

# Missouri State High School Activities Association Tennis Advisory Committee Meeting

**November 13, 2024**  
MSHSAA Office  
9:00 a.m.

## **HISTORY OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

The MSHSAA Board of Directors in the late 1950's was concerned with comments from coaches, music and speech directors indicating they had little voice in the administration and regulations of the respective activities they directed in their schools. To address this issue, the Board was to appoint advisory committees for music and speech to assist the Executive Director and Board of Directors in planning and administering the various activities.

The MSHSAA Constitution, after a vote of the member schools, included provisions for music and speech advisory committees. However, specific procedures for implementing the committee recommendations were not addressed. In 1959 the Music Advisory Committee was the first to become active and met with the executive director to review the regulations applied to music festivals and to make recommendations to the Board via the Executive Director for improvements in the program.

Shortly after the Music Advisory Committee became active the Speech Advisory Committee followed suit. The first significant recommendation was to include all speech activities, rather than debate only, under the jurisdiction of the MSHSAA.

The hard work and promising recommendations made by these two advisory committees prompted the Board of Directors to establish similar advisory committees in each activity under the MSHSAA jurisdiction. As new activities have been added or expanded, advisory committees have continued to be developed to meet this growth.

## **PURPOSE OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

The advisory committees serve to provide increased communication from the "grass roots" level between the MSHSAA member schools and the MSHSAA Board of Directors. The committees shall act in an advisory capacity with the MSHSAA Board of Directors reserving the right to accept, reject or amend committee recommendations.

**2024 TENNIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA**  
**November 13, 2024**  
**MSHSAA Office**  
**9:00 a.m.**

**I. Welcome/Introductions**

- A. New Members: Kara Berry (Lafayette, St. Joseph – Northwest, Girls), Nichole McGinness (Maryville – Northwest, Boys), Julie Lichtenstein (Fulton – Northeast, Girls), Tony Senior (Mexico – Northeast, Boys),
- B. Outgoing Members: Jason Conley (Eureka – St. Louis, Boys), Doug Smith (St. Joseph’s Academy – St. Louis, Girls), Jim Stoner (Lafayette County – Central, Boys)
- C. Review of Advisory Committee Role and Procedures

**II. Old Business**

- A. Approval of minutes from the October 31, 2023 meeting
- B. State Championship Report (Boys Spring 2024 & Girls Fall 2024 – **Melton**)

**III. New Business**

**REGULAR SEASON**

- A. Rules Enforcement, Item 1 – **Rothdiener & Smashey**
- B. Class and District Assignments, Items 3, 4, & 11 – **Tackett, Birk, Boles, Brogan & All Clas 1 District 6 Coaches**
- C. On Site Protest Procedures, Item 7 – **Berkland**
- D. Team Format Position Statement, Item 8 – **Berkland**
- E. Uniforms, Item 9 – **Flanigan**
- F. Coaching Guidelines, Item 10 & 14 – **Berkland & Loeb**
- G. Stacking/Rank Orders/Line-ups & Challenge Matches, Item 12 – **Berkland**
- H. Line Calls/Foot Faults, Item 15 – **Reys & Loeb**
- I. Rest Periods Between Matches, Item 16 – **Reys & Loeb**

**POST SEASON**

- J. State Tournament Committee Formation – **Melton**
- K. Third Set Super Tiebreaker, Item 2 – **Cox**
- L. Post Season Scoring Format, Item 5 – **Rothdiener**
- M. Individual Tournament State Bracket Creation, Item 13 – **Berkland**
- N.

