

<i>Subject:</i>	PROPOSAL TO AMEND SPORTING CODE SECTION 5 - 6.6.1	Annex No. -	55
<i>Author:</i>	Col. Gernot Rittenschober, FAI/IPC Delegate, Austria	Agenda ref. -	23.2.1
<i>Date:</i>	27 November 2016	Total Pages -	1

## 1) PROPOSAL TO AMEND SPORTING CODE, SECTION 5 § 6.6.1

### 6.6.1. Chief Judge

The Chief Judge (CJ) for an FCE is nominated by the Judges' Committee from the annual nomination list. This nomination will be made in consultation with the relevant Discipline Committee, who a) **may shall** consult the Organiser. The nomination must be approved by the IPC Plenary.

~~b) A CJ may only be nominated once per discipline per calendar year. c) The CJ must have served as an EJ at a minimum of 2 FCE's (1 for CF) or as a CJ at some time prior to the current nomination and must not be from the organising country.~~

The CJ must have a thorough working knowledge of the General Section and Section 5 of the Sporting Code and the Competition Rules, including the latest changes made at the IPC meeting preceding the competition concerned and the philosophy behind these changes. He must also be familiar with all aspects of the conduct and operation of an international competition and will serve as administrative head of the Panel of Judges.

a) **may** consult is no rule, what are the conditions why one time it happens and another time not?

as it is already clearly stated that the Judge's C'tee is nominating the CJ for approval, the real decision maker (IPC Plenary) should at least be sure that the organizing NAC has been consulted and not only might have been.

b) - there is not any discipline with two FCE in the same year (if not WG or WAG is considered a FCE and happens in the same year as WPC)

- and if there would really happen two FCEs in one year and a qualified CJ is available twice, the judges c'tee nominates and plenary approves, then why should not the same CJ serve again?

c) This rule cannot be adhered to in disciplines without EJs (like Paraski or Speed Skydiving) so the ("1 for CF") has to be extended to 0 for SP and PS

- but what use is a rule that only gives instructions to the judge's committee how to select the nominee? so better delete this superfluous rule

In general writing too detailed rules and then need to make exceptions and not follow the own rules is questionable. Those who are elected to make decisions (e.g. committee chair including judge's c'tee) are supposed to know what they do and if they make stupid decisions, they are responsible for that.