<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback #</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Rule No.</th>
<th>Text of proposed amendment</th>
<th>Comment/Feedback/Reason for proposed amendment</th>
<th>WSPS Feedback</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Appendix 7</td>
<td>Old sticker - if a smaller size sticker is also added to the rifle in a consistent way, the new sticker must be applied in a precise 10cm distance, a sticker high 16mm (as described), and wide 10 cm, with inner arrows pointing outwards is recommended (was used in the past). In case old sticker on the rifle is still valid, no need to apply a new one, a simple equipment control sticker on the COG will do the trick.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. We do not agree with keeping the old sticker as this can be changed after equipment control. We must apply new stickers at each event after verifying at equipment control. We do agree to reduce the size of the sticker as requested to 30mm by 10mm.</td>
<td>Amend Appendix 7 accordingly</td>
<td>Amendment 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Appendix 11, section 11.3.3(b)</td>
<td>Rifle: The name of the country denoted by 3 letters as COG sticker – instead of single arrows stickers, that are NEVER applied in a precise 10cm distance, a sticker high 16mm (as described), and WIDE 10 cm, with inner arrows pointing outwards is recommended (was used in the past). Not all athletes have (or better, most wheelchair athletes) don’t have a pocket on the Jacket. A more inclusive solution needs to be sought out.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. We agree with this feedback, we can change the rule to say &quot;on the pocket or on the chest&quot;.</td>
<td>Amend rule 11.3(b) of Appendix 11 accordingly</td>
<td>Amendment 11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Appendix 11, section 11.1.8(b)</td>
<td>Malfunctions in the Final Medal Matches will be governed according to ISSF Rule 6.17.1.6. (Only one (1) allowable malfunction is permitted for each team during the Medal Match).</td>
<td>It only seems reasonable to give at least one allowable malfunction to each team’s MEMBER/COMPONENT, and not one to each TEAM. Athletes should not be compromised due to malfunctions of other team members.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. This rule is in accordance with ISSF Rules. No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Appendix 2, section 5.3.1</td>
<td>5.3.1 Replacement entries may be accepted in the same event, only due to injury or medical reason, at the sole discretion of WSPS, in consultation with the LOC. NPC’s requesting replacement entries must submit supporting documents to WSPS for approval.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. In the feedback in states &quot;as long as these do not impose new preparations for from the LOC&quot; which is exactly what ita changes do. Late changes create more work for the LOC, Jury members, WSPS, results provider, etc. NPC’s must have their entries in by the Entry by Name deadline and only for a medical reason will a change be considered. We do not support this change request.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Appendix 2, section 6.1</td>
<td>6.1A1 All athletes will be required to reach set MQS to be eligible to compete in certain Competitions. The MQS will be defined by WSPS for each Events and published in the relevant qualification documentation for each Competition.</td>
<td>We recommend removing the MQS requirement for ALL competition except Paralympic Games. Section 6 Article 6.1 of Appendix 2 should be eliminated. No MQS should be required for participating in ANY competition (other than Paralympic Games).</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. We have had conversations regarding the MQS scores before. We feel more comfortable leaving them in for major competitions as a safety requirement. Currently the only competitions we require MQS scores for our World Championships and for good reason, we want our World Championships to be a major event where athletes have to earn the right to compete, just like the Paralympic Games. In addition, the MQS score requirement helps support our Level 1 and Level 2 competitions which is important. The feedback regarding lowering the MQS score is noted.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>28 - 30</td>
<td>Appendix 7</td>
<td>The universal types must be mounted in the lower left corner of the frame and be powered by a USB power source as necessary. The universal types must be mounted vertically 60 mm right below the target centre.</td>
<td>The aim system VIS500 (EcoAims) has a straight bar of LED unit which is so far only mountable in vertical. The universal types must be mounted in the lower left corner of the frame and be powered by a USB charger or power-bank.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. This is a proposal to change the competition programme which is not the purpose of this rule review. The Paralympic competition programme review is a separate process.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.4.5</td>
<td>The universal types must be mounted in the lower left corner of the frame and be powered by a USB charger or power-bank.</td>
<td>The aim system VIS500 (EcoAims) has a straight bar of LED unit which is so far only mountable in vertically.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. This is a proposal to change the competition programme which is not the purpose of this rule review. The Paralympic competition programme review is a separate process.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>R1 - 10m Air Rifle Standing Mixed Gender and R7 - 50m Rifle 3 positions mixed Gender</td>
<td>Put together R1=R2 and R7=R8 so that SH1 also competes in mixed events, the same as SH2. We see no argument that SH1 women should have their own events based on gender.</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. This is a proposal to change the competition programme which is not the purpose of this rule review. The Paralympic competition programme review is a separate process.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 | 13 | 1.2.2.2 | Appendix 3  13  1.2.2.2 | Finals are required in all Events except P5  
WSPS are planning to adopt the new event rules from ISSF. The WFPS Rule 8.1.1 There will be team Events in each Event as numbers permit, except for the Paralympic Games.  
With exception of «Appendix 3 rule 1.2.2.2 Finals are required in all Events except P5» ISSS has now introduced Finals also in the Team events. The text above will probably introduce a double amount of finals in all WSPS competitions and will put a tremendous extra pressure, both on the finals range and the organizers personnel during a competition.  
Thank you for your feedback but it is not clear what this feedback is. WFPS does not plan to add any extra finals, only the 3 additional Mixed Team Events that have been in place since the Sydney 2010 World Championships.  
