

WSPS Rules & Regulations - Proposed 2022-2024 Amendments - Feedback Form

NPC/Organisation: World Shooting Para Sport

Feedback #	Document	Page No.	Rule No.	Text of proposed amendment	Comment/Feedback/Reason for proposed amendment	WSPS Feedback	Outcome
1	Appendix	32	Appendix 7		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). 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.	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.	Amend Appendix 7 accordingly
2	Appendix	43	Appendix 11, section 11.1.3 (b)	b) Rifle: The name of the country denoted by 3 letters as determined by the IOC on their jacket pocket on the side which is turned to the audience. If the NOC is already on the shooting jacket, a national flag should be placed or attached to the pocket facing the audience.	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.	Thank you for your feedback. We agree with this feedback, we can change the rule to say "on the pocket or on the chest"	Amend rule 11.1.3 (b) of Appendix 11 accordingly
3	Appendix	43	Appendix 11, section 11.1.8 (b)	b) 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).	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.	Thank you for your feedback. This rule is in accordance with ISSF Rules. While we understand the feedback, it is considered as one team which means the rule apply to both members of the team as one.	No change
4	Appendix	11	Appendix 2, section 5.3.1	5.3.1 Replacement entries may be accepted in the same Event, due only to injury or medical reason, at the sole discretion of WSPS, in consultation with the LOC. NPCs requesting replacement entries must submit supporting documents to WSPS for approval.	We recommend that the rule will state that "Replacement entries can be accepted in the same event/events, only if submitted to the WSPS and LOC not later than 48 hours prior to the official arrival day, and only if not requiring modification of the competition program time table, or creating any new service/request for the replacing athlete, that was not made identical for the withdrawn athlete. Rationale for the recommendation: There is no logical or logistical reason to limit entry changes only to medical reasons. NPCs should be given the freedom to make changes to their teams up to a reasonable time before the arrival day, as long as these changes does not impose new preparations from the LOC (for example – replacing a rifle entry with a pistol one will still be prohibited, but replacing one R8 athlete with a new one, will not require a medical reason). In the cases that the NPC will want to subscribe the replacement athlete in events not already subscribed for the withdrawn athlete, a late entry fee charges may be imposed.	Thank you for your feedback. In the feedback in states "as long as these do not impose new preparations for from the LOC" which is exactly what late changes do. Late changes create more work for the LOC, jury members, WSPS, results provider, etc. NPCs 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.	No change
5	Appendix	12	Appendix 2, section 6.1	6.1 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.	In order to render our sport more accessible, and also in order to match as possible ISSF regulation, 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). Rationale for the recommendation: That rule, in the way it appears today in the rulebook, is creating a limitation on the introduction of new athletes to the sport (especially with very few competitions available for Para athletes), and is also not in conformity with ISSF rules and regulation, which does not limit participation requiring MQS. In our mind, removing this restriction will result in larger participation in all competition, which is in the best interest of our movement. A reasonable compromise might be accepting MQS results or other proof of experience provided by the NPCs, acquired in national level competitions (this will assure maintaining a minimum level of safety and security. (in such case, a MUCH LOWER BAR of scores must be set, only in order to assure safety, and not more than that)	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.	No change
6	Appendix	28 - 30	Appendix 7		We recommend reinstating/integrating the old appendix (attached) stating clearly that the spring is a D13590, or Appendix 7 needs to be updated with the old version, stating that the spring should be a D13590 type, wire width 4mm, total resting height 60.5mm and total outer diameter of 25mm. Rationale for the recommendation: The existing appendix is not specific enough and open to interpretations and manipulations regarding the type of spring allowed to be used. it is not sufficient to rely on the flexibility test, as other characteristics of the spring are crucial to its functionality. I attach to this file the old version of appendix 7, which, in my opinion, is just perfect, and can be reinstated.	Thank you for your feedback. We do not feel this is necessary to include the instructions of how to make the spring. WSPS can provide this to members that are interested, but it is not appropriate for the rule book.	No change
7	Appendix 10	41	2.4.5	The universal types must be mounted in the lower left corner of the frame and be powered by a USB charger or power-bank	To promote equality and fair sportmanship between shooters also the universal type of LED indicator must be possible to be mounted vertically 60 mm right below the target centre. The aim system VIS500 (EcoAims) has a straight bar of LED unit which is so far only mountable in vertically.	Thank you for your feedback. This change is supported, the device may be placed on the bottom right or left as long as it complies with rule 2.3 in Appendix 10.	Amend rule 2.4.5 of Appendix 10
8	Appendix 2	11	2.1	R1 - 10m Air Rifle Standing Mixed Gender and R7 - 50m Rifle 3 positions mixed Gender	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.	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.	No change

9	Appendix 3	13	1.2.2.2	Finals are required in all Events except P5	<p>Ref Cover Letter for the proposal for new Technical Rules for WSPS. According to the letter, WSPS are planning to adopt the new event rules from ISSF.</p> <p>The WSPS rule « 8.1.1 There will be team Events in each Event as numbers permit, except for at the Paralympic Games.»</p> <p>With exception of «Appendix 3 rule 1.2.2.2 Finals are required in all Events except P5»</p> <p>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. Rule 8.1.1 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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback but it is not clear what this feedback is. WSPS does not plan to add any extra finals, only the 3 additional Mixed Team Events that have been in place since the Sydney 2019 World Championships.</p>	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.	Amend rule 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 WSPS.	No change
13	General comment				Has the revision taken into account Judge's instruction and clarification document in order to minimize the need for the clarification document?	Thank you for your feedback. Yes we have made the rules more clear in this version including the previous clarification document that is now incorporated in the rules. We will continue to clarify rules as needed in order to be clear and fair to all stakeholders but aim to do this as little as possible. When publishing the new rules this will replace all previous forms of the rulebook and clarification documents.	No change
14	Rulebook	5	Definitions - Loader	Loader: a Team Official who will assist athletes with loading during Competitions.	<p>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, handling 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.</p> <p>Rationale for the recommendation:</p> <p>Unlike what outsider viewers may think, the role of the Loader for SH2 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 elite 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.</p> <p>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 for Loaders. Redefining the role of Loaders will grant them the required recognition for the role they take in the sport.</p>	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	<i>IPC Handbook is capitalized and must be defined</i>	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	<i>neither rifle or pistol events are defined in the glossary of terms</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal. We will adjust the rule accordingly.	Remove Shotgun Events from definitions.

