IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships Mondial 2012 Dubai – United Arab Emirates
IPC Jury Meeting No: 1
Time and Date: 17.00, 28th November 2012
Subject: Approval to begin the World Parachuting Championships
Details: **Item 1 – Meet Director Report** The Meet Director reported to the Jury that he was ready to start. **Item 2 – Judging Report** The IPC Controller (J&S), Gillian Rayner, reported to the Jury that all Chief Judges have confirmed that they are ready to start all World Parachuting Championships. **Item 3 – Judging Equipment** The Jury has received the required IPC Judges Committee written approval of all judging equipment to be used. **Item 4 – FAI Controller Report** The FAI Controller, Alberto Martin Paracuellos, gave his report to the Jury. The deposit had been paid to the FAI in time. The provisional FAI Sanction fee had been paid to the FAI. The FAI Controller reported that the state of organisation readiness is satisfactory.
Decision: The Jury decided that the conditions in SC5, 4.5.1 had been met and gave approval to start all WPC's. The Organiser was informed of the Jury decision.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 28th November 2012 Time: 18:25

JUDGING EQUIPMENT USED AT THE MONDIAL 2012

Accuracy
Full WECKBECKER Electronics system including tuffet and landing pad, wind measurement, recording and public information panels.
Used at previous Cat 1 events for many years

Style
Full WECKBECKER Electronics system
used at previous Cat 1 events for many years

FS, AE, CF
NameSpace Intime scoring system software together with organiser provided equipment in accordance with requirements used for FS and AE at previous Cat 1 events (WC Projestov 2009, WC Saarlouis 2011) and for CF at past Cat 2 events.

CP
NameSpace Intime scoring system software used jointly with Jasper Williams speed sensor equipment at previous Cat 1 events (WPC Pretoria 2008 & WPC Kolomna 2010, WC Johannesburg 2009) together with organiser provided equipment in accordance with requirements.

Chair of Judges Committee
Pia Berggren

Approved!

Pia Berggren

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships Canopy Piloting Dubai – United Arab Emirates
IPC Jury Meeting No: 2
Time and Date: 08.00, 29th November 2012
Subject: Approval of replacement of a judge in canopy piloting
Details: The Chief Judge for Canopy Piloting, Rainer Hoenle, requested that the Jury approve the replacement of a selected judge. Johanna Huber was unable to attend. The Chief Judge has selected Paul Moore as her replacement.
Decision: The Jury approved Paul Moore as a replacement. The chief judge in canopy piloting and the organiser was informed of the Jury decision.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 29th November 2012 Time: 08:10

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships Mondial 2012 Dubai – United Arab Emirates
IPC Jury Meeting No: 3
Time and Date: 08.10, 29th November 2012
Subject: Approval of competition site and PA-system.
Details: According to SC5, 5.2.5. the competition site and PA-system have to be approved.
Decision: The Jury approved the competition site and PA-system.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 29th November 2012 Time: 08:15

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships Canopy Formation Dubai – United Arab Emirates
IPC Jury Meeting No: 4
Time and Date: 14:10, 29th November 2012
Subject: Approval of change of exit speed for CF.
Details: The Chief Judge of CF, Barry McAuley, asked for the jury approval for change of exit speed of the Pilatus Porter to be increased to 75 +/- 5 KIAS. This was requested at the competitors briefing for CF.
Decision: The Jury approved the change of exit speed on the Pilatus Porter for CF to 75 +/- 5 KIAS.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 29th November 2012 Time: 14.15

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships Canopy Piloting Dubai – United Arab Emirates
IPC Jury Meeting No: 5
Time and Date: 10.10, 30th November 2012
Subject: Change of rules for Canopy Piloting
Details: The Chief Judge of Canopy Piloting, Rainer Hoenle, proposed the Competition Rules be amended to reflect the fact that the height of the course markers are only approx-imately 1.5 meters, due to changes in the weather conditions. This was proposed during the CP Technical Meeting and all present agreed. Proposed change to the rules: ADDENDUM A, 4.1. First sentence. All course markers, G1,through G5, for the specific Event must <u>be approximately 1.5 meters</u> in height above the surface. ADDENDUM C, 2. Last sentence Electronic sensors shall be placed at the entry gate (course marker #1) and exit gate (course marker #5). The height of the sensors shall <u>be approximately 1.5 meters.</u> ADDENDUM C, 3. Last sentence. Course markers must be <u>approximately 1.5 meters</u> in height.
Decision: The Jury approved the change.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 30th November 2012 Time: 10:20

