

Appendix K

Delegates meeting 2024 (pt. 7-b.VIII)

Long Range Matters

From Mr. Lee Shaver, chairman of the Long Range Committee, we have the following information:

(this has been agreed upon by the members of the long range committee and can probably just be confirmed by the delegates)

I have been in communication with all the members of the long range committee, including one that was on holiday in France.

I sent to them an email touching on all the subjects that came up during the LR delegate meeting in Hungary, and an extra issue or two. I have included my note to them below this note to you.

I have made notes to you on each subject in colored text, but I wanted you to have available the notes I sent to them for discussion.

Item #1;

location of 2025 LR world championships.

The only country that offered to host the LR world championships for 2025 was the USA. The proposed location was Raton, New Mexico, at the NRA's Whittington Center.

It was discussed and voted upon and the decision was unanimous to accept the offer of the USA to host in 2025 at that location.

There was also a discussion as to when the match should be held with the options being in August or October, and the vote was for early October if possible.

This should be ratified at the world championships this year.

As it says in the sentence above, I believe this needs to be ratified by the full delegates meeting to be official.

Item #2;

Tang sights,

There was a question about the safety of tang sights that did not tip fore and aft in use, and whether the rules should be modified to prevent their use.

This question comes from one or two people that have attempted to make their own tang sights and not realizing the danger of that tang sight hitting them in the face when the rifle is fired.

Many of the earlier design rifles that are used for short range competitions have tang sights that are solid and stationary. That is just fine when shot with light loads and or in the sanding position as they

were intended to be used. Shooting heavy recoiling rifles prone with taller tang sights is a little different matter.

It seems that when someone comes over from the short range matches they do not always understand why the long range tang sights tip fore and aft. It is not just for storage, but for safety when shooting.

It would be a simple thing to make a change in the rules to clarify that the sight must be free to move forward under recoil for safety sake, but my fear is that once we start putting details like that in the rules they can easily become overly complicated and confusing.

My personal opinion is that the rules require correct sights from the 1860 to 1899 time frame in our competitions. All of those sights tipped fore and aft for the same reasons we use them today.

I don't think the rules is the proper place to define what a correct sight from the 1860 to 1899 really is and how it worked.

I think this should be referred to the small arms committee where they can study the question and follow up with a report, just as they do with other questions of this type.

If you think this should be handled in the rules then I am certainly willing to listen to your reasons for doing so.

The committee is unanimous in that we should not attempt to put clarification of this issue in the rules themselves. It is clear that all long range sights contemporary to these rifles tipped forward for the same reasons it is advisable today.

We discussed this in Hungary during the LR delegates meeting and still feel today that this issue should be passed on to the SAC for study and a report, similar to the sling question that has been discussed recently by that committee.

My opinion (Gerhard):

This can now be decided by the delegates and later on published on our website as the matter is absolutely clear. It must not be decided again by the delegates.

Item #3;

Team selection process,

The rules as written now were written with the intent that the individual aggregate for mid and or long range would be fired before the captains had to choose their firing teams for the team competitions, but it was not really clearly written that it "must" be that way. It was simply intended to be that way so a team captain could get the best idea of who was shooting well and place them on the team.

In 2019 at Bisley the methodology was changed such that the "individual" target was shot in the morning , and the team match at that same distance was fired in the afternoon. Leading to a situation where the team captain had to select the firing team after only one distance, and not the entire aggregate.

Because it was done that way in 2019, the Hungarians, who had never been involved in the LR world before just copied what had been done at Bisley, for the 2023 world match in Hungary.

I brought this subject up for clarification during the LR delegates meeting in Hungary. I discussed how this was not really the intent when the rules were written, but I also pointed out that shooting the entire aggregate is really only an advantage to countries that have the largest teams and really need the advantage less than countries with small and minimum teams.

The real benefits to shooting one distance per day is range organization, moving around less, etc.

After discussion, we voted on if everyone would really prefer to shoot one distance per day and choose the team after the first distance, or would they rather do as the rules originally intended with shooting the entire aggregate then shooting the team matches later.

I abstained from the vote after explaining that I felt we were the team that could benefit most from team selections after the aggregate, and since I was the LR committee chair and the presenter at the delegate meeting I felt I needed to recuse myself, and my countries vote.

The vote was unanimous to continue with the way the last two world matches have been held, with shooting one distance per day, shooting the individual competition in the morning, selecting the firing teams after only one distance and then firing the team matches in the afternoon.