17	Rulebook	7	Definitions – VI Assistant	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 loader in the classification regulations, since it is basically performing the exact 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 Loader. The marginal differences between the loaders of SH2 and VI can be described in the specific regulations.	Thank you for your feedback. We feel that the definitions are adequate as currently described. A VI Assistant has a different role when compared to Loader, as described in these Rules.	No change
18	Rulebook	8		should mention that "issf rules latest version shall prevail"	<i>in order to be able to establish that the latest edition of the rules and regulations are to be applied</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal. The ISSF 'in force version' will be added to the definition of ISSF Rules to clarify that the most recent version is the one we are referencing.	Update definition of ISSF Rules.
19	Rulebook	11	2.1.1	The Events recognized by WSPS for the sport of shooting Parasport are:	<i>wording is confusing</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal. This wording is more clear and will be used.	Amend rule 2.1.1 accordingly
20	Rulebook	12	2.2.3	erase	<i>rule 2.2.3. is very similar to rule 2.3.4</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal. The rule is duplicated and we will remove one.	Remove rule 2.3.4
21	Rulebook	12	2.2.2	2.2.2 WSPS Recognised Competitions levels are as follows:	Regional games (ParaPan American Games) CAN NOT have special status, unless the IPC assures that ALL Regions will hold regional games.	Thank you for your feedback. This is in accordance with current IPC Regulations. It is planned that in the future the Parapan American Games will not be under the category of IPC Games but for now this is the case.	No change
22	Rulebook	13	2.4.1	erase	<i>definition of LOC is given in the Glosary of terms</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, the rule covers the definition of the LOC so we will therefore removed LOC from our list of definitions.	Remove LOC from definitions.
23	Rulebook	14	2.5.2		<i>need definitions of: Nationality Policy and Athlete registrstion and Licensing programme</i>	Thank you for your feedback. The nationality policy will be published on the WSPS and we will also define it. Likewise the athlete registration and licensening programme will also be defined.	Add 'WSPS National Policy' and 'WSPS Athlete Registration and Licensening Programme' to definitions.
24	Rulebook	15	2.7.3	WSPS will resolve cases regarding...transgender athletes in accordance with the IOC's transgender guidelines latest edition and any applicable WSPS regulations.	<i>wording is not amicable</i>	Thank you for your feedback. While we appreciate this feedback, for a number of reasons we will keep the original wording.	No change
25	Rulebook	15	2.9.2	Prior to the Competition a list and timetable for those athletes required to be present for Classification will be published.	<i>better wording</i>	Thank you for your feedback. This rule reflects current practice but please let us know if you have a specific question.	No change
26	Rulebook	15	2.9.3	... must (are required to) attend	<i>better wording</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, must attend is more clear than 'are required to' and we will update the rule.	Amend Rule 2.9.3 accordingly
27	Rulebook	15	2.9.2	2.9.2 Prior to the Competition a list and timetable for those athletes required to be present for Classification will be created. Athletes and NPCs will be informed accordingly of their appointment time by WSPS in the pre-Competition meetings.	What is "pre competition meeting"? If the intention is the technical meeting, then it is too late of an occasion to inform about classification, as it is usually after the classification panels have finished. In the case that the term talks about another type of meeting, or communication, it needs to be defined and explained.	Thank you for your feedback. The 'pre competition meeting' was an idea to have this at our competitions but in practise we do not have it. We agree, the 'pre competition meeting' can be removed, WSPS will communicate the classification schedule to NPCs directly.	Amend Rule 2.9.2 accordingly
28	Rulebook	16	2.9.4	"...in accordance to article ..."	<i>I would suggest removing article numbers from the WSPS Classification Rules and Regulations and just reference the document</i>	Thank you for your feedback. Our preference would be to reference the articles in order to make it more clear and easier to navigate for those reading these rules.	No change
29	Rulebook	16	2.10.1.1	delete the first 'all' on 3rd line	I believe it is a typo.	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this is a typo.	Amend rule 2.10.1.1 accordingly

30	Rulebook	17	2.12.1	Any violation by an athlete, Team Official, team member or any other individual of these Rules and Regulations will be resolved in accordance with the procedures set in these Rules and Regulations and the ISSF Rules and Regulations	<i>better wording</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we believe the submitted wording makes it more clear.	Amend rule 2.12.1 accordingly
31	Rulebook	17	2.11.6.3	change 1st word of 3rd line from 'to' to 'of'	I believe it is a typo.	Thank you for your feedback. This is not a typo and is correct.	No change
32	Rulebook	17	2.12.2		<i>I would suggest replacing "will be handled..." with "will be resolved..."</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we also feel that resolved will be more clear than handled.	Amend rule 2.12.2 accordingly
33	Rulebook	18	2.13.1.2	delete the word 'where', first word of 3rd line	I believe it is a typo.	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this is a typo.	Amend rule 2.13.1.2 accordingly
34	Rulebook	18	2.14.1.1	Contravene the spirit of fair-play or offend members of any committee, officials or judges WSPS Officials or the Competition Jury in the course of his/her official duties;	The word "Offend" is too vague, offend how? Doing what offends? Too open to own interpretation	Thank you for your feedback. To list all of the possible offences would take too long and still not cover everything. We will change the word 'offend' to 'obstruct' to make this rule more clear.	Amend rule 2.14.1.1 accordingly