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Freefall Style & Accuracy
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 6

Time and Date: 08:00, 1st December 2012

Subject: Protest from the Australian Delegation

Details:

Reasons given for protest

The Team Manager for the Australian S&A-team, Faye Cox, submitted a protest against the commencement of round 3 in the accuracy event since round 2 had not been completed. First, the protest stated that the Meet Director is not permitted to change the order of the rounds. Secondly, the protest stated that since round 2 had not been completed the jump order for round 3 could not be determined and consequently could not commence.

Evidence

The Team Manager gave evidence to the Jury and explained the timings to allow the Jury to determine that the protest was valid. In addition she confirmed that the jump order for round 3 was in the reverse order of the results for round 1.

Deliberations

There is nothing in SC5, 5.2.2 (3) that prohibits the Meet Director from commencing round 3 without having completed round 2. The jump order for round 3 was in accordance Competition Rules 4.2.

Decision:

The protest was denied and the protest fee was retained.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 1st December 2012 Time: 09:07

APF PROTEST FORM

PROTEST	
EVENT: **Male accuracy**	
TEAM NO: 19	COMPETITOR NO:
ROUND: 3	COUNTRY: **Australia**
APPLICABLE RULE / S: (As per the FAI Sporting Code 2012 – Section 5)	
5.2.2 (3)	
REASON FOR PROTEST: (Use other side of form if necessary)	
Based on the fact that male accuracy round 2 had not been completed the competitors were of the understanding that the correct jump order had not yet been determined for round 3.	
In accordance with FAI Sporting Code Section 5 Chapter 5 regulation 5.2.2 (3) "The meet director may change the jump order for a round if necessitated…". However, it does not permit the meet director to change the order of the rounds – and as round 2 had not been completed round 3 should not have commenced.	
Additionally as the results from round 2 had not been finalized – technically the exit order should not have been determined and therefore teams should not have been called to commence round 3.	
PROTEST FEE: Cash Attached (X) Cheque Attached ( )	
SIGNED : (Team Manager) Faye Cook	
DATE : **30th November 2012**	TIME: **14:30**

16:20
+100 US$ at manifest on behalf of Meet Director

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Artistic Events
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 7

Time and Date: 14:45, 1st December 2012

Subject: Protest from the Venezuelan Delegation

Details:-

Reasons Given for protest

The Head of Delegation for the Venezuelan Delegation, Pedro Gonzalez, submitted a protest in relation to the Free Fly Team Number 717. They had missed their Manifest call. He requested that consideration be given to a re jump as he was in a meeting and did not hear the call. The Team were not on the Drop Zone.

Evidence

The Head of Delegation was offered the opportunity to withdraw the protest as it did not comply with SC5, 5.3.1.1, re submitting a protest within 2 Hours of the incident. He insisted on continuing with the protest. In his evidence he acknowledged that ''The Sound system was working properly and was good'' and complied with SC5, 5.2.5.

Deliberations

The protest was not valid as it was submitted a full 5 Hours after the incident. However, even if it had been submitted within the 2 Hours, there was no evidence given that SC5, 5.2.5 had not been complied with and by the Head of Delegations own admission the Team were not on the Drop Zone.

