has a very big role, perhaps each grade needs a coordinator/manager who is responsible for drafts, record keeps etc	X Ref: 31 Has been mooted in the past, reality is that people never volunteered for it and SD ended up doing it anyway. SD has the authority to appoint any assistants like this they wish in any case.
10	1.3 (re grade committee): who actually is this? is this an official delegate from each team?	X Ref: 31 Currently operates as all team managers. Suggest include this point. Explanation added in table
11	2.1 - If this is the highest level then why is it B grade not A grade?	Historically there was an A Grade, now defunct. Leaves space for it if ever wanted to return.
12	2.1 (re junior team in C Grade) - This will no longer be the case from next season so suggest removing	X Ref: 27 But it is for this season so has to stay. If Phoenix move then it can be deleted
13	2.1 re D Grade stating for male and female: why do you need to state that this is for female and male players when this is the case across all B,C and D?	Earlier had this for all grades, internal review suggested removing from all as it is a default. Missed deleting here in edit. Will be removed Section 2.1 amended
14	2.2 re scheduling - league on 1 night of the week were possible. Otherwise you risk loosing people from the sport when games are played on all different days of the week	Can put in some points about scheduling intent, but reality of available ice time does not allow this. Section 2.2 amended
15	2.3 - This should outline what the forfeit will be I.e. 5-0 loss	X Ref 17 Good point. Added to Section 2.3 as 3-0 loss
16	2.5 re reduction in game time - Strongly disagree with this statement. This could have a drastic effect on a game and there should be a focus on games running on time rather than this penalty	There has to be a mechanism where a game is running over does not unduly punish following games. Things like injuries etc can impact game time and need to be compensated for. Focus is on running to time though (hence the no clock rule)

17	2.6 - As mentioned above this should outline what a forfeit is i.e. 5-0 loss	X Ref 15. Good point. Added to Section 2.3 as 3-0 loss
18	2.7 - First there should be an attempt by the senior delegate to reschedule the game.	X Ref: 34 Can put some words about trying to reschedule, but in reality the limitations of ice time do not allow it generally, hence s required to be clearly communicated as the outcome. Sentence added to Section 2.7
19	3.2 - Why does every team need to have a coach? if they have juniors on the team then they should however teams should not be forced to have a coach	X Ref: 42, 57 This was in the current RoE and carried across. Happy to remove if current community wishes Section 3.5 amended to recommend but not require coaches
20	3.6 - What do these payments cover? this could be a sub section. such as IHA insurance, administration costs etc.	Will be covered by payments policy, also explained on website and on ESD when signing up. Do not propose to include here.
21	3.6 - This section should clearly outline what the fees will be this handbook should be reviewed every year and these can be revised. Fees should be transparent to all members.	No. Adding information like this makes the entire document obsolete if not updated for some reason. This is to be communicated separately each year. This is a Policy document, not a season guide.
22	4.4 re not moving back to D Grade - This does not work! There has been numerous occasions where players have come up to C grade and then they are dropped by their team because they are not at the level. By having this rule you stop them from being able to play after they are dropped	XRef: 28, 32, 50, 75, 83 Agreed need to consider case of C Graders being dropped. Will be re-written Section 4.4 amended. Section 6.6 amended
23	5.1 - how many players must you be down to, to be allowed to use subs? to allow for progression this should be 14 (inc goalie) as this allows teams to utalise subs from lower grades more ofter giving subs more of a chance	X Ref: 1, 41, 55 Section 2.6 amended to align with IIHF Rules. Section 5.1 amended to align with this change.
24	6.1 Item 4 - what if people are unable to attend? can they still register and advise the grade committee?	Previously had provision for alternative arrangements, this will be added New item added to Section 6.1 to address.
25	6.1 Item 6 - This is overstepping quite a bit, the teams can assess the level of skill as they would pick players that would best help their team	Reflects current issues where players have skill levels very different from the league intent and norms, and some are reluctant to move. Would only be used in extreme circumstances, mostly would naturally be done by teams.
26	6.1 Item 9 - This is confusing this makes it sound like it will be 2 different draft dates which does not make any sense	Will clarify. Intent is that teams needing a goalie are not unduly affected in selecting skaters