No change |
| 10 | Appendix 8  | 36 | 2.11.1.2 | ISSF Rule 8.9.3c is removed, 2.11.1.2 is not corresponding to ISSF 8.9.1 (No malfunction in sighters)  
Thank you for your feedback. This is in reference to 2.12.1.2. The feedback is correct, we will remove the sentence in this rule.  
Amend rule 2.12.1.2 of Appendix 8 accordingly |
| 11 | Appendix 8  | 36 | 2.12.1.4 | "40 shot event", the text is more or less only written for 25m with series etc.  
Thank you for your feedback. We agree with your proposal and we will remove the information about 40 shots.  
2.12.1.4 of Appendix 8 accordingly |
| 12 | Appendix 8  | 36 | 2.12 | Is there anything WSPS unique here? Is special WSPS regulations needed or follow ISSF rules?  
Thank you for your feedback. This rule is based on ISSF Rules and have been adapted to fit WPS.  
No change |
| 13 | General comment |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14 | Rulebook 5 | Definitions - Loader | Loader: a Team Official who will assist athletes with loading during Competitions.  
The definition of LOADER must be more detailed. Our suggestion for the definition:  
LOADER – A team official of the athlete’s choice, that will assist the athlete with the loading, handing and keeping safety of the weapon during all time necessary on the FOP. The Loader, when indicated necessary by the classification panel, makes an inseparable part of the athlete while handling the weapon, and will be accredited as such.  
Rationale for the recommendation:  
Unlike what outside viewers may think, the role of the Loader for SHG athletes is very crucial. Depending on the athlete’s disability, the loader does almost everything: from only loading the rifle, to sometimes positioning the athlete, responding to urgent needs while shooting, and many other basic functions that the couple athlete-loader is training on day in day out. The Loader in today’s rifle shooting para sport makes one half of a team, and needs to be accredited as one.  
The main problem that this suggestion aims to resolve is the problem of accrediting loaders for the Paralympic games, and other occasions where technical staff accreditation are limited, but nonetheless, also to recognize, at least partially the role.  
Citing the Paralympic games accreditation manual, an AB accreditation is for: “Athlete Competition Partners are persons without an impairment whose participation is essential to guiding, piloting and directing athletes in designated sport classes that require such assistance during competition”. That kind of accreditation is reserved to various roles of assistants, but as for today, not Loaders. Redefining the role of Loaders will grant them the required recognition for the role they take in the sport.  
Thank you for your feedback. While we understand the feedback and concern regarding Paralympic accreditations, the definition proposed is not the intention of a loader. A loader is meant to assist an athlete in competition due to the athlete impairment and not serve as a coach/assistant part of the athlete team. If the loader were to serve as a part of a team this would be unfair to athletes that are not allowed to have a loader.  
No change |
| 15 | Rulebook 6 | Definitions | ipc handbook is not defined in the Definitions  
IPC Handbook is capitalized and must be defined  
Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal. We will adjust the rule accordingly.  
IPC Handbook to be added to definitions |
| 16 | Rulebook 6 | Definitions | remove shotgun events definition  
Neither rifle or pistol events are defined in the glossary of terms  
Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal. We will adjust the rule accordingly.  
Remove Shotgun Events from definitions. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rulebook</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Add definition of VI Assistant</td>
<td>VI Assistant: a Team Official who supports VI athletes during the Competition as determined by these Rules and Regulations. This suggestion is to unify the definition of Loader and VI assistant, as it is unclear why originally the VI assistant was not given a definition of a leader in the classification regulations, since it is basically performing the same role. The recommendation is to update the classification regulation (and as consequence also this definition) providing VI athletes the possibility that highly likely will be given by the panel to all VI athletes to be assisted by a Leader. The marginal differences between the leaders of SH2 and VI can be described in the specific regulations.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Update definition of “ISSF rules latest version shall prevail”</td>
<td>In order to be able to establish that the latest edition of the rules and regulations are to be applied</td>
<td>Update definition of ISSF Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amend rule 2.1.1</td>
<td>The Events recognized by WSPS for the sport of shooting Paraport are:</td>
<td>Amend rule 2.1.1 accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Remove rule 2.2.3</td>
<td>Rule 2.2.3 is very similar to rule 2.3.4</td>
<td>Remove rule 2.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Regional games (Parapan American Games) CAN NOT have special status, unless the IPC assures that ALL Regions will hold regional games.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Remove LOC from definitions.</td>
<td>Definition of LOC is given in the Glossary of terms</td>
<td>Remove LOC from definitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Add 'WSPS National Policy' and 'WSPS Athlete Registration and Licensing Programme' to definitions.</td>
<td>WSPS will resolve cases regarding …transgender athletes in accordance with the IOC’s transgender guidelines latest edition and any applicable WSPS regulations.</td>
<td>Add ‘WSPS National Policy’ and ‘WSPS Athlete Registration and Licensing Programme’ to definitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Prior to the Competition a list and timetable for those athletes required to be present for Classification will be published.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>… must (are required to) attend</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amend Rule 2.9.3 accordingly</td>
<td>… must (are required to) attend</td>
<td>Amend Rule 2.9.3 accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Amend Rule 2.9.2 accordingly</td>
<td>Prior to the Competition a list and timetable for those athletes required to be present for Classification will be published.</td>
<td>Amend Rule 2.9.2 accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>“… in accordance to article …”</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Amend rule 2.10.1.1 accordingly</td>
<td>Delete the first “all” on 3rd line</td>
<td>Amend rule 2.10.1.1 accordingly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your feedback. This is not a typo and is correct. No change