**GENERAL**

- O. Cold Weather Guidelines – **Berkland**
- P. Rank Order (Defining Varsity vs. J.V.) – **Melton**
- Q. Justification and Identification of Rank Order Changes – **Melton**
- R. Definition/Guidelines for Challenge Matches, related letter G– **Melton**
- S. Increased Clarity Regarding Injury and its Relation to Rank Order – **Melton**

- T. Stacking Appeal Process and Language – **Melton**
- U. Stacking Appeal Committee Formation – **Melton**

**IV. Discussion Topics**

- A. Class and District Assignments (application of board policy) – **Melton**
- B. State Ind. Tourn. Schedule, Friday Night 3<sup>rd</sup> Round Consolation - **Melton**

**V. Open Agenda**

---

**"Anyone attending a meeting of the Missouri State High School Activities Association who requires auxiliary aids or services should request such services by contacting the Executive Director of the MSHSAA, telephone 573/875-4880, no later than 48 hours before the meeting. Thank you."**

### **Item 1 – Rules Enforcement**

Agenda Item: I think a rules/enforcement clarification would be helpful about footfaults and appeals judges. After the normal process of notification of opposing coaches and their player is satisfied, and finally there is installation of an appeals judge at the net post, here's the confusing procedural issue that I don't think there is consensus on.

Must the appeals judge wait for an appeal that the opposing player has foot faulted, or can they call a foot fault when they see one?

Submitted by: Nathan Rothdiener and David Smashey Republic High School

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: rules enforcement

Rationale for Change: The problem is that when a player is receiving serve, they are watching the striking of the ball and have a hard time seeing foot faults, especially those that are not egregious. They would also have to wait until after the entire point is played, which is problematic.

---

### **Item 2 – Third Set Super Tiebreaker**

Agenda Item: Third set super tiebreaker. If a match in districts and beyond is close enough to go to a third set it should be played out to a full set to 6 like we used to do.

Submitted by: David Cox - Willow Springs

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Section 4: Post season Entry Procedures - E. 7

Rationale for Change: A close match shouldn't be decided by a super tie breaker.

---

### **Item 3 – Class & District Assignments (related to Item 4 & 11)**

Agenda Item: it would be great to get the Districts out earlier each year so that we can coordinate/adjust schedules to add people in our district to our schedule or shift people who we've included for this reason off of our schedule.

Submitted by: Aaron Tackett - Springfield Catholic High School

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: District Release

Rationale for Change: Scheduling purposes

---

**Item 4 – Class 1 District Assignments (related to Item 3 & 11)**

Agenda Item: Reconsider tennis as an individual sport and allow Class 1, 16 districts like we have done in the past. This year we had 10 teams in almost every district across Class 1.

Submitted by: All coaches from Class 1 District 6

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Section 3 - Post Season Criteria - F

Rationale for Change: Our district devised a schedule that we felt was in the best interest of the athletes. This had to be done over the course of 2 days. With 10 teams in a district it created a bracket that had 20 single players and 20 doubles teams, played out over 5 rounds. For our district we had 2 teams that had to travel 2.5 hours and ended up staying the night, 1 team traveled 2 hours, 3 teams traveled 1.5 hours, FOR DISTRICTS. I totally understand the travel if this were a sectional match or state, that makes sense...but not for districts. We ended up playing our districts on Thursday and Friday with Saturday for a rain out. That means the athletes missed 2 full days of school, if you advanced. We had to do this because next week is team districts and it is going to be played out over 4 rounds, which means matches will be played, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, again with very little room in the schedule for rain. The solution is to go back to the 4-6 team bracket with 16 districts. There is always going to be 75-80 teams in class 1, so this will be an ongoing issue.

---

**Item 5 – Post Season Scoring Format**

Agenda Item: Change post season individual scoring from the current format, to playing best 2 out of 3 sets. Getting rid of the 10 point tie breaker. Change the post season team scoring by playing out the 3rd set as well or keep the 10 point tie break in lieu of the 3rd set, but play 2 / 3 with AD.

Submitted by: Nathan Rothdiener

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Section 4 E. 7 and Section 4.F.9

Rationale for Change: I've had a few coaches mention this. Tennis should be played with AD whenever possible. We are making scoring confusing. It is different everywhere we go, and every tournament we play. In the post season, at individuals we play with ad, But in team we play to 8 with ad for doubles and 2/3 no ad in singles. Players, coaches, parents, and fans get confused. It would help to develop some consistency in team scoring by making singles 2 out of 3 with add.