35	Rulebook	18	2.14.1.3	Add 'or any of its variants'4	is it worth considering adding reference to Coronavirus, or one of its variants?	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
36	Rulebook	18	2.14.1.3	2.14.1.3 breach any protocol or procedure put in place by an LOC and/or WSPS for that or another Event or Competition (for example in relation to the health, safety or security of athletes, including any protocol put in place in relation to the coronavirus pandemic).	We can't bring COVID (a temporary situation) in the permanent Rules... A phrasing in the sorts of: "any conduction, safety or health protocol" instead of the word "coronavirus pandemic" should be enough.	Thank you for your feedback. The COVID situation is listed as an example only, not a permanent regulation.	No change
37	Rulebook	18	2.15.1	2.15.1 Further disciplinary action, including in relation to situations that are not covered by these Rules or Regulations or ISSF Rules, may be taken against any individual bound by these Rules and Regulations on a case-by-case basis by the WSPS Technical Delegate, in consultation with WSPS. Further action(s) may be taken at WSPS' discretion.	The rule MUST be clearer, or contain more sub-sections defining the bodies in place for disciplinary actions (a federal tribunal, Jury, IPC court etc.). If any other action can be taken, list the penalties available, and the body that is in place to rule on any case.	Thank you for your feedback. We feel the current rules listed are adequate in order to administer disciplinary action. WSPS is the body that would administer such penalties.	No change
38	Rulebook	19	2.16.1.2 verbally coach their athlete(s) only when authorized by a member of the Competition Jury.	<i>better wording</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this wording makes the rule more clear.	Amend rule 2.16.1.2 accordingly.
39	Rulebook	19	2.16.1.4		<i>capitalize Range Official, also need a definition in the glossary of terms</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we will add this to the definitions.	Amend definitions accordingly.
40	Rulebook	19	2.16.1.5	In 50m Three-Position Finals, coaches may assist and do verbal coaching only during changeover times.	<i>coaches already come to assist athletes</i>	Thank you for your feedback. It is unclear what the proposed change is and we believe it is clear.	No change
41	Rulebook	19	2.16.3.1		<i>coaching violations should be penalized in the Event, not in the Competition?</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we will replace competition with event.	Amend rule 2.16.3.1 accordingly
42	Rulebook	19	2.16.1.4	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.	An SH2 athlete needs to speak to their loader. Rule 4.3.2.2: only load the rifle and/or adjust the sights at the request of the athlete, not support the rifle. But the loader is required to adjust the chair and other things too, so the rule cannot be too restrictive on tasks the loader does. So cannot be expected to ask permission for such tasks.	Thank you for your feedback. This feedback is accepted, we will adjust the rule to say "except in SH2 events.."	Amend rule 2.16.1.4 accordingly
43	Rulebook	19	2.16.1.3	During Competition, coaches are permitted to approach the starting line only following a specific request by their athlete(s) and a member of the by Competition Jury permits this request.	During Competition, coaches are permitted to approach the firing line only following a specific request by their athlete(s) or an assistant and a member of the Competition Jury permits this request. An VI athlete and an assistant is a unique and inseparable unit; so the request to get coach on the Field-of-Play must be available by both of them.	Thank you for your feedback. Both of these proposed changes are accepted.	Amend rule 2.16.1.3 accordingly
44	Rulebook	19	2.18.1	... based on Performance points	<i>Athlete ranking is calculated by performance points</i>	Thank you for your feedback. The verbiage as written is clear, no change is necessary.	No change

45	Rulebook	19	2.16.1.4	2.16.1.4 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.	SH2 Athletes with L class must be allowed to speak with their loader in order to instruct them as to required assistance they require (as correcting sights, dry firing, or any other action requiring assistance). See rule 4.3.2.2	Thank you for your feedback. Athletes may speak with their loader if requested and approved by the competition jury. If the loader is the athletes coach, it would be unfair to allow them unlimited contact while athletes without loaders do not have this.	No change
46	Rulebook	19	2.18	2.18 Rankings	See the proposed ranking System attached as a separate file. A renovation of the ranking system: Level 1 recognized WSPS competition should be introduced into the ranking system. Performance points should be given to all athletes ranked in the top half of the competition, with a minimum of the first eight. Level 1 recognized competition should be added to the table, with a respective "Duration of validity" of one (1) season, and a respective "Value B" allocated (suggested as Value B = 2). The table in rule 1.13.5.2 should be updated with the respective values: 9th Rank – (A1)=3, (A2)=0; 10th Rank - (A1)=2, (A2)=0; 11th Rank and forth - (A1)=1, (A2)=0; *Or A better, more balanced "A Value" may be considered. Rationale for the recommendation: In order to create a more realistic and representative ranking, that calculates most of the competitions in the annual cycle, and to promote wider participation, and more competition opportunities.	Thank you for this feedback and proposed changes to the ranking system. We are happy to consider this but we believe this should be a separate process to the rulebook review more in line with what we did for the Paralympic programme consultation. For example we can review the ranking system before Paris 2024 so that for the next edition of the rules (2025) we will implement the proposed new rankings.	No change