Thank you for your feedback. The idea here is to use the coronavirus pandemic as an example, that is not what this rule is meant to be about so adding the information about variants is not necessary. No change
SH2 Athletes with L class must be allowed to speak with their loader in order to instruct them as to required assistance (as correcting sights, dry firing, or any other action requiring assistance). See rule 4.3.2.2

SH1B, SH1C and SH2 rifle athletes must use a WSPS shooting jacket. Athletes shooting on the floor in the prone position may use an ISSF jacket.

RULEBOOK 25: 3.2.1.4

3.2.1.4 SH1B, SH1C and SH2 rifle athletes must use a WSPS shooting jacket. Athletes shooting on the floor in the prone position may use an ISSF jacket.

We recommend that WSPS (short) jackets will be allowed for all athletes shooting from a shooting chair or wheelchair, and ISSF (long) jackets will be allowed to all athletes shooting in a ISSF position or from a high stool.

Art 3.2.1.4 should be modified: Athletes shooting from a chair or wheelchair can use only a WSPS jacket (normally Trunk Function Score B and C, both SH1 and SH2, as defined in 4.2.3.1). Art 3.2.1.5 should be modified: The term "SH1A rifle athletes" should be replaced with "Athletes with a trunk function score A" or to "Athletes shooting from a high stool or as per ISSF position"?

Rationale for the recommendation:
In order to create more even field, it makes no sense to determine the type of shooting jacket allowed by the shooting class, but more reasonable to determine it by the shooting position. This kind of definition exists already in rule 4.2.3.1, that is referring to only the "trunk function score", regardless of the shooting class.

Thank you for your feedback. We believe that the rule as currently written is the most fair. The determination by position proposal does not make sense as it does not take into account the impairment type of the athlete.

No change

RULEBOOK 26: 3.2.1.7

b) Equipment Control

If it is allowed to use a zipper in stead of buttons on the jacket, this should be specified or referred to other rules where you can find it described (as it is mentioned in the ISSF rules?). If an athlete due to his/her impairment can ease getting dressed by having a zipper instead of buttons, he/she should know what rules to seek by before getting checked internationally and most likely get it approved because of one Jury members subjective opinion.

Thank you for your feedback. Based on what we currently have in place, we agree to remove the rule allowing for athletes to have a zipper as this is not controlled, utilised, or enforced. Remove rule 3.2.1.7(b)

No change

RULEBOOK 27: 3.2.3.2

At end of this rule there is 'b) Equipment Control' Is the 'b) correct?

Thank you for your feedback. Yes it is correct. We do not need to test the flexibility of non shooting shoes.

No change
This rule will specify that equipment checks on the firing line will be conducted preferably during the Pre-Event Training, and otherwise during the time given for access to the line. In the unlikely event a check needs to be done during competition or sighting time, for an athlete that was present in the P.E.T. (but the Jury didn’t control him during the P.E.T.), the time consumed for the check will be added to the athlete’s competition/sighting time. Jurymembers will be instructed to complete, if possible, all checks during the P.E.T.

