

Subject:	PROPOSALS TO AMEND SC5 & FREEFALL STYLE & ACCURACY LANDING RULES	Annex No. -	18
Author:	Austrian Aero Club, IPC Delegate Gernot Rittenschober	Agenda refs. -	12.4.3 22.2.3
Date:	28 October 2015	Page -	1 of 3

PROPOSALS TO AMEND SPORTING CODE, SECTION 5, and FREEFALL STYLE & ACCURACY LANDING COMPETITION RULES

- 1) De-confliction of responsibilities between FAI controller, Chief Judge and Jury in SC5 and handbooks
- 2) Revise the IPC entry fee refund policy if a FCE does not take place SC5 4.4.4.
- 3) Revise the S&A CR in regard to junior participation S&A CR 7.3.

1) De-confliction of responsibilities between FAI controller, Chief Judge and Jury

FAI controller handbook: "3.2. 2. Will ensure that an information board and official scoreboard (to be designated by the Chief Judge and approved by the Jury) are in place and convenient for competitor access.

Situation:

Unlike General Section where many tasks are given to the jury (which may be nominated or representative as decided by ASC) and where **no function like FAI controller exists**, in SC5 certain responsibilities and tasks have been given to the FAI controller.

The same applies for the Chief Judge who is mentioned in GS and whose role is defined as:

4.3.3.1 FAI Air Sport Commissions shall appoint Judges for events requiring, in whole or in part, subjective evaluation of a performance or for other duties as specified in the specialised sections of the Sporting Code.

Both CJ and FAI controller are IPC appointed and Plenary approved officials who are supposed to be experts and one could expect them to make reasonable decisions in close co-operation with the Meet Director without a jury constantly looking over their shoulder.

But in reality the responsibility of FAI controller and Chief Judge is questionable because in SC5 there are several details where the jury has to consent/ verify/ approve their decision.

Proposal: Clean up the SC5 and leave the responsibility for decision making on appropriate level.

Remark: This proposal does not intend to limit the responsibility of the jury as stated in:

GS 4.3.1.1 Matters of advice, arbitration or rule interpretation shall be the responsibility of the International Jury, as defined in 4.3.2. and it seems to be sufficient to apply SC5 in general

4.7.2 Duties and Rights

(1) It is the responsibility of the Jury to ensure that the provisions of the General Section and Section 5 of the FAI Sporting Code, the Competition Rules, the Official Information Bulletins and the Organiser Agreement are strictly observed.

while it is doubtful if it really has to be a specified task for the jury to:

- approve the AMD which was already accepted by the CJ
- approve the location and area of the competition site after the FAI controller has already approved it
- approve the "public address system" (i.e. loudspeaker) after the FAI controller has already approved it
- approve the official notice board after the CJ has designated and the FAI controller has already approved it (and usually the Meet Director has built it)
- verify and approve the results (which are already verified and signed by the CJ)

Examples Section 5:

3.1.2.(5) However where a Competition Record performance takes place during an FCE and is part of the competition results approved by the Jury,...

4.3.1. (3) Any Automatic Measuring Device, which is used for judging must be acceptable to the CJ and needs the approval of the Jury.

Subject:	PROPOSALS TO AMEND SC5 & FREEFALL STYLE & ACCURACY LANDING RULES	Annex No. -	18
Author:	Austrian Aero Club, IPC Delegate Gernot Rittenschober	Agenda refs. -	12.2.3 22.2.3
Date:	28 October 2015	Page -	2 of 3

4.7.2.4.b) **The Jury** is required to **verify and approve** the competition results...

5.2.1. an event is considered complete after the official results for the event have been posted by the CJ and the time limit for protests for the event has expired.

5.2.5.(1) The location and area of the competition site, the public address system therein and the notice board **must be approved by** the FAI Controller and **the Jury**

5.2.10. (2) The official results of each event will be posted, as soon as possible, on the scoreboard **designated by the Chief Judge and approved by the Jury**.... . The Chief Judge will ensure that the official results are available in time for the award ceremonies.