47	Rulebook	25	3.2.1	WSPS Shooting Jacket	must specify which is the WSPS shooting jacket	Thank you for your feedback. This is covered under WSPS Rule 3.2.1.5	No change
48	Rulebook	25	3.1.2	End of 2nd line reads 'Rule 0'	Is there a rule number missing from here?	Thank you for your feedback. This is a typo in the tracked changes version. In the draft rulebook that was shared there is not an issue.	No change
49	Rulebook	25	3.2.1.4	SH1B, SH1C and SH2 rifle athletes must use a World Shooting Para Sport WSPS jacket. Athletes shooting on the floor in the prone position may use an ISSF jacket.	What is a WSPS shooting jacket? Definition?	Thank you for your feedback. This is covered under WSPS Rule 3.2.1	No change
50	Rulebook	25	3.2.1.5	Only the top 3 jacket buttons may be fastened, and the buttons may not extend below the bottom of the ribcage or equivalent. Any additional buttons must not be used.	No evidence that as using a 4th button gives any extra advantage, especially for seated SH1 athletes	Thank you for this feedback but with no proposal or evidence submitted we cannot consider making a change to the rules.	No change
51	Rulebook	25	3.2.1.4	3.2.1.4 SH1B, SH1C and SH2 rifle athletes must use a WSPS 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 a wheelchair, and ISSF (long) jackets will be allowed to all athletes shooting in a ISSF position or from a high stool. Article 3.2.1.4 should be modified: Athletes shooting from a chair or a 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) Article 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 only to 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
52	Rulebook	26	3.2.1.7 b)		If it is allowed to used a zipper in stead of buttons on the jacket this should be specified or referred to other rules where you can find it described (is it mentioned in the ISSF rules?). If an athlete due to his/hers impairment can ease getting dressed by having a zipper instead of buttons, he/she should know what rules to work by before getting checked internationally and most likely not 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)
53	Rulebook	26	3.2.2	3.2.2 Shooting Trousers	We recommend that the use of shooting trousers will be prohibited for all athletes shooting from a shooting chair or a wheelchair, and allowed to all athletes shooting in a ISSF position or from a high stool. Article 3.2.2.1 should be modified: Shooting trousers will be prohibited for all athletes shooting from a shooting chair or a wheelchair, and allowed to all athletes shooting in a ISSF position or from a high stool. Article 3.2.2.2 should be modified: The term "SH1A rifle athletes" should be replaced with "Athletes with a trunk function score A" Rationale for the recommendation: In order to create more even field, it makes no sense to allow/forbid the use of shooting trousers 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 only to the "trunk function score", regardless of the shooting class.	Thank you for your feedback. We do not understand the proposal. Athletes in a seated position would not be able to wear ISSF trousers as they could not bend their legs. It means that only standing (ISSF position) or using a high stool is the only possibility to wear trousers which would only apply to SH1A athletes. This proposal just changes the wording but does not have any effect on the actual rule and we believe it is clear the way it is current written. There is no need to change the verbiage of SH1A athletes, this is their class and subclass as defined in these Rules and the Classification Rules.	No change
54	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

55	Rulebook	28	3.4.3.4	3.4.3.4 Each athlete's equipment may be checked by the Competition Jury on the line prior to the start of each Event.	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 athletes competition/sighting time. Jury members 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
56	Rulebook	29	3.5.5		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
57	Rulebook	30	3.7.3	I suggest remove "this includes screwdrivers"	enough said with "there must be no use of any tools to "lock or unlock"". What about the brakes, the wheelchair must have brakes?	Thank you for your feedback. Yes the wheelchair must have brakes, but the releasing of the brake does not require any tools. The idea of the rule is to add "artificial stability" to the athlete and more importantly to avoid any potential safety breaches, if the athlete needs to leave the firing line immediately for example.	No change
58	Rulebook	30	3.7.3	The athlete must be able to remove themselves from the firing line without any assistance.	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 of play to their allocated place next to their coach. Coaches/Loaders may assist athletes in this process.	Thank you for your feedback. It is agreed that we can clarify this rule to say "without any artificial assistance". Of course we understand that some athletes will need support to leave the firing line and this is of course allowed. What is not allowed is the use of any artificial tool that would be required for the athlete to leave the firing line.	Amend rule 3.7.3 accordingly
59	Rulebook	30	3.7.2	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.	We recommend that the word "during" will be removed from that Article 3.7.2 An additional subsection might be added: 3.7.2.1 "Only in case of an obvious infringement of these rules or an obvious advantage gained by an athlete, the technical delegate or chief of equipment control jury may perform a spot check of shooting table or equipment during the running time of a competition". Rationale for the recommendation: The article states today that: "shooting chairs will be subject to spot tests on the shooting line before, DURING or immediately after the competition". In our opinion, spot checks before and after the competition are completely reasonable, and actually should be conducted more often during the preparation time by the officers on the firing line. Nevertheless, spot checks DURING a competition are an unnecessary disturbance to the athletes, and needs to be justified by an obvious and immediate suspicion of foul play or attempt to gain unfair advantage. See examples of this suggestion already implemented in rules 7.2.5.3, 3.4.3.4 and Appendix 11.2.4 (b).	Thank you for your feedback. We do not feel that further clarification on this rule is necessary. The proposed changes are what is already happening in practise, this means it would be more prudent for us to train our judges accordingly than to adjust these rules as described. While checks during competition are rare, we must leave this rule in place in case there is a situation where there needs to be a check during the competition.	No change