		Clarified in Section 6.1
27	6.4 re Phoenix - This team will be removed from next season so this section should not be included. Additionally these junior players will develop far quicker if mixed into the senior teams rather than having an all junior team.	X Ref: 12 They are there for this season so will stay. If Phoenix move, then can be deleted.
28	6.6 - So if players are dropped and they potentially miss out because there is too many new players. Preference should not be given to new players. New players should all be guaranteed a spot on a team as a entry league if they are deemed suitable level. it should be the responsibility of the IHACT board to ensure that all players entering the sport have a place this may require entering a new team not impacting any players dropping a grade.	X Ref: 22, 32, 50, 75, 83 Agreed need to consider case of C Graders being dropped. Will be re-written. Note limits on ice time availability severely limit flexibility, not possible to simply add a team whenever needed. Section 4.4 amended. Section 6.6 amended
29	6.6 re preference to male players in D-Grade - This is a absolutely absurd rule and is completely discriminatory! I understand that overpopulation is an issue however this shows a need for more teams not a restriction on women. As discrimination against women something like this has the grounds to be taken further such as the human rights commission. I highly recommend this ridiculous rule be removed! Playing in the league is part of the development of womens players as they move up in the senior divisions.	This is a current rule in the RoE and was carried across as intent in this Draft was to not make wholesale changes without consultation and let the community direct change. We agree with you, and the section has been deleted. Section 6.6 amended
30	7.1 re slap shots in womens - THIS IS NO TRUE!! womens league allows slapshots and it is a skill that many women can do very well!	XRef: 39, 84 Agreed (copying error). Section 7.1 amended
31	**Section 1.3** There is mention of the Grade Coordinator leading the Grade Committee, but there is no Grade Coordinator role within this document. I also couldn't find this role within the IHACT Organisation Structure or Board – though there does appear to be 4 league coordinator positions (People- TBD) listed on IHACT board page: https://ihact.org.au/ihact_board/ . There are also no details on who else makes up the Grade Committee. Clarification is therefore required.	X Ref: 9, 10 Currently operates as all team managers. Suggest include clarification. Historically volunteers for coordinators have been scarce Description added in the table
32	Clarification is needed around the definitions of "grade" and "league." My understanding is that the Women's League and the Junior League operate separately from the graded leagues (B, C, and D). The current wording has implications for several other sections of the document—	XRef: 22, 28, 50, 75, 83 Generally used interchangeably in this draft, but agree should be consistent. Will review on completion of content.

	particularly Section 4.4—because it appears to contradict current practice. At present, there are women who participate both in the Women's League and in other graded leagues. While some play in different positions (e.g., skater in one and goalie in another), there are also players who participate in the same position across both leagues. I strongly support the Women's League; however, because it does not contain internal "graded" tiers, there are limited pathways for skill progression within that league alone. For this reason, many women seek development opportunities by also playing in the graded leagues and value the opportunity to play in both. Given this context, statements in Section 4.4 appear inconsistent with both current practice and the intent to encourage participation and development for women players. Statements from 4.4 for consideration in relation to Section 2.1 • *A senior player may only play in one grade within any 12 month period. No senior player may play in more than one senior grade at the same time.* • *A player may play as a skater in one grade and a goalie in another, providing they meet the skill requirements for both roles in both grades. They may not then substitute at all in the lower grade.* These statements imply that a senior player is restricted to a single **grade** within the graded system, except when playing different positions. However, since the Women's League is not structured as a graded system, it is unclear whether these restrictions are intended to apply to players who participate in both a women's competition and a graded competition in the *same* position. Clarifying whether the Women's League is considered a "grade" for the purposes of Section 4.4 would prevent misinterpretation and ensure the regulations reflect current participation pathways.	Will look at re-drafting to consider Women's league position and these points. Section 4.4 amended to address points on female players
33	**2.4 Finals structure**	Not intended to amend finals format this year.

