

January 7, 2008

Peter Eastman, President  
NAPPI International  
6314 Corporate Court, Suite A  
Fort Myers, FL 33919-3516

**Re: Biomechanical Assessment of the NAPPI System**

Dear Mr. Eastman:

I want to thank you for the opportunity to review the physical skills portion of your training course. This report is the result of my overall assessment of the principles and skills you and your staff demonstrated to me on May 21, 2005.

It is obvious that a great deal of effort and critical thinking has been performed to result in your current system. While the physical skills I observed and participated in from both a client and a staff perspective were very effective, the underlying philosophy, which is also taught as part of your program and used for skill development, critique, and in-field skill modification, is a particularly exemplary part of your program. This philosophy forms the foundation for the NAPPI system and the physical skills flow naturally from the objective criteria set forth. This philosophy is clearly articulated in the NAPPI-Ten Criteria and the SMART Principles.

*NAPPI- Ten Criteria*

- *Minimum Impact*
- *Doable by Widest Range of Staff*
- *Applicable Over Broadest Range of Scenarios*
- *Wide Margin for Error*
- *Disaster Proof*
- *Stems from natural response*
- *Requires minimal athletic skill*
- *Easy to learn*
- *Easy to remember*
- *Effective*

*SMART Principles*

- *Stay One Step Ahead*
- *Move One Step at a Time*
- *Accelerate 0 to 100*
- *Refocus the Attention*
- *TLC – Take Control*

Rigorous and honest application of the principles has resulted in techniques that are easy to learn and effective. I was impressed with the logic behind the criteria including the fitness and health levels of the staff, the limited training time for staff to acquire skills, and the fact that many of these situations while high in risk actually occurred infrequently. All of these issues impact dramatically on the safety of the staff and clients.



I appreciated the physical training techniques used to make the S.M.A.R.T. Principles a physical as well as a mental concept. This furthers the efforts to train staff to use the physical techniques as an extension of the integrative framework of crisis management rather than as a reactionary physical response to a posed threat.

When compared to classical methods of self-defense, the advantages of the NAPPI System for client care become obvious. Specifically I analyzed the self-protection skills taught in the NAPPI system for Wrist Release, Front Choke Escape, Arm Bar Choke Escape, X Shield, Hair-pull Escape, Bite Release, One Arm Body Wrap, Capture and Wrap, and Following to the Floor. When compared to the corresponding techniques as taught by classical self-defense, the advantages and increased safety afforded by the NAPPI system was clear. In addition to the obvious differences apparent to even an untrained observer, the NAPPI-Ten criteria provided an easy and objective framework to categorically distinguish between the two styles of techniques. The NAPPI Self-protection techniques are well engineered to work around the elements of risk associated with the self defense techniques and still produce an effective skill without the use of joint locks, joint hyperflexion, pain or threat of pain, and undue force. NAPPI techniques have none of the striking, twisting, locking, pressure point or other “pain compliance” elements of classical self-defense.

My interactive review was extensive. I participated and observed the aspects of all the techniques. Each of the skills was demonstrated one movement at a time and each was presented to me in such a way as to enable me to analyze the movements in a clear sequence, including the movements prior to and subsequent to each aspect of a technique.

My overall assessment is that great effort has been made so that the NAPPI Physical Techniques are safe. They are well engineered for safety and your training methods seem to ensure that the transmission of those techniques is as effective as possible. Are there risks involved in the application of these physical techniques? Certainly, but during my viewing of your demonstrations; with every grasp of a body part, every block, every turn and every movement, I saw the coordinated and direct approach to address safety concerns. At every point of contact you were able to demonstrate not only what your technique calls for, but also the options that were considered and rejected. You showed me what you do and why you do it and these explanations were complete and honest.

The NAPPI Ten-Criteria and the SMART principles allow users of your system to understand the principles behind the choice and application of appropriate restraint. This allows users of the system to confidently apply these principles dynamically in the field and innovate as necessary as crises develop and change.

Sincerely,

Chris Van Ee Ph.D.



## **Chris Van Ee Ph.D.**

*Senior Biomechanical Engineer  
Design Research Engineering  
46475 DeSoto Ct.  
Novi, MI 48377  
Tel: (248) 668-5533  
Fax: (248) 668-3460  
email: [ChrisV@drenq.com](mailto:ChrisV@drenq.com)*

*Adjunct Assistant Professor  
Wayne State University  
Department Biomedical Engineering  
818 W.Hancock  
Detroit, MI 48202  
(313) 577-1347*

*Dr. Van Ee is a senior biomechanical engineer at Design Research Engineering, where he performs accident reconstruction and forensic engineering investigations. He is also an adjunct faculty member in the Biomedical Engineering Department at Wayne State University teaching graduate students and is actively engaged in biomechanics research. His scientific research has focused on determining injury causation, human tolerance, and evaluating injury prevention strategies. Current research projects include mechanisms and prevention of aortic rupture, traumatic head injury in pediatric and adult populations, cervical spine injury, restraint system design and performance, and the development of advanced biomechanical methods for forensic investigation of marine, automotive, and industrial accidents. Dr. Van Ee received his Ph.D. from Duke University. He has worked in collaboration with The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, The National Institutes of Health, United States Department of Justice, Society of Automotive Engineers, and numerous manufactures of automotive, marine, and safety related products on projects related to biomechanics and injury prevention.*