This will require a slight rule change. We do not necessarily have to write a rule to require the matches be shot that way, but we should eliminate or modify the sentence that is in the rules now about when the teams should be named.

Rule 7.4.g.i

"g.) Team Shooting:

i) Team Matches shall preferably be fired separately from individual events. Mid and long range team entries identifying team members and coach shall be presented to the M.D. one hour prior to the commencement of the respective matches and by times to be published in the programme of events. Timing shall permit the completion of individual events at mid range and long range before the respective teams are named."

The final sentence in that rule;

"Timing shall permit the completion of individual events at mid range and long range before the respective teams are named." could either be eliminated, or maybe it would be better to modify it to something like this;

"Timing shall permit the completion of at least one individual event at mid range and long range before the respective teams are named."

This would prevent being forced to name the firing team before the individual matches even started, but would allow for the methodology used in the most recent two world championships.

Your thoughts are appreciated as always.

We ask that the final sentence in Rule 7.4.g.i as mentioned above, should be changed to "Timing shall permit the completion of at least one individual event at mid range and long range before the respective teams are named."

The actual changes to the sentence are the addition "of at least one" and removal of the (s) on the word events.

Item #4;

Team Coaching,

We, the long range committee went through the process some time ago, of discussing the team coaching situation, asked for a vote among the LR countries and decided that team coaches must be from the same country they are representing.

This decision has apparently never been ratified by the full delegate meeting and included in the rules.

So, I brought it up again during the delegate meeting in Hungary so it could be discussed and voted on in a face to face meeting. It was voted on and all but one delegate voted to uphold that earlier decision to make the coaches to be from the same country as the shooters they are assisting.

That will be written up with the appropriate rules changes for inclusion for the delegate meeting this year.

The committee asks that the following rule be modified by the addition of a sentence at the end of the paragraph clarifying that the non shooting coach must be from the same country as the firing team.

7.4 Shooting Rules:

a. Coaching:

i) For individual events and team events when shot concurrent with individual events, competitors may receive coaching up to the time when their first scoring shot hits the target. From then on, no coaching or assistance from others, including other shooters, is permitted.

ii) For team events, when shot separate from the individual events, coaching is permitted throughout the event between the team shooters. In addition (and in team shooting only) each team may have one (1) non-shooting coach. This coach may assist each team member by giving advice, and/or adjusting the rifle sights for the shooting team members" **This non-shooting coach must be from the same country as the team they are coaching.**

Item #5;

One thing that was not on the agenda in Hungary, but was brought up by the French delegate, is concerning elder or handicapped shooters.

The question was asked if it might be possible to allow elder or handicapped shooters to shoot from a bench or table so they would not have to get down on the ground, and then back up again.

There was a brief discussion about it, and of course everyone wants to be inclusive, so the idea was passed on to the LR committee for consideration.

I did some looking into the situation and found that the MLAIC already has an inclusive policy found in section 9 of the rules.

Section 9.9 covers how to deal with a handicapped entry by passing the information on to the MLAIC Commission, where they are to make the decision as to if and how the entry will be allowed to compete.

It seems to me in reading that section of the rules, that if we attempt to write rules about handicapped policy, we will be stepping on the toes of the commission, who have been entrusted to deal with this issue.

There is also a process in place to deal with this issue, so I don't see that we need to become involved in it.

Your thoughts are appreciated.

My thoughts: Case by case decision!

The committee feels that the matter of handicapped contestants that wish to take part is well covered in section 9 of the MLAIC rules.

Section 9 grants the authority to deal with the matter to the MLAIC commission, and we do not feel that we should take on the challenge of dealing with it within the rules, as in creating a process, or separate class for them to participate.

As the rules are now, they can go through the process with the Commission to have allowances made for them to compete.

Item #6;

One final thing came up after the delegate meeting in Hungary, and during the match itself.

Prior to the match, the Hungarians had written up a plan for how to operate the camera system, how to score, etc. Basically they tried to cover all the bases on how to run a good and fair match while scoring with cameras.

As part of that work, they reported that they would be investigating the targets between relays for any questionable hits, etc.

This report was sent out to all the team captains and staff prior to the event in Hungary. It had been OK'd by the LR committee and the delegates.

At the match, the match director (Gerda), decided that this could not be done, because as she said, the shot had to be scored before the next competitor fires on that target, and she would not allow any inspection of targets between relays to check shots.