Thank you for your feedback. We believe this is a fair request and in practise this is how we plan to proceed. Certainly it is not our goal to disturb any of the athletes or their timing but rather to create a fair playing field.

No change

Why are we targeting only SH1 and SH2A? in case of double above knee amputation SH1C athlete is compromised the same way as SH2C… We recommend to allow that kind of strapping to ALL double above-the-knee amputees without distinction.

Thank you for your feedback. The reason that SH2B & SH2C athletes are not allowed for strapping is due to the backrest that is allowed. Strapping and a backrest would allow for an unfair advantage and therefore this change is not supported.

No change

Not all SH2 athletes can do this by themselves, their helper needs to do it. This rule does not take into account shooters disabilities. Rule 4.1.7.7 states if eliminated from the final, all athletes (including SH2) must immediately leave their firing point and move to the side of field play to their allocated place next to their coach. Coaches/laders may assist athletes in this process.

Not all SH1 athletes can do this by themselves, their helper needs to do it. This rule does not take into account shooters disabilities. Rule 4.1.7.7 states if eliminated from the final, all athletes (including SH2) must immediately leave their firing point and move to the side of field play to their allocated place next to their coach. Coaches/laders may assist athletes in this process.

No change

The wording of this rule needs to be changed. Assume it’s to reduce lateral support? “An athlete’s hip is not allowed to touch the wheels.” is fine. But restricting the wheel height is not. As restricting the height of the wheels can make it more difficult for wheelchair users to propel themselves around, especially if their shooting chair is also their everyday chair. This forces the person in the wheelchair to sit higher, and become more unstable, which can become dangerous for the user. Wheelchair users need to have unrestricted durng their chair to improve their function when wheeling and sitting in the chair. Also restricting wheel height restricts the size of wheels a user has on their wheelchair, which then impends on everyday function in their wheelchair.

Current WPSR Rule 3.7.10 states the sitting angle is free, by restricting the wheel height to hip: actually restricts the sitting angle. The removal of this rule was under discussion through emails back in 27/11/2016 with Tyner, and never resolved. And was asked back then without any justification or reason, or who initially proposed the rule.

Thank you for your feedback. While we understand the concern, we do not feel this rule needs to be changed. Keeping our sport safe and fair is the priority here. We do realise this rule may conflict with some athletes and their everyday wheelchairs, and in this situation it is not an issue to use a different chair for competition. We must be fair to all athletes.

No change

The height of the wheels of the wheelchair may not exceed the height of the athlete’s hip when in the sitting position.

The height of the wheels of the wheelchair may not exceed the height of the athlete’s hip when in the sitting position.

Thank you for your feedback. We suspect that this rule was created to be inclusive for a specific case but this rule is not used in practise and therefore we will remove it.

Remove rule 3.7.7.1

Under special circumstances the Classification Panel may allow a special backrest to overcome a specific physiological condition of the spine (special circumstances must be written on the athlete license card/#WPS License).

Under special circumstances the Classification Panel may allow a special backrest to overcome a specific physiological condition of the spine (special circumstances must be written on the athlete license card/#WPS License).

Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we can make the rule more clear to say no tools meaning artificial support. The brakes of a wheelchair would not require tools but we agree that this can be more clear.

Amend rule 3.7.3 accordingly

The new version of this section is more confusing and generic than the old text was not generalist, but already interpreted by the Jury) was. The old version was much clearer. The new version is almost forbidding even the use of brakes. This is the term “lock or unlock” means (at least when it was specified “using tools too...” it had some sense) We need to try using clear terms, avoiding the use of terms that need explaining, it leaves too much room for interpretation.

Remove rule 3.7.7.1

For wheelchairs used as Shooting Chairs, there must be no use of any tools to “lock or unlock” a Shooting Chair on their firing point. This includes screwdrivers. The athlete must be able to remove themselves from the firing line without any assistance.

For wheelchairs used as Shooting Chairs, there must be no use of any tools to “lock or unlock” a Shooting Chair on their firing point. This includes screwdrivers. The athlete must be able to remove themselves from the firing line without any assistance.

Amend rule 3.7.3 accordingly

Addendum: 3.7.2 All Shooting Chairs will be checked with the athlete in the shooting position during Equipment Control and will be subject to spot checks on the shooting line before, during or immediately after the Competition.

Amend rule 3.7.3 accordingly

The new version of this section is more confusing and generic than the old text was not generalist, but already interpreted by the Jury) was. The old version was much clearer. The new version is almost forbidding even the use of brakes. This is the term “lock or unlock” means (at least when it was specified “using tools too...” it had some sense) We need to try using clear terms, avoiding the use of terms that need explaining, it leaves too much room for interpretation.

