

TECHNICAL NEWS BULLETIN NO 6 / 2008

New Rules (records)

Although the 2008 IPF Congress held recently was not a Congress in which an official rule change should take place, but as per the Constitution, a two thirds majority from the floor would allow proposals to be heard.

The Czech Republic delegation proposed that a minimum increase in records generally should be reverted to 0.5 kg, reason being, and the unfairness that a lifter must take a minimum of 1 kg to achieve a record that is not a multiple of 2.5 kg. Perhaps a 1 kg minimum increase across the board should have been introduced as an amendment, but 0.5 kg was passed and the following adjustments should be made to the Technical Rule Book and come into effect Jan 1 2009. All records go towards the total.

EQUIPMENT AND SPECIFICATIONS

Page 6, Item 4 - Change 1 kg to 0.5 kg

ORDER OF COMPETITION

Page 25, Item 4 (a) - Change 1 kg to 0.5 kg and remove the words.....unless the new record is divisible by 2.5 kg then an increase of 0.5 kg is acceptable.

WORLD AND INTERNATIONAL RECORDS

Page 33 (h) - The same applies to this sentence as above.

Bar cleaning

The athlete's commission proposed that the bar be cleaned in every deadlift attempt, not just in the last round or at the discretion of the referees. This was passed and will now read under REFEREES Page 28, Item 12 at the end of the paragraph..... and in either of the other two rounds should the coach or lifter so desire.

GENERAL RULES OF POWERLIFTING

Page 4, Item 9

New phrase to add to the existing text

If a team member or members of a team are found to have committed a violation of the Anti-Doping Rules during an event where a team ranking is based on the total of individual points, the points of the lifter or lifters will be deducted from the team result and may not be replaced by the resulting points of another team member

Shoes/Boots

It was suggested that the wording should be more specific than that proposed to be added to the existing text- - - - and that, over the length of sole and or heel, and must be reasonably flat. In the meantime, it is suffice to say that footwear which is considered to bring our sport into disrepute should be refused at gear check. No abnormalities.

UB Boot

There appears to be some concern at gear check regarding the black/brown boots from the above named supplier. It has been suggested that these particular colours make them hard to distinguish between that of an Army Boot. These boots are perfectly legal. The UB Logo can be found on the tongue (IPF registered). If worn with white or brightly coloured laces this will also aid in them being more noticeable.

New Bar?

The ELEIKO Company, whose representative was present in St. Johns Newfoundland at this year's Open Championships and whose bars and weights were used for the meet, produced a new bar for evaluation which had been designed specifically for women's lifting and that of deadlifting. Unfortunately it did not meet the approval of the Technical Committee or Athletes and Coaches Commissions.

Reasons for refusal

The amount of these bars needed by organisers of championships and the expense involved.

Unfair to those lifters who do not have access to this particular bar to train on.

Confusion in the warm-up area, when combined Men and Women compete. If only used on platform the bar would appear alien to those used in the warm-up area.

The conclusion was that the bars currently in use cause no problems, and there really is no need for a " special " bar.

Jury

Having been accused of personally arbitrarily changing a rule relating to the Jury, specifically to that of reversing decisions. It was "suggested" (I use the term loosely) that I had entered the word majority into the rules when this particular situation should be judged unanimously.

Nowhere does it say in any of the rule books which I have in my possession 1974 - 2008 that the decision of the Jury must be unanimous. In my answer I quoted from rule books within these years. - **The President may consult with the rest of the members of the Jury and take the appropriate action based upon a majority verdict.**

Entering the word majority into the up-dated text was not a rule change but a clarification. There must be consistency, as for e.g. rule 5 - **During the competition the Jury may by a majority vote replace any referee whose decisions in its opinion prove him to be incompetent.** Furthermore, I would not enter anything into the rules without consultation.

How could a Jury function if it was to be unanimous? It could be that one Jury member, the minority, overruling the two thirds majority, perhaps one with "personal agenda" Human nature.

This is the simple reason why there must be an odd number, as on the platform. It was not up until the late nineties that rule 9 was changed which had always said - The Jury shall not at anytime overrule or change the decisions of the referees. Rule 9 now reads - Only in extreme circumstances where there has been an obvious or blatant mistake in the refereeing will the Jury in consultation with the referees by majority vote reverse the decision. Much publicity has been given to this subject in which one has tried to define the words obvious/blatant relating to this rule.

It was suggested that in the past year the situation be monitored. I am under the impression that improvements have been made whereby only in truly extreme circumstances have there been decision reversals. In fact, in the two Internationals in which I have officiated since, there was only one instance, and this was justified. An unfinished World Record Deadlift Attempt. (A situation where the Jury must be particularly alert), the lifter receiving two white lights. I spoke with the lifter in question and she agreed the lift was incomplete. Incidentally, the same lifter recently achieved the World Record.

Having officiated in the sport since 1970, it has always been mine and all other officials I have been in contact with that the referee panel and that of the Jury are two different entities, not, collectively as in the referee decision/s to that of the jury e.g. Two white one red (referees) Two red one white (Jury) an even number. This would result in no working majority, divided in opinion, unable to reach a verdict.

As I have said previously and still maintain. I am of the opinion that we must return the Jury number to that of five, as it was in the early days of the IPF.

Quote: - **The IPF President shall preside in the Jury and the Chairman of the Technical Committee shall also be a member; three other members plus a reserve shall be elected for each Jury.** This old dinosaur can remember. This would result in at least three i.e. the majority deciding, or more than likely four, possibly five. This would unlikely to be "hung", because the two side referees are generally of Category 2 status. To reduce the Jury numbers to three I believe was because of the lack of Category 1 referees, when the Women, Master's and Junior's were introduced. At our combined 2007 Open Championships eighty (80) referees were nominated. Ample to choose from. There may be difficulty with other World Championships where at times it is a struggle with numbers.

Note: I am not suggesting that the IPF President and Chairman of the Technical Committee should sit on every Jury panel!

In our "brother" sport of Weight Lifting IWF At Olympic Games and World Championships, the Juries are composed of five (5) members each, one of them being the President.

The Jury, in unanimity and after discussion, has the power to reverse the decision when the referees' decision has been judged on majority by the Jury to be technically incorrect.

Conclusion

I feel that there will always be controversy if we are to continue with a three man Jury. It is strange that two Jury members have the power/authority to overturn the decisions of possibly three Cat 1 referees on platform. Hardly democratic! Increase the Jury number to five (5) at least for our "Premier" Championships - Open Men and Women, and our show-case event - The World Games. Incidentally, at the recent Open Worlds a five man Jury did sit experimentally in the 125 kg and plus 125 kg classes. Favourable comment was received.

Perhaps it was just co-incidental but there were no reversals of decisions. One may deduce from this, that there was no overpowering personality/s, and by far, more democracy.

New Referees

Cat 1

Josephine Wing-yuk Ip	Hong Kong
Andre Ludick	RSA
Stephen Mcquaid	GBR

Cat 2

Mark Dickerson	GBR
----------------	-----

Congratulations to them and thanks to the examiners.

Technical Committee Meeting

While in St. Johns Newfoundland for the 2008 Congress and Open Championships, six members of the Committee met (quorum) and discussed items that may be put forward as proposals to Rules Congress 2010 or possibly should Congress decide, in 2009.

1. Scales to register to second place of decimals.
2. Bench Press even extension.
3. Minimum 15 cm movement of bar from chest to lockout.
4. Three (3) or five (5) persons Jury depending on availability of Category 1 Referees.

Seasons greetings to one and all.

John Stephenson
Chairman IPF Technical Committee