60	Rulebook	30	3.7.3	3.7.3 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.	The new version of this section is more confusing and generic than the old (also not perfect, but already interpreted by the Jury) was. the old version was much clearer. The new version is almost forbidding even the use of brakes... What does the term "lock or unlock" means? (at least when it was specified "using tools to..." 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.	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we can make this 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
61	Rulebook	31	3.7.6	The height of the wheels of the wheelchair may not exceed the height of the athlete's hip when in the sitting position.	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 dump in 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 impedes on everyday function in their wheelchair. Current WSPS 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 Tyler, and never resolved. And was added 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
62	Rulebook	31	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/WSPS License).	What special circumstances? List or define the circumstances, give example.	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
63	Rulebook	31	3.7.9.3	3rd line to read 'level of the sitting height'	Insert word 'of'	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this will make it more clear.	Amend rule 3.7.9.3 accordingly

64	Rulebook	31	3.7.9.2	3.7.9.2 Cushions thicker than 5cm are permitted only if they are compressible to a maximum depth of 5cm when the athlete is sitting in the shooting position.	A method of controlling the compression of the cushion must be described. Operative suggestion – Use the ISSF equipment control machinery for thickness measurement for the control of the cushion (obviously, updating the allowed compression considering that the weight in the machine is way lighter than the athlete body weight). Otherwise, the rule is not enforceable.	Thank you for your feedback. ISSF Equipment is not suitable for this type of measurement. We will explore options to make this rule more enforceable.	No change
65	Rulebook	31	3.7.9.5	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. I cite here my original contest of the rule, that was supported by medical evaluation at the time: “Additional rule 3.7.9.5” is obviously not a clarification, and, as I mentioned before, can’t be introduced without consultation with the STC, with medical professionals, and without being introduced and reviewed in the formal way (sport forum/general assembly during the introduction of a new rule book!). Having said that, the proposed addition is also in contrary with the existing rule 3.7.9.1 that clearly states that: “All cushions thinner than 5cm are permitted.”, and on top of that, puts in serious risk the health of wheelchair athletes, which the majority of is using air cell cushion prescribed by their physicians, and for a very medically important reason – avoiding skin breakdown, pressure lesions and protecting from fragile tissue damage. (a written medical opinion will follow this review in the following days).” At the very minimum, a VERY CLEAR explanation of what is that magical cushion that whoever wrote this rule meant is required!	Thank you for your feedback. To clarify WSPS may add or change rules at anytime that we deem necessary in order to keep our competition fair. The ability to change and edit the rulebook as needed is not limited to this consultation or the sport forum in accordance with our own rulebook (page 1). This rule is a reflection of that, when we identify items that can give an athlete 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.	Amend rule 3.7.9.5 accordingly
66	Rulebook	33	2.16.1.4	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.	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 and if very necessary (f.ex safety cases) VI athlete can speak with an assistant but without harrasing other athletes. Look also 7.4.2.2 non-verbal signals No athlete and assistant can master all necessary handmarks etc to communicate between them.	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.	No change
67	Rulebook	33	3.7.12	3.7.12 Visible Free Height	Visible free height – we need to resolve the problem between B and C. Depending on the athlete's body structure and height, for a specific athlete measurement C can be lower than B, which makes no sense. Both measurements need to be a percentage or the total back length. Obviously this rule need to be updated together with a classification rules review, but, at the moment, the text can be reduced to “The visible free height must be at least as prescribed in the athlete's classification and license card”. The rest of the explanations belongs in the classification regulations.	Thank you for your feedback. We do understand this feedback and understand that the rule can be made more clear. Since the Classification Rules reference the Technical Rules, at the moment we will not make any changes but will aim to clarify this in the future.	No change
68	Rulebook	36	3.8.2.1	c) The use of the table will be checked on the line by the Competition Jury to confirm that the table is used in a safe manner by the athlete	better wording	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this rule has been updated.	Amend rule 3.8.2.1.c accorngly