Remove rule 3.7.7.1

Thank you for your feedback. We suspect that this rule was created to be inclusive for a specific case but this rule is not used in practise and therefore we will remove it.

Remove rule 3.7.7.1

Thank you for your feedback. We suspect that this rule was created to be inclusive for a specific case but this rule is not used in practise and therefore we will remove it.

Remove rule 3.7.7.1

Amend rule 3.7.9.3 accordingly
Amend rule 3.7.9.5

Any programmable or adjustable air cell cushion is prohibited.

This rule is already contested since the 2018 “rules clarification” when it was introduced pretending to be a clarification, while in reality it was a new rule, not researched or approved by any medical panel.

Thank you for your feedback. We do not support this rule change as it opens up the door to many potential “safety” reasons that an athlete might “need” to talk to their assistant. If there is a safety situation the athlete and assistant must do what is required to handle the situation safely but we absolutely must limit the contact between assistants and athletes in order to make it fair for all competitors.

A similar argument could be made for Rule 3.9.13.3, where the assistant must be in the shooting position. The assistant would have to be propped up on a wooden chair while the athlete would be shooting. This rule is an unfair advantage we must allow this for all athletes or for none which is what this rule reflects. We will adjust the rule to remove the word ‘adjustable’ to make this rule more clear.

Aim to remove the word “adjustable” to make this rule more clear.

No change

Subject to 2.16.1.3, while on the firing line during Competition, an athlete may speak only with a member of the Competition Jury or a range official.

Amend rule 3.8.1.8

Aim to add “for the changeover...” to be checked. Thank you for your feedback. Yes agreed we should use the term ‘rifle rest’ as per ISSF rules and definition and make a distinction between ‘SH2 support stand’ and ‘rifle support’.

No change

Springs must have the open turn and must be marked in the position at which the spring passes the test, and the spring must be used in this same position during the competition.

Springs have their own tendency to bend in a certain direction, by enforcing this rule could actually impact the rule where a spring cannot bend forward or back and must remain vertical. The enforcement of this rule is at the discretion of the Technical Delegate / Jury.

Thank you for your feedback. We do not support this rule change as it opens up the door to many potential “safety” reasons that an athlete would "need" to talk to their assistant. If there is a safety situation the athlete and assistant must do what is required to handle the situation safely but we absolutely must limit the contact between assistants and athletes in order to make it fair for all competitors.

Aim to remove the word “adjustable” to make this rule more clear.

No change

If the athlete is not actively participating in the changeover process the penalty for a first violation in a Competition will be a red card and for a second violation in that Competition resulting in a red card disqualification.

Define actively participating, need to be specific.

Thank you for your feedback. It would be very difficult to be specific in this situation but we will add an example to help clarify. The point is to avoid an athlete doing nothing while the assistant does everything. This is not in line with able body shooting or how we want our sport to be perceived. The enforcement of this rule is at the discretion of the Technical Delegate / Jury.

Aim to remove the word “adjustable” to make this rule more clear.
Amend rule 4.1.7.2 (a)

During the presentation phase:

a) SH1 athletes mustư rest the rifle on the resting stand with a hand remaining on the rifle for safety or in the oblique position.

The rule text refers only to the standing position, where a resting stand exists. A better phrasing, that will cover all situations is: “SH1 rifle athletes must rest their rifles in a safe way, or keep them in an oblique position when using a sling”.

Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we can make this rule more clear.

Amend rule 4.1.7.6 accordingly

To clarify the loading time in R9 as 10 seconds in line with R4 and R5

Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we will include this for all SH2 events.

70 Rulebook 43 4.2.3.5 b

For athletes that load the rifle themselves, the de-shouldering can be integrated into the act of loading and a separate movement is not required

To differentiate between athletes with and without loaders and make clear the act of loading can constitute de-shouldering and it doesn’t have to be a separate movement

Thank you for your feedback. Yes we agree that it can be the same movement, but the act of loading must clearly remove the rifle from the shoulder. The rule clearly states this. Without a clear de-shoulder we only have the RS event, not also R4. We must make sure we continue to have two SH2 10m events by following this rule.

No change

81 Rulebook 43 4.2.3.5 b

b) In the standing position all athletes must clearly and visibly de-shoulder (removal of physical contact between butt plate and shoulder) the rifle in between shots. There must be a visible separation of at least 3cm between every shot.

Thank you for your feedback. We agree with this feedback, the 3cm rule was to make it more clear of how much distance is required to deshoulder and in order to avoid dispute. The suggestion of enforcement by jury members is noted.

Thank you for your feedback. Yes we understand this feedback based on certain wheelchair models and this proposal is accepted.

Amend rule 4.2.3.2 accordingly

4.2.3.2 The arms and sideboards of the Shooting Chair and the shooting table must be removed (if the construction of the wheelchair requires a sideboard, the height of this may not exceed the height of the top of the wheel).