	It is suggested that the grand final include a 5-minute sudden death overtime (perhaps even 3-on-3 format) rather than going directly to a shoot-out. The timeslots for these games are 1.5hrs which should allow sufficient time for this to occur. It is also recommended to remove the penalty shoot-out statement requiring each player to shot and amend to algin with the IIHF rule regarding tie-breaking shoot-out. Statement from Handbook related to penalty shoot-out: • *No player may take more than 1 shot until all players have had 1 shot, and so on for subsequent rounds if required.* IIHF Rule: • *If the score is still tied after all shots are taken by each team, the procedure shall continue with a "tiebreak shoot-out", using the same or new Players. The team that shot second in the first five Penalty Shot will start first in the "tie-break shots". The game shall be finished as soon as a duel of two Players brings the decisive result. The same Player can be used for each shot by a team in the "tie-break shoot-out".*	Shootout procedure is consistent with current RoE
34	**Section 2.7 Cancellations** It is suggested to amend the clause related to cancelled games as in some instances these have been rescheduled. Current wording: *Games may be cancelled in any league due to circumstances outside of IHACT control, such as rink availability, maintenance issues or availability of officials.* *In the event of a cancellation, both teams will be awarded 1 point. Cancelled games will not be rescheduled.* Suggested revision: Games may be cancelled in any league due to circumstances outside of IHACT control, such as rink availability, maintenance issues or availability of officials.	X Ref: 18 Can put some words about trying to reschedule, but in reality the limitations of ice time do not allow it generally, hence s required to be clearly communicated as the outcome. Section 2.7 amended

	In the event of a cancellation, an attempt to reschedule the game will be made; however, if this is not feasible for any reason, both teams will be awarded 1 point.	
35	**Section 4.3** *A player may only play for one team within a grade. They may not play for another team in that grade as a substitute.* In the past there were some instances where in the women's league players/goalies have played as a substitute for another team within the same league. There may need to be further consideration of this section as in some instances there may not be sufficient people on the sub list. If this clause is to be enforced, it may be worth adding an exception to this clause for goalies, where there are often limited number of goalies and instances were individuals on the sub list would not be available.	X Ref: 2 Agreed as no other league to draw on for subs. Also added goalie qualification in the event there aren't enough. Section 4.3 amended
36	**Section 4.8** There is reference to a IHACT Playing Up/Down Policy; however, there is no such document on the IHACT website – if this document exists than a link should be provided within Handbook. Otherwise, this section likely needs rewording.	Policy exists, will upload
37	**Section 4.10 and 5.1** Can we please use suitable ice hockey terms 😊 Updated terms for table in 4.10: **Playing** instead of fielding **Game** instead of match Revised wording in 5.10: A team may field play with a maximum of 6 Substitutes in any match game. If a team cannot meet the minimum numbers to meet the ice with only 6 Substitutes they will be deemed to have forfeited the match game.	Will update Section 4.10 amended Section 5.1 amended
38	**Section 6.3 Returning Players** *A player may be placed on a team's initial returning players roster if they played for that team in either of the 2 previous seasons, and otherwise meet the eligibility requirements of this document.*	Outside of 2 season window they go through draft. Will review wording for clarity Section 6.3 amended

