



IPC JURY NOTICE

6TH FAI World Canopy Piloting Championships Farnham - Canada

IPC Jury Meeting No: # 03

Time and Date: 13.30 hours, August 24th, 2016

Subject: protest regarding competition rules 5.10.2 and 5.5.1., signed by 6 competitors.

Details of protest:

The Chief Judge applied competition rule 5.10.2 different under arguably similar weather conditions on different days. Therefore, based on the application of competition rule 5.5.1, the better ranked competitors were exposed to the worst weather conditions at that time.

The Jury decided that the protest was valid. It had been delivered within the 2 hour time frame to the Meet Director, together with CAD 73, accepted as equivalent of 50 Euros. (SC5, 5.3.1 (1))

The Jury had a meeting with the Chief Judge and the relevant (Speed) Event Judge. The CJ stated that he did not notice adverse weather conditions during all jumping that would merit a re-jump. He stated the winds were never exceeding the 7 m/s windspeed which is the maximum windspeed for the speed event. He was aware of the wind conditions, focusing on canopy performances in the course, and all present Judges were monitoring weather conditions and parachute performance. He finally stated that the competition was only stopped (by the Meet Director) well after the last competitors had landed.

The Jury had a meeting with the Meet Director about the situation. The MD had asked two competitors from last load how the weather conditions were. One competitor did not reply, the other said it was not good. The MD also noted a trend of more wind. Based on the expectance of more wind, he decided to stop the competition. He did not see any landings of competitors.

The Jury had informed the signing competitors that they had to choose one representative for the hearing in the protest, as they all had signed the same protest text. The Jury then heard Mr. Thomas Dellibac as the representative. The following questions were asked and items discussed:

1. The Jury informed Mr. Dellibac that according to SC5, 5.3.1 (6) the protester has the right to withdraw the protest. This was noted. The Jury informed him that he was heard as this is part of the Jury protocol for dealing with protests.
2. The Jury stated that it had read the protest and asked if Mr. Dellibac wanted to add further explanation to the protest. He stated that the rule was applied in an unfair way and the jumping under these conditions was unsafe. He stated the protesters don't like to jump in these conditions and that they cannot perform in the way they want as competitors. Some further technical details about the parachute handling and landings were given.
3. The Jury asked if he felt that there has been a breach in the application of competition rule 5.10.2. He stated this was not as such in relation to wind speed, but that it was applied unfair for the adverse conditions. He told that other criteria should be added to the competition rules, in order to give the CJ more tools to judge adverse weather, giving examples like object size and form.
4. The Jury asked if he felt that there has been a breach in the application of competition rule 5.5.1. He stated that had not been the case, but that due to the effect of this rule at this particular time, the higher ranking competitors were affected.

Deliberations:

1. The protest was signed by 6 competitors who had jumped at different times, from different passes. Yet, the protest was signed by a group, there were no individual protests.
2. Competition rules 5.10.2 gives the authority to the Chief Judge (or relevant Event Judge) to decide on the offering of a re-jump. The Chief Judge is convinced he did apply this rule correctly, the weather conditions were such they did not merit a re-jump. The Jury concludes that competition rule 5.10.2 has not been breached by the Chief Judge.
3. Competition rules 5.5.1 prescribes the jump order of competitors. As weather is unpredictable, as is the exact time of jumping of competitors, the effect of the jump order on the actual performance of a competitor is also unpredictable. In this case, the protesters argue that it turned out bad for them. However, Mr. Dellibac admitted the rule itself has not been breached. The Jury is of the same opinion.
4. The competition was only stopped by the Meet Director after all competitors had landed, based on a noted trend for increasing wind speed, and information from one of the last landed competitors. This questions of the Meet Director might have lead competitors to believe that the conditions were already so adverse that this would merit a re-jump.
5. All time before the actual stop of the competition, the wind speed had never exceeded the maximum of 7 m/s.
6. The Jury noted that the protest is signed by competitors who jumped at different times, when the claimed adverse weather conditions cannot be assumed to have been the same for all protesters.

Decisions:

- The Jury concludes there has been no breach of competition rules 5.10.2 and 5.5.1.
- The Jury rejects the protest.
- The Jury retains the 73 CAD.

Signature:  RONALD OVERDIJK Jury President

Date: 24-08-2016 Time: 16.20