

Subject:	USA PROPOSAL TO AMEND CANOPY FORMATION CR 2.8	Annex No. -	32
Author:	Kirk Verner, IPC Delegate, USA	Agenda ref. -	16.3.2
Date:	02 December 2013	Page	1 of 2

Proposal: CF competition rule change – definition of omission

Respectfully submitted by the United States

Motion: to amend Competition Rules for Canopy Formation, section 2.8 to read as follows:

2.8 **Omission:** ~~[A formation or inter missing from the drawn sequence or no clear intent to build the correct formation or inter is seen, and another formation or inter is presented.]~~ is one of the following:

1. ~~A formation or inter missing from the drawn sequence.~~
2. ~~No clear intent to build the correct formation or inter is seen and another formation or inter is presented and there is an advantage to the team resulting from the substitution.~~

Commentary:

1. **As currently written, the rules regarding an *incorrect* formation and of an *omission* can result in a situation in which they contradict each other.** If a team were to dirt-dive the wrong sequence and perform an incorrect formation that resulted in an advantage to the team, the judging panel would in theory have to view it as an incorrect formation, and therefore not penalize the team, because the current language in the rules regarding incorrect formations stipulates that there shall be no penalty (5.1.3 and 5.2.3: “Teams will not be awarded points for incorrect formations. There will be no penalty.”). This could lead to teams intentionally inserting incorrect formations into dives to speed their performance to a level that would still result in a higher score than would have been achieved by performing the correct sequence, even without the incorrect formation scoring. Given the fact that rules violations to gain competitive advantage have been observed at the past three World Championships (and documented on video at the last one), this is not a far-fetched scenario.

2. **As currently written, the definition of an omission is written in such a way as to allow two different interpretations, the more logical of which would render the definition impotent.** According to rules of grammar and logic, the placement of the comma offsets the third condition from the others and essentially requires that two conditions be met, one of which *must* be that “another formation or inter is presented.” In other words, a team could argue that a total omission does not meet the definition of “omission” because they did not also present another formation! The new wording (taken from the FS rules) makes very clear which two conditions go together.

<i>Subject:</i>	USA PROPOSAL TO AMEND CANOPY FORMATION CR 2.8	<i>Annex No. -</i>	32
<i>Author:</i>	Kirk Verner, IPC Delegate, USA	<i>Agenda ref. -</i>	16.3.2
<i>Date:</i>	02 December 2013	<i>Page</i>	2 of 2

If this motion is not approved, the committee should at least consider the following rewrite of the definition of “omission” to correct this problem:

2.8 Omission: A formation or inter missing from the drawn sequence, or no clear intent to build the correct formation or inter is seen, and another formation or inter is presented.

However, it should be noted that moving the comma would not address the conflict between the language of the rules regarding omissions and incorrect formations, and therefore would not solve the larger problem.)

3. This clause has been successfully used in FS for years. The language of this proposal is taken directly from Competition Rules for Formation Skydiving section 2.12. It has been used successfully to score dive sequences in that discipline and it stands to reason that it can be used in the sequential CF events as well without any additional complications in performance, judging, or scoring.