	Recommend there be clarification on what happens if someone exceed the 2 previous seasons timeframe. Do they go in the draft? Is there an exemption that teams can apply to include the player in their returning player roster?	
39	**Section 7.1 Current Rules** In the past women's league has permitted slapshots – it is unclear why this rule has changed. Slap shots should continue to be permitted in the women's league.	XRef: 30, 84 Agreed (copying error). Will be removed Section 7.1 amended
40	**Section 7.5 Code of Conduct** This section notes the IHA Code of Behaviour and ethics is an appendix to the document, but there is no appendix. Please add it or a link.	Wasn't included in Draft for simplicity. Will be included in final version
41	Minimum team numbers to avoid a forfeit - this was previously seven skaters, which teams occasionally reached. Moving to ten skaters risks more games being forfeited with no obvious benefit - suggest keeping this at 7.	X Ref: 1, 23, 55 Multiple numbers have been suggested for this. Current RoE states 10 so was carried across. Section 2.6 amended to align with IIHF Rules. Section 5.1 amended to align with this change.
42	Why do all teams need a coach? We understand this position for junior teams, but several senior teams (including Vikings), have not had a coach for a number of years, without downside. There are a limited number of coaches available for senior teams who do not play in C/B already. This may also result in teams forfeiting games if/when coaches are unavailable (although this is not explicitly said in the Handbook, it seems implied).	X Ref: 19, 57 This was in the current RoE and carried across. Happy to remove if current community wishes Section 3.5 amended to recommend but not require coaches
43	There is no guidance on how fines can be administered by the Referee in Chief. This needs much more detail and oversight (e.g., is there an appeal process, what terms need to be met, will fines be addressed to individuals or teams, etc.).	Will review in light of these points. Reference to fines removed from this document. Further consideration will be given in upcoming Disciplinary Policy Section 3.7 amended
44	4.5 - Player skill level - the mechanism to move players between grades is very vague. If there is a "collaboration" between these positions, how does that operate and what threshold needs to be met? Can players appeal a decision? What triggers this process (e.g., points in a season, player feedback, etc.)? A mechanism like this is probably needed, but this stands out as an area that will lead to confusion if it is ever used.	Understand the concern, but it is a very difficult one to define explicitly for all cases. Do not want to get into defining skill levels for grades. Intent is that Senior Delegate and Grade Committee work sensibly together to meet the intent that a broadly even skill level per grade is maintained. This is a real and current concern in D grade for example

45	Clarification between 4.6 and 4.7 - Are interstate or overseas players eligible if they attend the draft? Or do they need to receive 'clearance' to play whether they attend the draft or not?	2 issues here. 1st is overseas/interstate needing transfers. Covered by 4.7 2nd is new players who are not on a returning roster needing to go into Draft. The two issues are not actually related.
46	4.7 - is there any time restriction on 'previously played hockey' (eg last 5 years). I suggest the current drafted requirements will result in a lot of admin for all parties involved, and greater detail around these requirements will help to minimise this.	There is no currently stipulated expiry for interstate transfers, so if you have ever played hockey in another state you need to do this. There is no cost though. This is administered by IHA, not IHACT. For international, there is a 0 cost option of haven't played for over 15 years. These rules are set by IIHF. All the details are on the IHA page linked in the Handbook
47	5.2 - Why is there a limit on substitute appearances? There are a small number of players who can sub in each grade, and this rule means they will reach the five game cap unnecessarily fast. Also, players looking to move up grades would benefit from increased exposure to that level. Suggest removing or raising cap for regular season games.	Intent is to ensure players who wish to play all season commit to a team to ensure fairness and transparency to all. Also avoids teams subverting the fairness of the draft (ie a good player registers as a sub and so does not enter the draft, then "subs" into that team for all games, but never for any others). If there is strong community desire to change the number this could be reviewed. Note this is a simplification of the existing rule which had a formula for the cap depending on number of games in a season.
48	6.1 point 12 - Clarification, reads as though teams cannot 'pass' on a round in the draft, even if they are at the player limit (while other teams are not)? If they meet the player limit and don't want more players, this is surely not required?	Intent is that a team must pick each round until they meet the minimum, or their desired number if higher. They can then pass. Draft continues until all teams get to this point. Will clarify the language here Moved this to a new point (14) to clarify they can stop when at minimum required they wish
49	6.2 Balancing player numbers - The process for reallocation needs much more detail. This scenario seems very unlikely and could likely be managed through other means (e.g., waiving of substitute conditions for that team). Recommend this is rewritten.	Difficult to be definitive as would depend on the unique scenario as it happened. Agree not likel but trying to make this a comprehensive document! Left as up to SD and committee so can be decided on case by case basis. Some more guidance provided in Section 6.2
50	6.6 - The two tiered draft is a good idea, but making it so that teams cannot enter the second phase of the draft if they pass at any point of the first phase, is harsh. This risks pushing existing players out of the	Do not agree with your proposal. Intent of the 'no passing' rule is to prevent teams passing on new players who may be less skilled in favour