As modern wheelchairs are almost always equipped with wheelchair protection often referred in these regulations as ‘sidebars’, and the common interpretation of this rule in the past years was that in that case, they need to be in the lowest possible height, nearly touching the wheel; in order not to give unfair support, the rule will be better written indicating the maximum allowed distance of the wheel protection above the wheel. From my observations, allowing for 1cm of space will cover all cases, and will prevent arguments on the firing line about the meaning of “height of the wheel”.

The suggestion is to change the phrasing from “must not exceed the height of the wheel” to “must not exceed the height of the wheel by more than 10mm”.

Thank you for your feedback. Yes we understand this feedback, the 3cm rule was to make it more clear of how much distance is required to de-shoulder and in order to avoid dispute. The suggestion of enforcement by jury members is noted.

No change

82 Rulebook 46 5.4.2

High stools are Shooting Chairs when the athlete sits with his/her feet flat on the ground, with a seat at a height equal to or higher than the athlete’s mid-thigh height. The mid-thigh height is the mid-measurement between the knee joint and the hip joint (measured along the femur bone). Any disputes will be resolved by the Technical Delegate in his/her absolute discretion.

Helps define high stool

Thank you for your feedback. It is not clear what the proposed change is. We feel that rule 3.7.1.1 does define what is required of a high stool.

No change

83 Rulebook 48 3.7.1.1

Permitted: only the top three (3) jacket buttons may be fastened and the buttons may not extend below the bottom of the ribcage or equivalent.

No evidence that as using a 4th button gives any extra advantage, especially for seated SH1 athletes

No change

84 Rulebook 51 7.2.1.2

To unite physical impaired (PI) and visual impaired (VI) shooters I recommend that VI Apparel and equipment rules will be presented in the same (main) paragraph as of PI shooters. F. ex. allowed shoes in VI sport is now explained in PI paragraphs OR shooting table in VI shooting.

This is also beneficial to integrate these classes from the team leader or team official point of view.

Thank you for your feedback. We do not agree with this feedback, the LED is part of the athlete equipment, it is like asking our athletes to bring their own rifles to the competition which is what we do. We believe it is for the advantage of the athlete that they are able to bring their own LED light as this is the light they train with and their will be no dispute over the strength of their light, how it effects their shooting, etc.

No change

85 Rulebook 51 7.2

W Apparel and equipment; page 39, point 3.

Thank you for your feedback. We do not agree with this feedback. The LED is part of the athlete equipment, it is like asking our athletes to bring their own rifles to the competition which is what we do. We believe it is for the advantage of the athlete that they are able to bring their own LED light as this is the light they train with and their will be no dispute over the strength of their light, how it effects their shooting, etc.

No change

86 Rulebook 52 7.2.4.3

The athlete must bring their own LED for the Competition.

This rule seems unfair for a respectable big international organization as WSFS. If we cannot provide the targets, we might as well exclude the VI already, it’s just the same as asking trap athletes to bring clay targets from home, or SH1 athletes to bring rubber bands for Slugs…

Thank you for your feedback. While we understand this feedback, we feel it is better for new VI athletes to have all of this information in section 7.2.3. This is also beneficial to integrate these classes from the team leader or team official point of view.

In the future it is possible we follow this suggestion but we believe for the time being this is the best approach.

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rulebook</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Point</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.3.1.2</td>
<td>The existing regulations must be supplemented with the following addition: “The rifle stock must be removed from the shoulder after each shot.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.3.2.2</td>
<td>The cheek must be used as described in the ISSF Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.2.7.1</td>
<td>Use of a backrest in the shooting position is prohibited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.3.2.2</td>
<td>The cheek must be used as described in the ISSF Rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.3.2.3</td>
<td>The barrel of the rifle must be level with the shoulders of the athlete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.4.2.3</td>
<td>7.4.2.3 may adjust the sights at the request of the athlete and is not allowed to support the rifle. Only one (1) person may be touching the rifle during aiming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.4.6.3</td>
<td>7.4.6.3 permitted to load if allowed in accordance with the terms of their WSPS Classification card.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.4.2.2 and 7.4.5</td>
<td>The points can be integrated 7.4.2.2 Verbal communication between the athlete and the VI Assistant is prohibited during the Competition. 7.4.5 Verbal communication between the athlete and the VI Assistant is prohibited during the Competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.4.3 and 7.4.4</td>
<td>7.4.3 The VI Assistant position behind the athlete is fixed according to the rules and cannot be changed. The VI Assistant must stand at a minimum of 50cm behind the athlete. 7.4.4 VI Assistants must stand in position for the duration of the Events (VIP &amp; VIS) and it is not permitted to move between shots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your feedback. The rule is regarding competition rules, a backrest may not be used while competing. If an athlete wants to sit down to rest between shots, this is not an issue.