What happened next was easily predictable. A good many people had to accept misses because double shots could not always be identified on the camera screen even if it was magnified. I lost track of how many I heard from that lost shots at 300 yards. Johan lost a shot at 300, and I lost one at 500 that way, so we know it was a real problem, and all because Gerda decided to not use the written plan that had been developed ahead of the match that had been working well in all their test matches.

I read through our rules pretty carefully a couple of times and I did not find where the rules say that a shot must be scored before the next competitor fires. It does say that any protest must be lodged prior to the next shot being fired. Meaning you can not protest a shot from a few shots ago. It needs to be dealt with as soon as possible.

Our rules do say in [7.10.d.vi](#),

vi.) In case, the shooter challenges the score, the chief range officer (line officer) will decide which value shall be applied. The decision of the chief range officer is final

And in 7.12.b

b.) Challenging a score

i) A competitor may challenge the score of their shot if there is reason to believe it is scored incorrectly. The challenge must take place before the next shot is fired at the target.

Challenges shall be communicated to a firing line officer, who will communicate to the Butts officer using one of the messages in 7.12.a.) as the challenge warrants.

If the challenge is upheld the score will be corrected and marked accordingly.

ii) Challenging a score when using an optical scoring device see above ([7.10.d.vi](#).)

I could find no place where there is wording that would have prevented the inspection of targets between relays for a questionable hit. Just that any protest had to be lodged before the next shot was fired. It does not explicitly say that the score has to be decided on before the next shot is fired.

In the end we had a situation where a number of people lost good shots because the most common shots missed were clustered in the middle of the target with other shots. So the better shooters were hit harder than the lesser competitors.

This is something that clearly needs to be addressed at some point prior to another world match being scored with cameras. It does not have to be dealt with right now, but we should at least start the conversation about it.

Once again, your thoughts are always appreciated.

We, the committee members, feel the decision made by the match director in Hungary, to disallow inspection of targets between relays to settle a challenge was in error. The rules clearly state that any challenge to a score must be lodged prior to the next shot on the target, but it does not state that the decision must be made by the range officer before the next shot is fired.

The Hungarians had developed a very carefully thought out process for operating a match while scoring with cameras. That process was looked at and passed on by the LR committee and the LR delegates.

It took into account that there was some possibility of doubled up shots at the shorter distances, and some possibility that the camera may not pick up all the shots. The plan was always to challenge a shot when needed and then look at those challenged shots between relays to be fair to all contestants.

It was also deemed to be well within the rules by all involved, because the rules do not require the score to be settled before the next shot. It is clear that the intent would have been to do so when firing on pulled targets, because it is easy to visually inspect the target instantly. It is clear to us that the intent was that the target was to be inspected before the decision is made by the range officer. The only way to allow for a visual inspection of the target after a challenge when scoring with

cameras is to either shut the range down every time a challenge is issued, or wait and handle all of them between relays.

The latter method seemed to make more sense, so that is how it was decided to do it.

The decision by the match director eliminated the fairness that was designed into the rules, and if not corrected, is likely to affect attendance at future matches scored with cameras. Not allowing for visual inspection between relays affected more shooters than I wish to think about. Two of which are LR committee members.

The worst part is that we showed up to a world championship after investing a sizable amount of time and money to do so, to be informed by the match director that the plan that had been worked out ahead of time was not going to be used because of an arbitrary decision on their part.

We, the committee, do not have recommendations for how to correct this at this time. We wish to take some time and discuss it further, and come up with a more comprehensive plan prior to the next MLAIC competition that is scored with cameras.

In the meantime, it is our opinion that visually checking targets for challenged shots should be considered mandatory when scoring with a camera.

One final thought;

In Hungary, the daily posting of scores took place only online. This may be the modern way to do things, but it didn't work well. We did not see any scores posted till late in the week, when we learned that we had to delete previous files from our phones to get new ones to download.

Thanks to having no real posting of scores, we were forced to accept incorrect scores, because we were told the time had run out to protest the scores before we even found out what scores we had been given.

We would like to have the rules for the operation of a match to be clarified to make sure there are hard copies of scores available to look at and, preferably delivered to the delegate for each country daily.

My personal thoughts (Gerhard):

Although I was there every day, I did not realize that there were such problems, nor did somebody approach me to clarify this situation.

Of course, immediately after security, first thing to watch is fairness!

If there were such problems which might have been unfair to one or the other participant, I am extremely sorry!

In order to avoid such problems in future, we should definitely stick to the rules and, in case of „doubtful“ or „lost shots“ we should check the shots between the relays.

If there is anything more I can do to help or clarify what is in this email, please let me know.

Best regards,

Lee Shaver..