	league if they drop down a grade. Recommend this is softened and teams pick later in the draft order (e.g., in the second or third 'round') in the second phase if they pass in the first phase, to balance.	of players willingly dropping from a higher grade, which is contrary to the intent of the grade system. As per other comments, agree the case of people dropped from a higher grade needs to be considered. Will be re-drafted to add such persons to the Priority List to avoid this penalty possibility. Section 4.4 amended. Section 6.6 amended X Ref: 22, 28, 32, 75, 83
51	Retain from eisting RoE: Supplementary Discipline Players will incur supplementary discipline when they exceed the following thresholds of penalty minutes: ● 40 minutes – Warning letter ● 50 minutes – 1 game suspension, does not impact the players PIM ● 60 minutes – Immediate suspension of further participation in games. season suspension and any application for membership with IHACT in future seasons will have to be approved by the sitting Board.	X Ref: 8 Was removed for inclusion in separate, more complete disciplinary Policy. As that is not yet ready I will put back in for this year, with note that it would be superseded by any Disciplinary Policy New Section 7.6 added
52	1.3 - The proposed roles and responsibilities require amendment. The Senior Delegate has too many responsibilities and should not be solely responsible for administering senior leagues. The grade committees have been relegated to an information only role. The grade committees, especially for C and B must at least have an input role in administering their respective leagues, in keeping with their self-managed nature (and to support the volunteers who occupy the senior delegate role).	Descriptions align with current reality, where the Senior Delegate does do the bulk of the organisation. Leagues are referred to as self-managed, but in reality the SD administers scheduling, rink bookings & liaison, financials, officials, scoring and stats, registrations, payments, discipline and complaints. Happy to review who does what but it must reflect what actually ends up happening instead of an ideal. Administering means application of rules and policies as set out in this document. It does not give the SD absolute authority to make arbitrary decisions.
53	2.1 - The mention of a junior team in C grade - should clearly state this team plays at the invitation of the grade committee and note plans for the Phoenix to exit the league in 2027, freeing up space for greater senior participation.	Do not agree that the committee are the sole arbiter of which teams participate. It is an idea to relocate the Phoenix, but by no means certain. Phoenix is an important part of the development pathway for younger players, who go on to be senior players and support these leagues in the future. If they relocate it will be reflected in the Handbook, but not before.