No change
Rulebook 56 8.1.1 There will be team Events in each Event as numbers permit, except for at the Paralympic Games.

With exception of «Appendix 3 rule 1.2.2.2 Finals are required in all Events except PS» ISSF has now introduced Finals also in the Team events. The text above will probably introduce a double amount of finals in all WSPS competitions and will put a tremendous extra pressure, both on the finals range and the organizers personnel, during a competition.ISSF has now introduced Finals also in the Team events. The text above will probably introduce a double amount of finals in all WSPS competitions and will put a tremendous extra pressure, both on the finals range and the organizers personnel, during a competition.

Thank you for your feedback. There are not additional finals for WSPS except for the three mixed team events that we already have. No change

Rulebook 44 4.3.4

If the Loader is also the athlete's coach, they must first ask permission of the range officer before speaking to each other, in accordance with Rule 2.16 above.

This is not practical in competition, the shooter cannot ask to speak to a range officer before getting their coach/loader to change their sights etc.

Thank you for your feedback. There are not additional finals for WSPS except for the three mixed team events that we already have. No change

Rulebook ALL Competition Cycle

The new Rulebook seems to miss an important part in the planning of a Paralympic Cycle – competitions schedule scheme.

Regional games and championships – should be established on a specific year (for example: "world championships should be organized every two (2) years: the year following the Paralympic Games and the year before the next Paralympic Games. Continental championships should be organized every two (2) years, on years following the world championships"

Regional for the recommendation:

The old rulebook's article 1.3.1, as unclear it was, need to be improved, not deleted. Our recommendation is establishing a constant cycle, enabling NPCs to prepare financially better in advance.

Recently, continental championships are held sporadically (if at all). Our recommendation will enable to increase the potential number of participants, enable viable competitions.

In order to promote our sport to the next level, establishing a fixed WC series is a must. With a fixed competition calendar NPCs and athletes could prepare (an perform) better. Our recommendation is based on the ISSF WC series and WCH calendar.

Thank you for your feedback. We completely agree with this feedback, and a more stable and consistent competition calendar is one of our goals. The reason we removed the specific dates and for our events is because we do not feel that the rulebook is the correct place for this. In theory, if for whatever reason we did not hold a certain event in a certain year, we would be in violation of our own rules. This feedback is noted and we will aim to publish a preliminary 2022-2024 competition calendar in the near future to assist with the planning of our members. No change

Rulebook ALL General Remarks

1. The mechanism to decide/approve changes in the rules and regulations MUST be indicated clearly within the rule book (can be STC, can be sport director, can be NPC member federations, can even be the neighbor's cousin, but it MUST be indicated WHO has the power to approve and change the regulations).
2. Whenever mentioned "defined", "decided" etc. by "WSPS", the regulations MUST specify who is the specific body or position of WSPS in charge of such decisions. Is it WPS manager, if STC, member NPC Via sport forum?
3. I think we need to clear that an athlete can't keep double classification any more. Either an athlete is SH1, or SH2. The old reasoning of SH2 not having 50m events is valid anymore, and the extra chance of getting a quota place is unfair rules 16.2.3 and 16.4 and appendix one rule 5.1 of the classification regulations talk about that point exactly!
4. We need to have the head of classification go through the Classification Master List, sending a request for ALL double/triple classified athletes to choose their "preferred Sport Class" based on the classification regulation number 16.2.3
5. Structure and responsibilities of STC need to be defined, as well as selection/appointment method. The current members of the sport technical committee have huge power over the future and present of our sport, but no one knows who they are, how they appointed or elected, for how long, and most important, how to reach them.
6. Team Leaders Meeting – MUST be reinstated as per old regulations. Need to be run by the Athletes and Coach liaison officers, without intervention (presence only) of other WSPS officials. This is the main channel for communicating information and testing ideas, and its better having

