

Revised Fixed Time Scoring Procedures, Rule 9.4.6, etc.  
Af Niel Beverley.

Hi All

A change in the 2006 rules to watch for is Rule 9.4.6 et al.

Previously the deduction was 5 points per overtime shot. Now we deduct the highest scoring hits equivalent to the number of overtime shots.

As I understand it WinMSS doesn't currently handle this as per the 2006 rules.

Until a change can be implemented in due course I think it will be better for ROs to record all hits (in case of dispute) and for the stats officer(s) to enter the correct hits. I'm sorry if this causes an extra burden but unless you have any better ideas it is safer if handled in stats. We need to watch also for 9.4.6.4 for SG & R.

Your thoughts?

As an aside, and going back many years, the RO used to deduct the hits.

I'm also going to post this exact same message in the IROA section, partly to make people aware and partly to canvas for comments.

#### 9.4.6 In a Fixed Time Course of Fire:

9.4.6.1 Overtime shots (i.e. shots fired after the signal to cease fire has been given), will each be penalized the value of the maximum scoring hit available on that target, except in the case of disappearing targets.

9.4.6.1 Overtime shots are shots fired at the targets after the signal to cease fire has been given. Overtime shots will not count for score.

9.4.6.2 Where static scoring paper targets are used, it is assumed that overtime shots result in the highest value hits visible on the targets, so these are ignored for scoring purposes. For example, on a stage with 1xA, 6xC and 1xD hits, where 2 overtime shots have been fired, the 2 highest hits (i.e. 1xA and 1xC) are ignored, with the final score being 5xC and 1xD hits.

9.4.6.3 Where static paper no-shoots are used, it is assumed that all hits occurred within the specified time, and will count in the scoring process, subject to Rule 9.4.2.

9.4.6.4 Where static metal or frangible targets are used, any target(s) that has (have) been hit after the signal to cease fire has been given will be ignored for scoring purposes. SG & R are the same, N/A for HG

.....  
.....

Fixed Time stages are supposed to represent a situation where the threat and therefore the targets are no longer there. A shot fire overtime theoretically hits nothing because the target wouldn't be there. This works just fine with turning or disappearing targets but with static targets we have to replicate the intention with the aid of timers and signals. Hence, all we are doing is removing the benefit (or loss) of a hit on a target that isn't (shouldn't be) there.

Take an array of 3 targets with 2 shots required on each in a fixed time (it doesn't matter what time for this example).

Take 2 competitors who each fire 5 shots within time and 1 shot overtime.

Competitor A hits all Ds, i.e 6 D hits on the target. Competitor B hits all As, i.e. 6 A hits on the targets.

The new rule simply deducts a D so the competitor scores 5 Ds and in Major this would be 10 points. The old rule would deduct 5 points to result in a score of 7 points.

The competitor's overtime shot scored 2 but the old rule deducts 5, i.e -3 points.

Now consider Competitor B. The competitor's overtime shot scores 5 and the old rule deducts 5, i.e 0 points.

Both competitors have carried out the same act by firing an overtime shot but the old rule arbitrarily changes the stage results by affecting one competitor more than the other.

Please remember this is not intended to be a penalty. We are merely trying to remove the advantage of a hit on a target (for scoring purposes) that isn't theoretically there any more.

The 2004 rule on FT was contrary to the existing procedures being used by SG and R and the way we had always previously been doing things going back years and years. I could explain why it appeared in the 2004 rules as it did but it's a long story and wouldn't serve much use now.

I am sitting with a copy of the IPSC rules from 1986 (7th Edition) and the way I have described the (2006) rule above is how it was then. I have copies of the Level 1 IPSC/IROA seminar from 1991 and this was how it was specifically taught and explained in detail. The 2006 rulebook merely re-establishes the concepts from old:

The target isn't theoretically there so ignore any hits that occur overtime. One of the key points is that we're not actually trying to "penalise" the shooter and we simply do the best we can to remove the benefit of the hits that occurred after the targets weren't theoretically there.

The easiest solution (but not the best for the clubs and members) is to stipulate that only turning or disappearing target arrangements are used. This doesn't suit, or is impossible, for some clubs. The rulebook

therefore attempts to provide a reasonable solution for an imperfect problem.

This particular rule applies only to static targets. On disappearing targets we rely on the mechanism to control the timed exposure. We deduct absolutely nothing for an overtime shot on disappearing targets.

This point is very significant because it firmly establishes and confirms that there is no intended penalty for the act of firing a late or overtime shot. Otherwise we would also apply the penalty to the act in the case of disappearing targets as well.

The 1986 rule was the same. The rule does not say the maximum potential value of a hit on the target, i.e. 5 points; the rule says the maximum scoring value of each shot so fired" and if each shot so fired hits only the D zone then you deduct Ds. The language has been (I believe accidentally) corrupted and mis-interpreted on the way. The IROA seminars taught it as I describe. I've pasted the text from the Instructors exam debriefing paperwork (early 90s, 1991 I think, or perhaps even earlier)

Rule 10.01 (ii) It is important that students thoroughly understand the logic of fixed-time stages, and the reason for penalties assessed for late shots:

- a. Fixed time stages are designed to test a competitor's ability to deal with a given situation in a limited amount of time
- b. If we all had access to turning target mechanisms, then we could eliminate the problem of late shots by simply having the targets disappear after the prescribed time has elapsed. The competitor could then shoot as many late shots as he wished and have no effect on the target score
- c. In the absence of turning target equipment, we have introduced a stop signal ( second buzzer ) to simulate the disappearance of the target. The deficiency of this method is that the target actually remains exposed to the competitor, and the score will likely be influenced by any late shots.
- d. The application of penalties to late shots in a fixed time exercise is only to remove any benefit the competitor might have gained by hitting a target that was theoretically no longer there. These penalties are not intended as any kind of "punishment" for shooting after the final signal
- e. To eliminate any possible benefit, we simply remove from the target as many hits as there were late shots. Not only do we assume that all of the late shots hit the target, but we also take the position that they gave rise to the best hits

Late shots will be penalised 5 points each only to the extent that there are " A " hits to account for all the late shots, the remaining late shots will be penalised according to the highest value hits remaining.

Ensure also that students thoroughly understand the logic behind Rule 10.01 (iii) assessing a procedural error for each extra hit on a fixed time target, and Rule 10.01 (iv) charging a procedural error for each extra shot taken above the number prescribed by the course description

Again I say there is no intention to apply a penalty. We apply no penalty to late shots in conjunction with disappearing targets.

However we do have a problem when it comes to scoring. We can't accurately determine the sequence of shots and hits. In the absence of this we have to make a rulebook decision and this is as described and it is felt that this represents the most reasonable solution. I believe it represents a fairer system for competitors as a whole, certainly compared to an automatic deduction of 5 points per shot. Not perfect I agree, we can't have perfect with static paper targets. The nearest thing to perfect is disappearing targets but that isn't perfect for some clubs either because it denies them the opportunity to use FT.

The addition of extra rule numbers (note that I do not same extra rules) is a red herring. There has been a single basic change and then the rule has been split up and expanded to make understanding easier. Think of the sub rules as paragraphs of the same rule (but that's not how we build the rulebook). Going back over the years I have found a certain degree of uncertainty about the intention and operation of this rule. Therefore the "extra" sub rules are to make clear statements about how to operate the underlying rule. Rule 9.4.6.4 is SG & R only.

I guess it would make sense to copy in the WinMSS team with approved changes as soon as the changes are ratified at a GA to assist with updates and new procedures. I'll suggest to the Rules Committee.