69	Rulebook	36	3.8.1.8	Shooting stand support – An additional separate board or table may be allowed for the shooting stand.	I would suggest use the term "rifle rest" as per ISSF rules and definition and make a distinction between "SH2 support stand"	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this will make it more clear.	Amend rule 3.8.1.8 accordingly
70	Rulebook	36	3.8.2.1.c	Should read 'the use of the table will be checked on the line...'	insert 'be checked'	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this is a typo.	Amend rule 3.8.2.1.c accorngly
71	Rulebook	38	3.9.13.3	All springs must have the open turn and must be marked in the position at which the spring passes the test, the spring must be used in this same position during the competition.	Springs have their own tendency to bend in a certian direction, by enforcing this rule could actually impact the rule where a spring cannot bend forward or back and must remain verticle.	Thank you for your feedback. We do not understand the feedback. The spring test that we have in place is exactly for this reason. The spring test is used to ensure the issue that is presented is not allowed during competition.	No change
72	Rulebook	38	3.9.13.3	3.9.13.3 All 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.	If a spring has a failing side (doesn't pass control at a certain angle), but passes the test on a different rotation, the failing side must be indicated, and the spring MUST be used with this side facing rearwards (180 degrees) from the target. Or, a different phrasing can be: “the spring can be used facing the target only by a passing side”. Or, at least a reference to the procedure in the appendix need to be added.	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, it is a good idea to reference the more clear definition in Appendix 7 in order to make this more clear.	Amend rule 3.9.13.3 accordingly
73	Rulebook	40	4.1.7.2	a) SH1 athletes must rest the rifle on the rifle rest with a hand remaining on the rifle for safety or in the oblique position;	to be aligned with the above proposal	Thank you for your feedback. Yes agreed we should use the term 'rifle rest' consistently.	Amend rule 3.8.1.8 accordingly
74	Rulebook	40	4.1.4.1	If the athlete is not actively participating in the changeover process the penalty for a first violation in a Competition will be first a yellow card, followed by a green card (two (2) point penalty) for a second violation in that Competition, with a third 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.	Amend rule 4.1.4.1 accordingly

75	Rulebook	40	4.1.7.2 (a)	4.1.7.2 During the presentation phase: a) SH1 athletes must 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 4.1.7.2.a accordingly
76	Rulebook	41	4.1.7.6	and R9	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 for all SH2 events.	Amend rule 4.1.7.6 accordingly
77	Rulebook	41	4.1.7.6	in SH2 events athletes/Loaders must complete the loading process within 10 seconds from the command "LOAD" being given.	better wording	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this wording makes it more clear.	Amend rule 4.1.7.6 accordingly
78	Rulebook	41	4.1.7.7	Coaches/Loaders may assist athletes in this process.	Should be added to rule 3.7.3	Thank you for your feedback. This rule is specifically about the finals competition and is separate from rule 3.7.3	No change
79	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 deshoulder we only have the R5 event, not also R4. We must make sure we continue to have two SH2 10m events by following this rule.	No change
80	Rulebook	43	4.2.3.2	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 wheel-protection (often referred in these regulation 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 based on certain wheelchair models and this proposal is accepted.	Amend rule 4.2.3.2 accordingly
81	Rulebook	43	4.2.3.5 (b)	4.2.3.5 SH2 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.	I understand the request for 3cm de-shouldering, I only find it hard to understand how this rule is going to be enforced... if we can enforce it, then it's better to leave it as it was, saying that the athlete must "clearly and visibly de-shoulder". It was clear for everyone until now, I don't understand why we need to complicate it. If the problem is that the rule is not being followed enough, then the solution will be to instruct the Jury to be more present and alert during PET and competition, and give yellow (and green, if necessary) cards without hesitation. I imagine that it will do the Job...	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.	No change
82	Rulebook	46	5.4.2		I find it unfair for the wheelchair athletes in the pistol final to have to turn their chairs to be introduced. 2 minutes is insufficient to re-establish the chair orientation and obtain their shooting position. They should only need to safety flag their pistols and then turn their heads to the audience.	Thank you for your feedback. This feedback is understood but is not supported. We feel it is very important to showcase our sport and athletes to the spectators and live stream audience. We do not want to see the back of athletes heads during introductions. Two minutes is sufficient time in our opinion. We are following the able body (ISSF) version of the sport where athletes must also regain their position.	No change
83	Rulebook	48	3.7.1.1	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 to 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
84	Rulebook	51	7.2.1.2	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	Thank you for this feedback but with no proposal or evidence submitted we cannot consider making a change to the rules.	No change
85	Rulebook	51	7.2	VI Apparel and equipment; page 39, point 3.	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. While we understand this feedback, we feel it is better for new VI athletes to have all of this information in section 7, not spreadout throught the rulebook. In the future it is possible we follow this suggestion but we believe for the time being this is the best approach.	No change
86	Rulebook	52	7.2.4.3	7.2.4.3 The athlete must bring their own LED for the Competition.	This rule seems unfit for a respectful big international organization as WSPS. 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 SH athletes to bring rubber bands for Sius...	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