---

**Item 6 – Cold Weather Guidelines**

Agenda Item: Addition of Cold Weather Play Guidelines to be established -- (Section 1: Essential Resources)

- Item F or G

Submitted by: Daniel Berkland - Staley

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Tennis Manual - Section 1: Essential Resources  
MSHSAA Sports Medicine Page

Rationale for Change: We currently have established guidelines for play in reference to heat, but there are currently no guidelines referencing play for extreme cold conditions. Tennis is a sport that requires players to be exposed to outside elements for prolonged periods of time. It is also a sport where it is difficult to "layer" with clothing or to protect extremities from cold temperatures during play. USTA currently allows for suspension of play if air temperature is 45-degrees or lower.

I am making the recommendation that MSHSAA tennis events should be suspended if the air temperature is below 45-degrees during the event.

---

#### Item 7 – **On-Site Protest Procedures**

- Agenda Item: POINT OF DISCUSSION... regarding Section 1: Essential Resources - Subsection H
- MSHSAA Handbook gives a detailed process of On-Site Protest Procedures
  - Issue is that this MSHSAA protocol involves scenarios in which an official is present at the event site
  - Tennis does not have an official on-site to look at a protest

I recommend that we develop and add "On-Site Protest Procedure" that is specifically designed for tennis matches, in which no official is present on-site. This procedure should be added into the MSHSAA Tennis Manual - Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection H (which is currently absent from the MSHSAA Tennis Manual)

Recommendation for On-Site Protest Procedure will be as follows...

- Coach that is initiating the protest must inform the opposing coach prior to start of the match.
- Protesting Coach must provide a detailed explanation for the protest,
- The opposing coach will have the opportunity to defend the protest position to the protesting coach,
- If the protesting coach wishes to continue with the protest given the explanation from the opposing coach, then a written report must be filed to MSHSAA within 48-hours of the completion of the protested match.

Follow-up Conversation/Possibility of further recommendation...

"Can protest be initiated after the Freeze Date, when Coaches do not have the ability modify rank order?" -- suggest we make a timeline for protest following freeze date, in which MSHSAA has time to review protest and establish validity of rank order before start of Team District play.

-- recommended that Freeze Date is the Wednesday of Individual District Tournament. That allows a 48-hour window in which a team could protest an altered rank order. MSHSAA would have the ability to rule on validity of altered rank order, and issue a ruling if the altered rank order is valid.

-- based in outcome of additional discussion... recommended to add additional wording into Section 3: Postseason Criteria for Protest Procedures

Submitted by: Daniel Berkland - Staley

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: MSHSAA Tennis Manual - addition of Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection H

MSHSAA Tennis Manual - may require modification of Section 2: Regular Season - Section O3

Rationale for Change: Rationale is to establish a protocol specifically designed for an on-site tennis event, in which there are no officials present to help interpret any rule violations. By requiring that the protesting coach explain the violation, and allowing the opposing coach to provide evidence in defense, it could potentially eliminate the need for protest to move to the MSHSAA office. Therefore solving the protest on-site.

---

#### Item 8 – **Team Format Position Statement**

Agenda Item: Modification of... Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection F -- "Posting Match Scores"

Recommend to move Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection N - Paragraph 2 - "TEAM FORMAT POSITION STATEMENT" to be included within Subsection F as Paragraph 2 to clarify which matches should be posted for Match Scores on the Regular Season Schedule Results.

Recommended that MSHSAA recognize the 6/3 dual format to be used for all regular season dual matches and to eliminate the option of the 4/3 (no double-back) format.

- Dual Matches may be stopped after 5 Match wins has been reached IF both coaches are in agreement.

- Team Dual Tournaments not utilizing the MSHSAA approved 6/3 format will not be counted as part of a schools W/L record for the regular season.

Submitted by: Daniel Berkland - Staley

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: MSHSAA Tennis Manual Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection F -- "Posting Match Scores"

Rationale for Change: Provides consistency around the state of the established format for a Dual Match during the regular season, and provides an accurate W/L record based on rank ability for the entire ladder and not which players just "matched up" in singles or doubles respectively. By not having common format in established Regular Season Duals... this can lead to a

misinterpretation of team records, which can adversely impact seeding evidence for the Team District Tournaments.