1. Our current regulations state that WSPS may amend rules at anytime at our sole discretion. Membership feedback is important and why we do this consultation, but we must reserve the right to adjust rules immediately should the need arise in order to keep our sport as fair as possible.
2. The ultimate authority for WPS is the IPC Governing Board and they are the ones that must approve rule changes or major changes to the sport.
3. This will be discussed and taken under advisement.
4. The Sport Technical Committee (STC) is an advisory group only. The sport is governed by the IPC and the IPC Governing Board. This may change with the proposed governance reform in which WSPS would then have a Sport Advisory Committee (SAC) in accordance with the reform proposal.
5. It is a good idea to have a meeting like this to share ideas and offer suggestions for WPS. We believe that this should be a separate format so as to not confuse with the old "Team Leaders Meeting" that was not achieving its desired purposes. For example, we can not have a "coaching meeting" at WPS events where feedback can be captured and sent to WSPS. This type of meeting does not need to be defined in the rulebook. No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rulebook</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 Rulebook</td>
<td>6 and 7</td>
<td>&quot;changes to these rules&quot; should mention that &quot;wps rules latest version shall prevail&quot; in order to be able to establish that the latest edition of the rules and regulations are to be applied</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we will clarify to state that these rules prescribe over all previous rules or clarification documents.</td>
<td>Amend rule 1.1.12 accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Rulebook</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would suggest inserting articles regarding safety in the field of play</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback. We feel that our safety rules are adequately covered. We are happy to consider further measures but none were proposed.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102 Rulebook</td>
<td>General remarks on order of regulations</td>
<td>1. Order of articles: equipment control needs to be unified for all events, also equipment. Only weapon specific details require a separate section. In general, a better order, following ISSF rule book logic is better than the current situation in my opinion. 2. 4.1.7.1, 5.4.1, 7.5.1 – if there are specific rules for finals, please include them in the rulebook. Outside publication on a website are no official regulation, and can be changes too easy… 3. 2.13.6 – probably needs to be reallocated to the technical part of the regulations 4. 2.16 – probably needs to be reallocated to the technical part of the regulations 5. 2.19.1 – Records – need to add World Records in MTR1, MTR2, MTP events. 5. 5.4.1 – need to be unified in format as 4.1.7.3 and 4.1.7.1 (a) combined together 7. 4.1.2, 5.1.2 – times on paper targets need to be eliminated. ISSF have already abolished them 6 years ago… with nowadays regulations (decimal scoring) it is almost impossible to even imagine anywere an international event on paper targets. We can add a note referring to the ISSF appendix (or create one of our own) with paper target and regulations, but it seems ridiculous to have them in the main body of the regulations. 8. 7.2.6 – the title needs to be MALFUNCTION, and only in the text we describe allowable and non-allowable 9. – if there are regulations, why in appendix?</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback, the phrasing is better. We believe the current version of the rulebook is adequate as the sections are broken into categories, making it easier to locate rules for specific athletes (such as VI athletes). We are happy to consider changing the format in the future after consulting the membership. 1. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently constructed. 2. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently constructed. 3. Yes agreed. 4. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently constructed. 5. Yes. 6. We prefer to leave the timing for paper targets as the times are different than ISSF so we cannot reference ISSF rules. There is no harm in our opinion to leave the times for paper targets in the rules. 7. This section is describing non-allowable malfunctions. 8. The Mixed Teams procedures are defined in Appendix 11.</td>
<td>Amend rule 2.19.1 accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 Rulebook</td>
<td>Phrasing and redundancy corrections</td>
<td>1. Page 10, rule 1.5.1 – redundant (exit with the exact phrasing on page 4). 2. Page 12 and page 13, rules 2.2.3 and 2.3.4 are redundant. 3. Page 15, rule 2.9.4 – seems like it misses the part saying &quot;in case there is no classification opportunity&quot;. 4. Page 16, rules 2.11.3/2.11.4 – the phrasing needs to be unified. It can actually be combined in one rule saying: &quot;Loaders/VI assistants will be assigned a Loader Bib denoting the Athletes start number&quot;. 5. Page 17, rule 2.11.6.3 – internal redundancy in the phrasing. 6. Page 19, rule 2.16.1.3 – &quot;starting line&quot; need to be changed to &quot;firing line&quot;. 7. Page 19, rule 2.16.1.5 – &quot;50m three-positions&quot; is not a valid term. Need to say R7/R8. 8. Page 42, rules 4.2.2.3, 4.2.2.4 – choose: athletes or competitors. We need to try and unify the terms in the book. 9. Page 44, rule 4.3.3 is redundant with page 40, rule 4.1.3 (that also need explanation why empty lines in R3???).</td>
<td>Thank you for your feedback, scores is correct. 2. Yes we do understand this is redundant, but in order to remain clear we will leave rule 1.5.1 as it is. 3. Agreed, will be updated. 4. We do not believe the proposed verbiage is more clear. 5. These are two separate items, one is a loader bib and one is an assistant bib, in accordance with the rules. 6. Agreed, we will remove the redundancy 7. Agreed, will be changed 8. The meaning of this rule is clear and does not need to be changed. 9. Agreed, we will use ‘athlete’ for both rules 10. Agreed, we will amend rule 4.1.3 to include all SH2 events. 4.3.3 is specific to loaders. R3 is included because of the extra space requirements for 10m Prone. 11. The verbiage of this rule is OK.</td>
<td>Amend rules accordingly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>