54	2.2 - The handbook should note that efforts will be made to ensure equitable access across game time slots. For example, this season the Eagles have been scheduled to play 9 late games on a Sunday night, when some teams like the Redbacks have only 2. There is absolutely no reason for this type of inequality. The good and bad time slots should be shared fairly.	Agree and this is the intent. Needs to be read against the backdrop of limited ice time and not much flexibility from the rink to re-arrange session times though. Section 2.2 amended
55	2.6 - The minimum number of skaters to avoid a forfeit should be no more than 9 for C grade. This allows up to 2 full lines of forwards and a rotating defender.	XRef: 1, 23, 41 Multiple numbers have been suggested for this. Current RoE states 10 so was carried across. Happy to take feedback. Section 2.6 amended to align with IIHF Rules. Section 5.1 amended to align with this change.
56	3.1 This proposal is of huge concern. Existing teams should be automatically registered for the next season unless they seek de-registration. Significant effort has been put into building and managing the existing teams over many years and this must be preserved. Experience over many years has shown that there have been times of communication difficulties between the Board and teams. Assigning the Senior Delegate sole responsibility for the registration process (noting this position is currently vacant) is deeply concerning and it opens the door for potential conflict of interest to arise.	Intent is only a verification that all teams are returning to ensure they are protected if new teams wish to join. No provision for a returning team to be denied, though will amend to clearly state this. Positive verification is a much stronger governance process than assumption and exception, providing transparency to all parties. Do not agree this allows for a Conflict of Interest to arise. Will re-draft to try and more clearly convey this intent. It's no different from current requirement to submit a team list in reality, just a quick verification before everyone starts doing that (so if a team is not returning everyone knows they can approach their players for example) Section 3.1 amended
57	3.2 Most teams will likely need to remunerate coaches to attract anyone not associated with the team to give up their time - therefore the requirement to have a coach should not be mandated in senior C or B. Most teams will choose to have one, but it should not be forced and is not necessary.	X Ref: 19, 42 This was in the current RoE and carried across. Happy to remove if current community wishes. Section 3.5 amended to recommend but not require coaches
58	3.7 The handbook should note that the courses run to accredit scorers and referees will provide at least 21 day written notice via email to members.	This is not the place for this kind of stipulation. Understand the desire for notice etc but this is added information to a document where it is not needed
59	6.1 The grade committee should by majority vote be able to agree to minor changes to the drafting process to suit the leagues, so long as	Agree in principle, but how would you define "minor"?

	sub-points 4 and 7 are met. This small amount of flexibility is helpful to balance the social and competitive sides of the leagues.	Section 6.4 was written to allow teams and players some flexibility to select where they play, provided all agree. I'm not sure what other flexibility your envisage being required? I've added a description of the intent of the Draft in Section 6, and a provision to alter the procedure in Section 6.1, with the caveat it doesn't change the intent, and the SD agrees that it doesn't change the intent (this is not an 'approval' per se, just a check the process is maintained) Section 6 and 6.1 amended
60	It would be helpful for the handbook to note that the Senators are covered by this handbook and are required to follow it the same as other teams, assuming that is the intention.	XRef: 63, 79 The document contains numerous references to the fact it applies to all teams, including the second paragraph of Section 6 on the draft. It is not good practice to mention individuals or teams in governance documents, so will not be explicitly mentioning the Senators. The rules definitely apply to them and they have been notified of this.
61	Finally, the handbook should outline the consultation process that will be followed for future changes and updates.	XRef: 4 Intent is to review as required. Do not want to hard code a time in the document as that is too restrictive for a volunteer organisation. Could put intent to review and an outline process of who to involve. New Section 1.3 added
62	Throughout document: • inconsistent capitalisation of policy, league, league hockey, draft list • "elsewhere in this document" could be replaced with the relevant section once the document is finalised	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content. Similarly cross-referencing will be updated once content and structure finalised to avoid rework
63	Not included in document: Mid-season transfers, transfers to different teams within the same grade out of season, club teams (eg. Senators)	XRef: 60, 79 All teams are treated equally by this document, regardless of how they organise themselves. No intent to address particular team situations here. Section 6.7 on transfers has been added
64	1.3 table • IHACT Board: remove comma at end of second point	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.