---

#### Item 9 – **Uniforms**

Agenda Item: POINT OF DISCUSSION... Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection K: "Uniforms"

- No change suggested currently, but want clarity of what is expected on uniforms.
- Are school colors required?
- Is a school logo required?
- Is it both?
- Do we need to add anything in regards to "additional spirit" flare? Body Paint, Face Paint, Socks, etc...

Submitted by: Meghan Flanigan - Notre Dame de Sion

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: MSHSAA Tennis Manual -- Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection K: "Uniforms"

Rationale for Change: Based upon the discussion from the Advisory Council, maybe we need to fine-tune the wording, etc...

---

#### Item 10 – **Coaching Guidelines** (related to Item 14)

Agenda Item: Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection L: "Coaching"

- Recommended that we clarify the phrases "during play" and "if it does not disrupt the flow of play"; recommended that once server is in position, coaching must cease at that point.
- Recommended that coaches are NOT allowed to sit on-court unless match is played indoors
- Recommended that a penalty system is established when coaches are not following guidelines, similar to when players are given; warning, point, game, and match penalty.

Submitted by: Daniel Berkland - Staley

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: MSHSAA Tennis Manual -- Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection L: "Coaching"

Rationale for Change: Currently there is ambiguity in the terminology of when coaching can take place outside of a changeover. Phrases like "during play" and "if it does not disrupt the flow of play" are all subjective. Changeover coaching is clearly defined to 90-seconds and coaches may be on-court or outside of the fence. Changeover conversations are easily enforceable and provide no ambiguity to what is allowed.

I believe that having the coaches allowed on-court during play (in which sometimes they are just a couple feet from the court) is an unnecessary element added to the tennis match. When



outside, it is easy enough for a coach to be coaching off-court. Coaching at an indoor facility is much harder to view the match and access the court for coaching, which is why it should be allowed for coaching to sit on-court for an indoor match.

Furthermore, there is also no protocol established for a coach that is in violation of any of the terms above. If a coach is "coaching" during a point, what is the consequence? Do we follow the same system we use for players... warning, point penalty, game penalty, match?

---

**Item 11 – Class 1 District Assignments** (related to Item 3 & 4)

Agenda Item: I think this is more a discussion point asked throughout the season, versus a change. The Class 1 8 team district sizes. I think it is a need to be able to explain to coaches why. When asked this is one issue that is mentioned the most.

Submitted by: Amy Birk (Saxony Lutheran) Kristi Boles (Dexter) Brandi Brogan (Arcadia Valley)

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Pages 128 and 129 of the official MSHSAA Handbook.

Rationale for Change: Last season have a uniform postseason was on part of this discussion. If the 2.0 differential can fit into making classes even, it seems like a better option.

---

**Item 12 – Stacking/Rank Orders/Line-ups – Challenge Matches**

Agenda Item: Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection O: "Stacking/Rank Orders/Line-ups"

- Recommend to define "rank ability" in the MSHSAA Tennis Manual to pertain to a schools roster only.
- Recommend to clarify that "rank ability" should be based on Challenge Matches and NOT match results played against another school's ladder. For example, a player should not be moved up or down their own team ladder based upon winning or losing against an opponent school ladder.
- Recommend that challenge matches are required to establish a team ladder. Documentation should utilize the MSHSAA State Scorecard, in which the players will complete the scorecard and sign the scorecard. This will create a catalog of evidence/justification for why a school is playing a particular rank order. This will be available to all coaches that are questioning the validity of a rank order.
- Recommend that doubles rank order follows the same protocol used to establish a singles rank order. Doubles teams should be established with recorded Challenge Matches to justify rank order of doubles teams.
- Recommend that an official MSHSAA Challenge Match is at minimum a Pro-6 format (or greater)

Submitted by: Daniel Berkland - Staley

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: This recommendation would require a complete alteration of the MSHSAA Tennis Manual - Section 2: Regular Season - Subsection O

Based upon the overall alteration - this could impact numerous other portions of the MSHSAA Tennis Manual.