Decision:-

The protest was denied and the protest fee retained

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 1st December 2012 Time: 15.00

DUBAI, NOV. /2012

TO: MEET DIRECTOR

FROM: PEDRO LUIS GONZALEZ
HEAD OF DELEGATION
VENEZUELA

SUBJECT: RE-JUMP CONSIDERATION

DEAR SIRS.:

AFTER THE 7:15 a.m. MEETING I WAS PAYING ATTENTION TO ALL CALLS REGARDING DIFFERENT KIND OF JUMPS AND AFTER A WHILE I NOTICE THAT NONE OF MY TEAMS FREE STYLE EVENT WERE CALL AND I WENT TO MANIFEST, WHERE I FOUND OUT THAT UNFORTUNATELY THEIR LOAD (717 VEN A) WERE IN THE AIR ALREADY.

FOR ME CHAPTER 5.2.5 "CALLING THE JUMPERS" WAS WORKING PROPERLY, BUT EVEN WITH THE GOOD SOUND SYSTEM WAS A BIG CONFUSION WITH NOISE, NUMBERS, etc...., SO I AM KINDLY ASK YOU TO CONSIDER A RE-JUMP POSSIBILITIES TO MY TEAM.

KIND REGARDS,

Received 12:40
50 €

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Canopy Formation
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 8

Time and Date: 08:30, 3rd December 2012

Subject: Protests from the Australian and Great Britain Delegations

Details:

Reasons given for protest

The Australian and the Great Britain 2-way CF sequential teams had submitted identical protests referring to the same incident. The Jury decided to handle both protests at the same time.

After working time, the two teams grouped together for a 3-way stack formation. With reference to the Competition Rules, 4.4. both teams where given a score of 0 (zero), on the grounds that no additional moves can be performed after the end of working time.

Evidence

The FAI Controller, Alberto Paracuellos, gave evidence to the Jury. He confirmed that the facts of the jump as stated in the protest, to the best of his knowledge, were correct. He was informed of the incident immediately after it happened, by his deputy at the CF competition site, Hans Geitner.

The FAI Controller confirmed that the score of zero was given to the Australian and Great Britain teams with reference to the Competition Rules, 4.4. The decision to do so was reached in agreement with the Chief Judge for CF, Barry McAuley.

The Chairman of the IPC Canopy Formation Committee, Lindy Rochow-Williams, gave evidence to the Jury. She confirmed that the word “sequence” in the Competition Rules, 4.4 referred to a draw, as specified in the definition given in the same rules, 2.5. In her opinion, performing a 3-way stack formation by two different teams, with no connection to the draw, did not constitute a “sequence” for the purposes of Competition Rule, 4.4.

Deliberations

The Jury concluded that Competition Rule, 4.4. did not apply to the incident, since the two teams had not performed a sequence as defined - “*A series of blocks and random formations that are designated by the draw*”.

Decision: The protest was upheld and the protest fees where returned.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 3rd December 2012 Time: 10:00

02 Dec 12, 16:20 h
AED 150,00 / Cash.

PROTEST FORM

PROTEST	
EVENT: **Canopy Formation – 2way Sequential**	
TEAM NO: 610	COMPETITOR NO:
ROUND: **3**	COUNTRY: **Australia**
APPLICABLE RULE / S: (As per the FAI Sporting Code 2012 – Canopy Formation)	
2.5	
3.4	
4.4	
REASON FOR PROTEST: (Use other side of form if necessary)	
We are protesting the penalty of minimum score given for round 3, on the grounds of "the score of 0 for additional moves at the end of working time (4.4)". The Australian and Great Britain 2way sequential teams grouped together for a 3way stack formation (in the docking order of Australia, Great Britain, Australia) after working time for both teams was completed. However according to section 4.4 they did not perform "any other sequence" as per definition given in section 2.5, of either 2way or 4way sequential or rotation events as per section 3.4.	
PROTEST FEE: Cash Attached (X) Cheque Attached ( )	
SIGNED : (Team Manager)	
DATE : **2 December 2012**	TIME: **15:50**


