

## Annex 5B

EXI“ Dr. Rainer Hoenle  
IPC Controller WAG 2001-06-21  
Granada, Andalucia, Spain

30.06.2001

### IPC CONTROLLER’s REPORT WAG 2001, Granada

According to Sporting Code V, 4.1.1. (3) the IPC Controller does not have to, but feels the necessity to report issues, that have arisen before and during the competition, that seem to require discussion and/or consideration at the next Plenary Meeting of the IPC.

#### **Before the start of the competition:**

1. The Organiser did not comply with SC V, 4.3.2. (3): not all of the equipment required here was on site and operational at the start of the Judge’s conference. There were no digital dual recording systems provided. Nevertheless, 6 VHS recorders were provided and – shortly before the competition jumps started – two digital dubbing stations were operational.
2. Public viewing was set up, but not operational at the start of the competition. On request, nobody seemed to care, to have the viewing monitors connected to the recording system. On the second day of the competition the system finally was operational.
3. The Organiser failed to comply with Competition Rules 6.2.1: An image of the competition was presented, which was a far distance away from presenting a visually attractive image of the competition jumps to competitors, spectators and media. During all of the competition no positive comment was to be heard. Would-be spectators had to face massive difficulties to get permission to enter to the competition compound, not even mentioning the financial impact, they were impounded with, while trying to do so.

#### **During the competition:**

##### **1. Activity of the Jury with impact on the outcome on the standings in FS:**

The Jury was presented with a protest, handed in by the teams of Russia and Brazil in FS 8-way, that rule 5.2.5 of the SC V was imposed on them in Round 2.

Both teams had missed their call to board the airplane. According to the rule, this failure to arrive in time to board the aircraft leads to the reception of the minimum score for this round, in this case “zero”. The calls were given at 20:44 and 20:54 ( 15 Minutes and 5 Minutes as required ).

The USA-Team, being on the same plane, responded to the call.

The Meet Director followed the rule of this paragraph and applied the minimum score for the teams involved.

After the Jury had discussed the incidences surrounding this matter and before the voting of the Jury the IPC Controller, present at this meeting, asked the members of the Jury to consider, if there actually was a violation of the protested rule and also, to take into consideration SC V, 4.5.4 and also, SC GS Chapter 5.

The Jury decided to accept the protest and to vote on it.

The IPC Controller repeated his statement that a breaking of rule 5.2.5 seems not to be present, that this rule was applied correctly by the Meet Director and questioned, that this case or incident was not covered by a valid rule, hence requiring a Jury decision as stated in 4.7.2 (2). ,

Evidence was collected by the IPC Controller before entering the Jury, that the calls in question were given in time and also, if they could be heard and understood.

In the hangar, 6 witnesses from different countries confirmed to have heard and understood the call, one witness had heard the call in the first floor of the building, where the team-room of Russia is located, also. There is evidence, that the teams of Russia and Brazil had left the competition site already, because of a misinterpretation of a loud-speaker-announcement.

The IPC Controller

“EXI” Dr. Rainer Hoenle, IPC Controller WAG 2001, Granada, Spain.