Rationale for Change: MSHSAA states the following... "The Tennis Advisory Committee and the MSHSAA Board of Directors are fundamentally opposed to "stacking." Stacking is the practice of placing tennis players in the line-up in a manner not consistent with rank ability, but rather for the purpose of gaining an advantage due to the match-ups created. This is a practice that is unacceptable due to the detrimental way that certain players (usually the lower level players) are placed and forced to compete. Coaches must be able to justify their line-ups to opposing coaches."

There are two current guidelines in the MSHSAA Tennis Manual that allows for coaches to legally "match-up" with an opponents ladder. 1) The ability to move a ladder position without a challenge match, and 2) The requirement to play doubles rank based on singles ladder position.

1) Allowing a player to be moved within a ladder without a Challenge Match creates the opportunity to flip players on the ladder for the upcoming matches without justification. If a coach "believes" that a #4 is better than their #3 on the ladder, the only way to justify a move is to play that Challenge Match. It provides the players an opportunity to move on the ladder based on skill set, and provides evidence/justification for the ladder change to an opposing school.

2) Forcing doubles play to be dictated by singles rank order creates a "guessing game" and coaches are essentially "matching-up" based on using singles rank order to gain an advantage at certain spots within the dual match-up. We currently are not required to play our doubles in proper rank ability, and in some cases are prevented from playing our doubles in rank ability.

---

### Item 13 – **Individual Tournament State Bracket Creation**

Agenda Item: Section 4: "Postseason Entry Procedures" - Subsection I: "Individual State" - Part 2: "Pairings"

- Recommendation to eliminate the current guidelines that create our Individual State Brackets
- Recommendation of three proposals for restructuring the brackets for Individual State Brackets...

Proposal #1 -- Regional Aligned Brackets (similar to the Team State Brackets)

- brackets will be created with spots for each District Champion and Runner-up
- these brackets would be predetermined in the MSHSAA Tennis Manual at the beginning of each season
- 1st round matches we feature a district champion and runner-up

- each successive year will allow for new district match-ups from across the regions
- ideally it will be arranged in a 4-year cycle, allowing the best players to earn recognition during career

Proposal #2 -- Seeding the Tournament Bracket via current District Individual Seeding Guidelines  
- still working on the details for this, but will have a detailed proposal to present at the Nov 13th meeting

- this seeding proposal would combine what is currently being utilized for the creation of brackets, but will have additional layers of seeding to accommodate players that did not currently have any consideration into the seeding process

Proposal #3 -- Seeding the Tournament Bracket via the MSHSAA Tennis Advisory Council

- goal would be to determine the Top 4 in each bracket (if possible)
- the Advisory Council members can serve as a voice for their region coaches, giving a unique perspective from all regions of the state with experienced coaches to determine potential seeding
- allows for the representation of ALL data to be considered when seeding the tournament bracket

Submitted by: Daniel Berkland - Staley

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: MSHSAA Tennis Manual

Section 4: "Postseason Entry Procedures" - Subsection I: "Individual State" - Part 2: "Pairings"

Rationale for Change: First off... this rationale for change has nothing to do with the current administering of the State Tournament. The event is always well ran, and compliments to the USTA officials and MSHSAA Staff for putting on a well organized event each and every season.

However... currently the MSHSAA Individual Tournament rarely recognizes the best players in the State, and is essentially a random draw with no justification to the draw other than what occurred 1-year prior to the start of the event. Every year, the script is the same with the players, parents, coaches, and spectators... confusion on how the bracket was assembled and lingering questions on what could have been if there was an attempt to seed the tournament.

We currently have no method in place to account for the following...

- new players (freshman / 1st year players) get zero consideration for placement in the bracket, even though they may be some of the best players in the State.
- players moving from Class-to-Class get zero consideration for placement in the bracket
- players moving from Singles-Doubles get zero consideration for placement in the bracket

Essentially, (in the words of many spectators and coaches) we have some poor branding when it comes to our sport at this level. By utilizing either a Regional or Seeding formatted bracket, we can more clearly let participants and fans know the purpose behind the State Tournament and justify the creations of our State Tournament Brackets.

Regional Brackets would provide a concrete bracket and uphold the viewpoint that MSHSAA wants regional representation in the State Competitions. By having an established regional rotation, it would also ensure that players of high caliber would have a good chance for placing high in a given rotation. It would also allow players to "pick their pathway" in terms of wanting a chance to play in the Singles or Doubles Brackets for the State Competition.