04:32

12 Dec 12, 16:20h
AED 150.00

PROTEST FORM

PROTEST	
EVENT: **Canopy Formation – 2way Sequential**	
TEAM NO: 613	COMPETITOR NO:
ROUND: **3**	COUNTRY: **Great Britain**
APPLICABLE RULE / S: (As per the FAI Sporting Code 2012 – Canopy Formation)	
2.5	
3.4	
4.4	
REASON FOR PROTEST: (Use other side of form if necessary)	
We are protesting the penalty of minimum score given for round 3, on the grounds of "the score of 0 for additional moves at the end of working time (4.4)". The Australian and Great Britain 2way sequential teams grouped together for a 3way stack formation (in the docking order of Australia, Great Britain, Australia) after working time for both teams was completed. However according to section 4.4 they did not perform "any other sequence" as per definition given in section 2.5, of either 2way or 4way sequential or rotation events as per section 3.4.	
PROTEST FEE: Cash Attached (X) Cheque Attached ( )	
SIGNED : (Team Manager)	
DATE : **2 December 2012**	TIME: **15:50**


04:32

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Freefall Style & Accuracy
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 9

Time and Date: 17:30, 3rd December 2012

Subject: Protest from the French Delegation

Details:

Reason given for protest

In round 5 of Men's Accuracy Philippe Valois from France, competitor no. 31, scored 14 cm. According to the French protest the score "...didn't make sense with what we saw on the field". The French protested the score on the grounds that a re-jump should have been offered according to the Competition Rules, 5.1.7 (5) when the AMD is defective or not reset.

Evidence

The Chief Judge for Freefall Style & Accuracy, Günter Berendt, gave evidence to the Jury. He explained that there had been no problems with the AMD. He presented the print out to confirm this. He further explained, that it was observed that the competitor landed with the whole side of a foot at virtually the same time and not with the heel touching the AMD first.

Deliberations

Given that the AMD was not defective and given the explanation by the Chief Judge regarding foot-position of the competitor when landing, there is no evidence supporting the protest.

Decision:

The protest was denied and the protest fee was retained

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 3rd December 2012 Time: 18:00

Recd. 14.47

World Parachuting Championships
mondial 2012
Dubai 28 Nov - 9 Dec

PROTEST

50 € Fee would have been 2 hours to Meet Director. Protest.

Dubaï, 03.12 **2012** → 5th round ACCURACY MEN BEACH DZ

FROM : **FRENCH TEAM**

TO : **MEET DIRECTOR**

CONCERNING : VALOIS Philippe **Competitor Number :** 31

hour of the knowledge : 11H35

RULES about wich the protest is being made :

- **Chapter :** FAI Rules specific to the events **Article :** 5.1.7. (5) "If a AMD is found to be defective"...
- **Chapter :** **Article :**

GROUNDS FOR PROTEST : LANDING SCORE by the AMD

According to the rules mentionned before, i would like you to consider this request :

The score that appeard on the board (14cm) didn't make sense with what we saw on the field.

TEAM ~~MANAGER~~ CAPTAIN
Ph. VALOIS

TEAM ~~CAPTAIN~~ MANAGER
C. LUSSO

COMPETITOR
Ph. VALOIS

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Canopy Formation
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 10

Time and Date: 16:00, 5th December 2012

Subject: Protest from Great Britain Delegation

Details:

Reason given for protest
The GBR CF 4-way rotation team 673 protested the disqualification issued after the landing from round 6 on the grounds that the FAI Controller does not have the power to disqualify (SC5, 4.1.1(2)) and that only the Meet Director, with the consent of the Jury, may penalize a competitor (SC5, 5.4.1 (2)). Further, the GBR found the penalty excessive, considering SC5, 5.4.

Evidence
The Jury heard extensive testimony from the GBR team manager and team captain, the FAI Controller Alberto M. Paracuellos and his deputy at the CF competition site, Hans Geitner.

Deliberations
The Jury deliberated and concluded that it is within the FAI Controllers authority to issue such a disqualification since he is responsible for safety during the competition and a failure to practice safe parachuting may lead to disqualification as per SC5, 1.3 (1).

The Jury further deliberated that it found no grounds to challenge the judgment made by the FAI Controller when issuing the disqualification.