87	Rulebook	53	NEW: 7.3.1.2	The existing regulations must be supplemented with the following addition: "The rifle stock must be removed from the shoulder after each shot"	Shooters who do not remove the rifle stock from their shoulders have a significant time advantage over their competitors, especially in the commanded finals. This fact is particularly evident in competitors who, due to their classification, may use a loader.	Thank you for your feedback. There is no need to deshoulder in the prone position, this is the same as all other WSPS and ISSF events. A deshoulder in prone for VI is not supported.	No change
88	Rulebook	53	7.3.2.2	The cheek must be used as described in the ISSF Rules.	contradiction with "7.3.2.4 It is not necessary that the cheek is touching the cheek piece"	Thank you for your feedback. There is not a contradiction here, ISSF Rules state that the cheek 'may' touch the cheek piece, not that it 'must'.	No change
89	Rulebook	53	7.2.7.1	Use of a backrest in the shooting position is prohibited.	Shooters may need to take a rest between shots, making a backrest prohibited then stops the shooter from leaning back to rest if needed, also could be dangerous having a chair without a backrest.	Thank you for your feedback. This 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
90	Rulebook	53	7.3.2.2	The cheek must be used as described in the ISSF Rules.	The 7.3.2.2 point is quite unclear because ISSF 7.6.1.3 says: The cheek may be placed against the rifle stock. Look also WSPS point 7.3.2.4. So, an athlete may or may not put his/her cheek on the cheek-piece. In VI shooting it is not necessary (actually not possible) to see the target and the position of head is quite free. I have heard that in some competition a nose of a shooter have had to point (almost) to the target. This may be extraordinary what an athlete has trained. In abled body shooting competitions nobody checks how the cheek is placed. I would suggest that the point 7.3.2.2 should be written like this: 7.3.2.2 The cheek may be used as described in the ISSF Rules. OR 7.3.2.2 The cheek must be placed to cheek-piece in a way that a nose must point less than 90 degree from the aiming direction	Thank you for your feedback. We do not see the need to adjust this rule as we do not have an issue with athletes turning their head away from the target. This rule is to avoid holding the rifle at the hip and firing which is not an image or form we want to promote. For athletes turning their head we do not have an issue with this.	No change
91	Rulebook	53	7.3.2.3	The barrel of the rifle must be level with the shoulders of the athlete.	From which shoulder this is determined? I propose that it will be the "back shoulder" which is also easier to be monitored by the range officers / jury members. 7.3.2.3 The barrel of the rifle must be higher than the level of the shoulder where the butt-stock is touching.	Thank you for your feedback. We do not feel there would be an difference if this rule specified a shoulder, they are on the same level.	No change
92	Rulebook	54	7.4.2.3	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	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	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, this was a typo.	Amend rule 7.4.2.3 accordingly
93	Rulebook	54	7.4.6.3	7.4.6.3 permitted to load if allowed in accordance with the terms of their WSPS Classification card	rule number sequence may be wrong?	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we will adjust rule 7.4.7 to be come 7.4.6.3	Amend rule 7.4.7 accordingly
94	Rulebook	54	7.4.2.2 and 7.4.5	7.4.2.2 is allowed to give non-verbal signals during the match for score indication and to show the direction of their target.; and 7.4.5 Verbal communication between the athlete and the VI Assistant is prohibited during the Competition.	The points can be integrated 7.4.2.2 Verbal communication between the athlete and the VI Assistant is prohibited during the Competition. VI Assistant is allowed to give only non-verbal signals during the match for score indication and to show the direction of their target. In case of safety matters verbal communication is allowed; and	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, combining these rules makes it more clear.	Amend Rule 7.4.2.2 accordingly
95	Rulebook	54	7.4.3 and 7.4.4	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 & VIS) and it is not permitted to move between shots.	The points can be integrated 7.4.4 VI Assistants must stand in position for the duration of the Events (VIP & VIS) and it is not permitted to move between shots. The VI Assistant must stand at a minimum of 50 cm behind the athlete. The assistant can only move to give signals of scores to the athlete.	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, combining these rules makes it more clear.	Amend Rule 7.4.3 accordingly

96	Rulebook	56	8.1.1	There will be team Events in each Event as numbers permit, except for at the Paralympic Games.	<p>Ref Cover Letter for the proposal for new Technical Rules for WSPS. According to the letter, WSPS are planning to adopt the new event rules from ISSF.</p> <p>The WSPS rule « 8.1.1 There will be team Events in each Event as numbers permit, except for at the Paralympic Games.»</p> <p>With exception of «Appendix 3 rule 1.2.2.2 Finals are required in all Events except P5»</p> <p>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.</p>	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
97	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 practice 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. This rule must be followed, otherwise it is unfair that athletes with loaders will have coaching and athletes without loaders will have not. We must make the competition fair for all athletes. Our Jury is always available and it does not take significant time to ask this permission.	No change