Seeded Brackets would provide the players an opportunity to finish based upon ability versus the "luck of the draw" - ensuring an end result that does represent the best of the best on the medal stand.

---

**Item 14 – Coaching Guidelines** (related to Item 10)

Agenda Item: COACHING: Players may receive coaching from an approved school coach only. School coaches are expected to communicate this requirement to all players, parents and private coaches. Refer to the MSHSAA Handbook for the definition of a school coach. Coaching and Instruction by School Coaches at Contests: Coaching and instruction CANNOT be given “during play” of a point. Coaching and instruction is permitted inside the fence and/or around the court, in between points (if it does not disrupt the flow of play), during changeovers and between sets. When coaching from the court, coaches must be seated at the facility provided bench. ONLY OFFICIALS can stand at the net post. Note: players can only meet with their coach during a changeover (NOT between points).

**Modification:**

COACHING: Players may receive coaching from an approved school coach only. School coaches are expected to communicate this requirement to all players, parents and private coaches. Refer to the MSHSAA Handbook for the definition of a school coach. Coaching and Instruction by School Coaches at Contests: Coaching and instruction CANNOT be given “during play” of a point. Coaching and instruction is permitted inside the fence and/or around the court, in between points (if it does not disrupt the flow of play), during changeovers and between sets. When coaching from the court, coaches must be seated at the facility provided bench or from an adjacent open court. The coach must be a half-court away during play if on an adjacent court. ONLY OFFICIALS can stand at the net post. Note: players can only meet with their coach during a changeover (NOT between points).

Submitted by: Ben Loeb; Rock Bridge HS

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: MSHSAA Tennis Manual Section 2:L

Rationale for Change: None Provided

---

**Item 15 – Line Calls/Foot Faults**

Agenda Item: Current Rule: Section 2: R

LINE CALLS/FOOT FAULTS: If foot faults or incorrect line calls are occurring, the following protocol shall be followed: 1. The player or the player's coach should notify their opponent or opponent's coach, respectively, of the concern. 2. The opposing coach is then required to talk with his/her player no later than the next changeover about the concern. 3. If the concern continues, the player may request for a coach to oversee the match to act upon appeals for an overrule; however, a non-biased line judge may be used. A line judge is an individual that both coaches agree upon to be used. Note: A coach or line judge called to a match for these occurrences may overrule either player on appeal.

Modification:

LINE CALLS/FOOT FAULTS: If foot faults or incorrect line calls are occurring, the following protocol shall be followed: 1. The player or the player's coach should notify their opponent or opponent's coach, respectively, of the concern. 2. The opposing coach is then required to talk with his/her player between points after observing a foot fault and no later than the end of the game about line calls. 3. If the concern continues, or if time is of the essence in the match (i. e. tiebreaker), the player may request for a coach to oversee the match to act upon appeals for an overrule; however, a non-biased line judge may be used. A line judge is an individual that both coaches agree upon to be used. Notes: A coach or line judge called to a match for these occurrences may overrule either player on appeal. (Also discuss adding on) Players may be a half court away on an adjacent court and move to the same side of the net as their teammate who is playing on changeovers. This applies when there is an open court on both sides of the match court or if the open court is an end court.

Submitted by: Ben Loeb; Rock Bridge HS

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Tennis Manual - Section 2:R

Rationale for Change: None Provided

---

#### **Item 16 – Rest Periods Between Matches**

Agenda Item: REST PERIODS BETWEEN MATCHES: (Team Play/Dual Matches) (See Table 12, USTA Friend at Court) • After a Doubles match and prior to a Singles match, each player shall be ready to play singles within 10 minutes after the completion of their doubles match, unless both coaches agree otherwise. (add the following) Players are entitled to a 5-minute warmup before the singles if they both played doubles, otherwise a 10-minute warm-up is allowed.

Submitted by: Ben Loeb; Rock Bridge HS

By-law or Rule Referenced by Agenda Item: Tennis Manual - Section 2:S

Rationale for Change: None Provided