Decision:
The protest was denied and the protest fee retained.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 6th December 2012 Time: 11:30

Team 15.30 Read

PROTEST FORM

Hearsay

PROTEST	
EVENT: **Canopy Formation – 4 Way Rotations**	
TEAM NO: 673	COMPETITOR NO:
ROUND: **6 onwards.**	COUNTRY: **Great Britain**
APPLICABLE RULE / S: (As per the FAI Sporting Code 2012)	
Section5. 4.1.2 5.4.1 (2) (and general section 5.2) 5.2.23	
General Section overview 1.1 and 5.2.1	
REASON FOR PROTEST: (incorrect application of sporting code rules pertaining to disqualification of a competitor/team- harsh/incorrect penalty- unfair treatment)	

Disqualification of Team 673 for Round 6 made (according to score sheet attached) by the FAI controller quoting "Disqualification for safety reasons"
This score sheet dated 4th December 2012, 14.50 pm was NOT available to the team at the time the team manager left the competition site @ 6pm that day.
This score sheet is not signed by the Meet Director

Additionally there was verbal notification (Manifest) that the team had also been disqualified for the rest of the meet, and they were removed from the manifest. However this has not been formally confirmed, and the unspecified 'safety reasons' have not been detailed to enable understanding of the alleged infringements.

This raises the following issues:

Under 4.1.1.(2) the Fai Controller is responsible for safety and adherence to the sporting code and competition rules. This role does not state disqualification
Under 5.4 .1 (2) and General Section 5.2) it states ONLY the meet director with the consent of the jury can penalise any competitor.

Therefore the protest is made that correct and just procedure has not been followed in the disqualification of Team 673.

Team 673 deny the allegation that they had acted in such a manner as to merit disqualification. Furthermore, even if this had been deemed the case and handled in the correct manner, the penalty given as per 5.4.1(2) (5.2.2.2) quite clearly states remedy for dangerous or hazardous, or repetition of lesser infringements, to carry a penalty of not less than 5% of the best score. Disqualification under this penalty is not a remedy.

Disqualification is only a remedy under 5.2.2.3 Unsporting Behavior - At no time has any explanation been provided to the team of what actions were deemed Unsporting Behavior.

We therefore query the disqualification of the team, as the Penalty applied can only be applied by the Meet director with the consent of the jury and further such penalty is excessive, unexplained and unfair.

Furthermore with reference to Introduction of Sporting Code and Chapter 1.1, it is stated that the sporting code seeks to be fair and capable of being understood by participants. Based on the decisions made above such clarity has not been demonstrated.

We therefore request the penalty of disqualification is revoked.
Thank you

PROTEST FORM

PROTEST FEE: Cash Attached (X) Cheque Attached ( )
SIGNED : (Team Manager) TEAM CAPTAIN
DATE : **5 December 2012** TIME:

InTime Scoring - 2012-12-04 14:48:48

Meet: 2012 World Parachuting Championships CF

Event: Canopy Formation 4-Way Rotations Open

Team: 673 (Great Britain CF4 Rotations)

Round: 6

Score: 0 (8 before penalty)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Percy	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mario	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lindy	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Julia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Agnieszka	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Final	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

2 - Camera angle / formation visibility

3 - Rebuild

Penalty :Disqualified by FAI controller for safety reasons

Penalty Applied: 100%

Date & Time: 14:51 7 Dec

Chief Judge: D. Hearing

Meet Director: _____

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Freefall Style & Accuracy
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 11

Time and Date: 12:30, 6th December 2012

Subject: Protest from Russian Delegation

Details:

Reason given for protest

The RUS Head of Delegation protested the disqualification of freefall style competitor 13, issued after the landing from round 4 on the grounds that the decision of the FAI Controller to disqualify is not appropriate since the competitor made his approach and landing in accordance with the requirements of a safe landing under a fast canopy, and the competitor did not make any dangerous moves, including turns more than 90 degree. The competitor landed following the windsock even though the landing-T was pointing in a different direction.

Evidence

The Jury heard extensive testimony from the RUS competitor, the FAI Controller Alberto M. Paracuellos and his deputy at the style competition site, Hans Geitner.

