

73rd FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 28-29 JANUARY 2023, MALMO, SWEDEN

<i>SUBJECT:</i>	Proposal to Shift Travel Cost for Judges	<i>AGENDA #</i>	22.2.1
<i>AUTHOR:</i>	Jim Rees, Delegate for USA		
<i>DATE:</i>	29 November 2022	<i>PAGES:</i>	2

PROPOSAL TO SHIFT TRAVEL COST FOR JUDGES

At FCEs, the Organizer Agreement (FCEAD 2.3) only requires the Host to cover accommodation, local transportation, and meals for Judges.

However, we do not require the Host to cover the transportation expense of getting Judges to the event. Instead, ISC reimburses the judges for this cost, and the money effectively comes from the sanction fee charged to the Host for each entrant.

Proposal – move the job and expense of transporting judges to the Host. Reduce the sanction fee accordingly(*). The entrance fee charged by the Host would increase to account for the added expense.

Pros:

- Hosts already fly people in and out all the time for other competitions, camps, record attempts, and more. They know how to do it, and they know how to save money doing it.
- The Host can pay for the travel directly in their own currency. Currently, the Judge pays for it in currency A, the sanction fee is exchanged from the Host's currency B to euros, and then again to CHF. Then when the Judge claims the expense, the currency is converted yet again from CHF to currency A. Up to 3 currency conversions versus zero.
- Less paperwork for the Judge and for the ISC Treasurer. Less training required on the Judge to learn how to file the paperwork. No up-front outlay for the Judge.
- "Back of the envelope" suggests Judge Travel accounts for roughly one half of the intended use for the sanction fee.
- Currently, Chief Judges have their greatest accountability to the various ISC committees, but none whatsoever to the Host. If the cost of travel becomes the responsibility of the Host, there is less chance of a conflict of interest when it comes to judging panel selections.

Cons:

- The judge selections and timing of Bulletin #1 (when entry fees are locked in) might not allow for accurate prediction of the Host's actual costs.
Rebuttal - the list of eligible judges and their home countries is known well in advance, so Hosts are certainly able to estimate the worst-case scenario.
- Events in remote locations (ie. Gold Coast, Pretoria, Tanay, etc.) will likely incur higher entrance fees than events in Central Europe. This could negatively impact participation at remote locations in addition to the impact of higher costs to the competitor for personal travel. The threat of reduced participation could affect who gets selected in the plenary vote.

73rd FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 28-29 JANUARY 2023, MALMO, SWEDEN

<i>SUBJECT:</i>	Proposal to Shift Travel Cost for Judges	<i>AGENDA #</i>	22.2.1
<i>AUTHOR:</i>	Jim Rees, Delegate for USA		
<i>DATE:</i>	29 November 2022	<i>PAGES:</i>	2

Rebuttal – remote locations already incur an added expense for participants. The increase associated with judge travel will impact < 5% of this cost.

- Itineraries booked by the Host could be unduly inconvenient for the Judge, long connection times, excess stops, etc when airfare alone is the sole concern for the Host.

Rebuttal - the Host is already required to deal with travel for the FAI Controller, and certain other officials, so this cannot be a *new* problem. We can easily copy the guidance from the current Reimbursement Policy into the Organizer Agreement (the language about lowest non-refundable fare with the least number of stops, etc.), but since we cannot afford to be looking over the Hosts shoulders when they are researching options, there are limits to the enforceability of such guidance.

(*) Determining an appropriate amount to reduce the sanction fee is not trivial, especially at a time when the need exists to increase it. Notwithstanding, the intended purpose of this proposal is to be revenue neutral.