	• Junior Delegate: amend "Administers the senior leagues" to "junior leagues"	Will fix incorrect junior/senior reference Section 2.4 amended
65	2.1 Grades, table row 1 – "over the age of 18". Currently juniors play in Senior B.	This table defines the basic league rules. Rules allowing Juniors to play up are defined elsewhere. Do not want to give the impression here it is an all-age league. C Grade the same
66	2.3 – "Goal Difference" should this be "Goal differential"	I think that means the same thing?
67	2.4 - refers to "Senior Delegate" however they wouldn't be the appropriate delegate for junior finals?	Will amend Section 2.4 amended
68	2.6 – use a non-breaking hyphen to prevent Referee-in-Chief breaking across two lines. The keyboard shortcut is Alt+Shift+-	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.
69	3.1 Team Registrations – All *senior* teams	Will amend Section 3.1 amended
70	3.2 Manager and Coach – "For teams with junior players, refer to section 3.5."?	Will address cross-referencing in final version
71	3.5 - It may be worth referencing on ice coaches as well. I believe there is 'mandatory possession' in the ACT so WWVP holders must be able to produce the physical card if compliance officers visit to check. Also of note, an interstate equivalent (eg. a NSW WWCC) can only be used as an equivalent if the coach etc is volunteering for less than 28 days in a 12-month period.	Coach is used as a catch all term, also covered by "any other team official" Will add mandatory carry requirement. Section 3.5 amended
72	3.6 – possessive comma if the payments belong to the officials.	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.
73	3.7 – inconsistency between full stop and colon in sentence before table. Majority use in document is a full stop.	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.
74	4.2 - "form" instead of "from"	Amended
75	4.4 - "A senior player may only play in one grade within any 12 month period". This can be interpreted as if a senior player is playing women's league in the summer then they can be excluded from C grade in the winter. If this is not the intention it should be clearly specified that "senior grade" refers to D, C and B. Interpretation issue – if a player cannot go back to D grade for two seasons after moving up to C, does that mean it is the responsibility of the C grade team to keep them on for two seasons? Or could they be	XRef: 22, 28, 32, 50, 83 Will be re-drafted to clarify, especially for case of players being dropped from C-Grade involuntarily Section 4.4 amended

	dropped at the end of their first C season, and be unable to play D grade until a second C season has passed even if they are no longer playing C.	
76	4.10 table formatting – prevent breaking over page, inconsistent use of full stops at end of sentence (majority use in this document's tables is a full stop)	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.
77	5.1 - "match"... game?	Amended
78	5.3 – missing word? "such as the regular goalie *being/becoming* unavailable due to unforeseen..."	Amended
79	6 Player Draft – should there be an exclusion here for club teams such as Senators?	XRef: 60, 63 No. All teams must abide by the same rules
80	6.1 - Inconsistent usage of full stops at end of sentences	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.
81	6.1.2 – To avoid the issue where teams drop players and only communicate this after grading, there could be a timeframe for the roster of returning players to be submitted eg. 2 weeks before the Draft, with an obligation on the Team Manager to ensure the player is then advised within 24 hours, so dropped players have enough notice to attend grading if desired, and don't find out they are dropped after grading. I appreciate this being added to the Handbook as I hope it helps avoid the previous issues of teams dropping players after grading has been completed. If a team does do this going forwards, I think it should be a matter which attracts a penalty such as a point deduction.	This is covered in Section 3.3 "at a time agreed between the Senor Delegate and the Grade Committee". Allows flexibility year on year and avoids an unnecessary restriction from this document.
82	6.5 - Currently is misspelled	Formatting, grammar, spelling etc will be double checked on finalisation of content.
83	6.6 - The priority list should also include players who were *dropped* from C, "D-Grade" is not hyphenated other than two usages in this section, female players in a secondary role could be considered in the priority list?	XRef: 22, 28, 32, 50, 75 Agreed about dropped players, will redraft to include this. Will consider provision regarding secondary positions for females, but first priority is a place for anyone who wants to play Section 6.6 amended
84	7.1 - Women's league *does* permit slapshots	XRef: 30, 39 Agreed (copying error). Will be removed Section 7.1 amended

85	7.3 – what happens if a coach is sick and needs a substitute? This is particularly relevant for team who need a bench coach as they have juniors	A coach with WWVP card is a legal requirement, not an IHACT stipulation. If the requirement cannot be met, either the junior(s) must not play or they forfeit. Out of IHACT control, reproduced here to ensure everyone knows about it. This is set out in Section 3.5
86	9 – missing word? "If a player wishes *for* an explanation for an…"	Amended
87	10 – "*in* tournaments"	Amended