Deliberations

The Jury deliberated and concluded that it is within the FAI Controllers authority to issue such a disqualification since he is responsible for safety during the competition and a failure to practice safe parachuting may lead to disqualification, SC5, 1.3 (1).

The Jury further deliberated that it found no grounds to challenge the judgment made by the FAI Controller when issuing the disqualification.

Decision:

The protest was denied and the protest fee retained.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 6th December 2012 Time: 13:00

100 $
14.50 h.

To World Parachuting Parachuting Championships 2012
Meet Director
Mr. Helmut Schlecht.
From: Russian Delegation

Protest.

On December 5th, 2012, while making a 4th round jump in style, competitor N 13 while making a landing, to ensure a safe landing to the restricted area, had to make his approach not exactly in the direction of the landing marker on the ground. While making a landing approach he has used to determine a wind direction a wind sock on the area and flags, which are on the landing area as well. These indications were showing different direction from the ground marker. The landing, following the ground marker for landing direction would lead to a landing by the wind direction, which is not safe.

We ask You to change a decision not to judge round 4 in style of competitor N 13, as far as this result should not depend on the landing of a competitor.

To our opinion the decision of FAI controller to dispualify this competitor from the furthe jumps is not appropriate, while competitor has made his approach and landing in accordance with requirements of the safe landing under fast canopy, and competitor did not make any dangerous moves, including turns more then 90° degrees, in accordance with 13.(1) Sec 5.

Basing on all of the above, we ask to score round 4 of style of the competitor N 13, and let him make 5th competition round.

Head of Delegation,
Vladimir Gazetov

IPC JURY NOTICE

2012 World Parachuting Championships
Canopy Formation
Dubai – United Arab Emirates

IPC Jury Meeting No: 12

Time and Date: 12:00, 6th December 2012

Subject: Protest from US Delegation

Details:

Reason given for protest
In accordance with SC5, 4.6.8, the US delegation requested that two judges in CF be dismissed and that all jumps which their assessment deviated from the actual score by more than 15% be re-evaluated by a different panel og judges.

Evidence
The US Delegation submitted a calculation purporting to show that two CF judges did not meet the evaluation standards required in SC5, 6.8.2.

Deliberations
The evaluation referred to in SC5, 6.8.2 is made using a minimum of 30 jumps to which an approved assessment has been made by an experienced of judges approved by the IPC Judges Committee.

The calculation made by the US Delegation used only 6 jumps with the actual score. This does not meet the requirements of 6.8.2 and therefore cannot be used.

Decision:
The protest was denied and the protest fee retained.

Signature:

Jury President

Date: 6th December 2012 Time: 12:30

50 €
16:50

5 December 2012

This protest is being presented in accordance with Sporting Code General Section Chapter 5, Rule 5.4.2

In the evaluation criteria laid out in Sporting Code Section 5 – Parachuting, Chapter 6 (FAI Judges), 6.8.1(2), it states that, during the evaluation process for judges, "at least 85% of the assessments for all disciplines, except Formation Skydiving, must agree with the approved score."

In the judging of our jumps for rounds 1-6 of CF 4-way sequential, two judges had assessment alignment percentages of 80% and 81% with the actual score. This is below the standards set for the evaluation process, and yet it has occurred at a First-Class Event. Additionally, these two judges were responsible for 70% (32/46) of the zeros given. This is 175% of the expected percentage if all zeros were evenly distributed across judges. Clearly, there is a significant deviation from FAI standards for these two judges.

We have attached an Excel spreadsheet that breaks down the zeros issued per dive and shows the number of assessments that deviated from the actual score for the two judges in question.

In light of these data, and the FAI's own criteria for determining judging competency, we request that these two judges be dismissed under the provisions of Sporting Code, Section 5, Chapter 4, 4.6.8, and that all dives in which their assessments deviated from the actual score by more than 15% be re-evaluated by a different panel of judges.

Respectfully submitted,
USA CF 4-way Sequential (Team 655)