5.3.1.(1) no later than two hours after results for the particular event or round have been posted on the official scoreboard, designated by the CJ **and approved by the Jury**

6.7.1.(5) The **CJ will ensure** compliance with the FAI Sporting Code and the Competition Rules during the competition working as necessary **with the Meet Director** and other competent personnel.
The CJ will control the evaluation of score sheets and will ensure prompt publication of the results on the official scoreboard.

2) **Revise the IPC entry fee refund policy if a FCE does not take place**

Situation: During 2015 IPC plenary the SC5 was changed with the result that Sanction Fees are not refunded if the FCE does not take place.

4.4.4 Refund of Entry Fees

(1) If an FCE does not take place, all entry fees, other than Sanction Fees, that have been paid will be returned in full...

Proposal: If a FCE does not take place a NAC participant shall get full refund.

4.4.4 Refund of Entry Fees

(1) If an FCE does not take place, all entry fees, ~~other than Sanction Fees~~, that have been paid will be returned in full

Rationale: FCEs are announced after a bid and IPC plenary decision based on a contract (organizer agreement) between FAI and the host.

If a FCE is cancelled on short notice (i.e. after the entry fee is already paid) for whatever reason like bad planning, force majeure,...? (all which is quite unlikely anyhow) this decision is made/confirmed by the host NAC and/or FAI officials (IPC Bureau, FAI controller).

So it is against all common sense that a participating NAC should pay Sanction Fee to FAI in addition to the risk that maybe travel expenses for the participants have been paid already, loss of wage for participants holiday has to be accepted.

Remarks: The 50% or non- refund policy with always full Sanction Fee payment of SC5 4.4.5 if a competitor or team does not participate by own decision or other reason (e.g. injury) seems to be already heavy risk sharing on the NAC participant side. Why should FAI earn money from someone who does not participate?

It seems to be even more unfair that FAI still earns money from NAC participants if there is no FCE held at all.

Subject:	PROPOSALS TO AMEND SC5 & FREEFALL STYLE & ACCURACY LANDING RULES	Annex No. -	18
Author:	Austrian Aero Club, IPC Delegate Gernot Rittenschober	Agenda refs. -	12.2.3 22.2.3
Date:	28 October 2015	Page -	3 of 3

And a still open admin question is who collects the same fee from those who have not yet paid their entry fee until the decision was made?

A possible outcome of this rule will be, that any entry fee payment is made at the very last moment or rather in cash after arrival, which may create additional problems for the organizer (just because FAI wants to collect Sanction Fee even from non-participants).

3) Revise the S&A CR in regard to junior participation

Situation: In S&A competition rules a junior competitor has to chose if he/she wants to be classified in the junior ranking or can participate in the national team.

Proposal: All present juniors shall be ranked in the junior classification and if a junior is good enough to jump in the national team, this should not prevent him/her from winning a junior medal.

S&A CR 7.3. ...

2 junior male competitors

2 junior female competitors

DELETE:

~~N.B. Junior competitors may enter one competition only, e.g. if they are part of the men's or women's team they will not be allowed to have their scores count towards the Junior event – they can only register in one competition.~~

ADD:

N.B. Junior competitors who are part of their male or female AL team will also be ranked in the junior classification.

Rationale: We should attract as many juniors as possible to attend S&A FCE because they are the future. This rule change gives a nation the opportunity to send the best junior(s) inside their team and two juniors in addition.

Remark:

The separation of juniors only makes sense if the junior competition is conducted as separate FCE (like it was in the past together with the World Cup of Champions and still may happen by SC5 4.1.1 (2)) but not if the WPC is held together like it happened in recent years.

If a junior is good enough to win both the general male/female and the junior classification, it may be so and the two medals are well earned.

Additional Remark:

It should also be considered if the requirement of 4 different NACs in the junior classification shall be applied if Junior WPC is not held separately.

If there is a sufficient number of juniors to award medals but they are from less than 4 NACs (while the S&A WPC has more than 4 NACs participation and is valid) the individual junior classification should also be valid and the weird distinction between winner and champion should not be a topic.

On behalf of the AUT NAC- OeAeC

IPC Delegate