98	Rulebook	ALL	Competition Cycle		<p>The new Rulebook seems to miss an important part in the planning of a Paralympic Cycle – competitions schedule scheme.</p> <p>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"</p> <p>In case of insufficient number of NPC's or participants in regional games or continental championships, a combination of regions/continents (for example: Africa+Oceania) may be assembled to assure viable championships.</p> <p>WC / GP – A minimum number of four (4) World Cups should be set and an unlimited number of Grand Prix can be sanctioned.</p> <p>Rationale for the recommendation:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Recently, continental championships are held sporadically (if at all). Our recommendation will enable to increase the potential number of participants, enable viable competitions.</p> <p>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.</p>	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
99	Rulebook	ALL	General Remarks		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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" ecc. "by WSPS", the regulations MUST specify who is the specific body or position of WSPS in charge of such decisions. Is it WSPS manager, is it IPC council, 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 not 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 talks about that point exactly! 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 4. 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 are they appointed or elected, for how long, and most important: how to reach them. 5. Team Leaders Meeting – MUST be reinstated as per old regulations. Need to be ran by the Athlete 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 WSPS 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 WSPS. We believe that this should be a separate format so as to not confuse with the old 'Team Leaders Meeting' that was not achieving it's desired purpose. For example, we can have a "coach meeting" at WSPS 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

100	Rulebook	6 and 7	"changes to these rules"	should mention that "wsp rules latest version shall prevail"	<i>In order to be able to establish that the latest edition of the rules and regulations are to be applied</i>	Thank you for your feedback and we agree with your proposal, we will clarify to state that these rules preside over all previous rules or clarification documents.	Amend rule 1.1.12 accordingly
101	Rulebook				<i>I would suggest inserting articles regarding safety in the field of play</i>	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.	No change
102	Rulebook		General remarks on order of regulations		<p>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</p> <p>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...</p> <p>3. 2.11.6 – probably needs to be reallocated to the technical part of the regulations</p> <p>4. 2.16 - probably needs to be reallocated to the technical part of the regulations</p> <p>5. 2.19.1 – Records – need to add World Records in MTR1, MTR2, MTP events.</p> <p>6. 5.4.1 – need to be unified in format as 4.1.7.3 and 4.1.7.1 (a) combined together</p> <p>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 anymore an international event on paper targets.</p> <p>We can add a note referring to the ISSF appendix (or create one of our own) with paper target old regulations, but it seems ridiculous to have them in the main body of the regulations.</p> <p>8. 7.2.6 – the title needs to be MALFUNCTION, and only in the text we describe allowable and non-allowable</p> <p>9. 8.5 – if there are regulations, why in appendix?</p>	<p>1. Thank you for your feedback and opinion. We believe the that current order 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.</p> <p>2. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently contracted.</p> <p>3. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently contracted.</p> <p>4. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently contracted.</p> <p>5. Yes agreed.</p> <p>6. Again, we feel the order of the rules is adequate as they are currently contracted.</p> <p>7. We prefer to leave the timing for paper targets as our 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.</p> <p>8. This section is describing non-allowable malfunctions.</p> <p>9. The Mixed Teams procedures are defined in Appendix 11</p>	Amend rule 2.19.1 accordingly
103	Rulebook		Phrasing and redundancy corrections		<p>1. Page 6, str line from the top - MGS times?? maybe SCORES...</p> <p>2. Page 10, rule 1.5.1 – redundant (exist with the exact phrasing on page 4).</p> <p>3. Page 12 and page 13, rules 2.2.3 and 2.3.4 are redundant.</p> <p>4. Page 15, rule 2.9.4 – seems like it misses the part saying "in case there is no classification opportunity".</p> <p>5. Page 16, rules 2.11.3 / 2.11.4 – the phrasing needs to be unified. It can actually be combined in one rule saying: "Loaders / VI assistants will be assigned a Loader Bib denoting the Athletes start number"</p> <p>6. Page 17, rule 2.11.6.3 – internal redundancy in the phrasing.</p> <p>7. Page 19, rule 2.16.1.3 – "starting line" need to be changed to "firing line".</p> <p>8. Page 19, rule 2.16.1.5 – "50m three-positions" is not a valid term. Need to say R7/R8.</p> <p>9. 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.</p> <p>10. Page 44, rule 4.3.3 is redundant with page 40, rule 4.1.3 (that also need explanation why empty lines in R3???)</p> <p>11. Page 53, rule 7.3.2.4 – doesn't seem to be in common English, need to be rewritten</p>	<p>1. Thank you for your feedback, scores is correct.</p> <p>2. Yes we do understand this is redundant, but in order to remain clear we will leave rule 1.5.1 as it is.</p> <p>3. Agreed, will be updated.</p> <p>4. We do not believe the proposed verbiage is more clear.</p> <p>5. These are two separate items, one is a loader bib and one is an assistant bib, in accordance with the rules</p> <p>6. Agreed, we will remove the redundancy</p> <p>7. Agreed, will be changed</p> <p>8. The meaning of this rule is clear and does not need to be changed.</p> <p>9. Agreed, we will use 'athlete' for both rules</p> <p>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.</p> <p>11. The verbiage of this rule is OK.</p>	Amend rules accordingly