

CIVA Judging Committee Report

Once again, we selected judges for the following championships: -

- a) Power – YAK52 – Russia
- b) Power – EAAC - Czech
- c) Power – WAC - South Africa
- d) Gliding – World Games – Poland
- e) Gliding – World Championships Advanced & Unlimited – Poland

For all the above championships, the normal CIVA procedure was used, i.e. all judges with an average (over the previous three years) RI ranking of 5 or less, were asked to indicate their availability, the results of this were sent to all CIVA Delegates, Stage 1 voting then took place within the CIVA Judging Committee, thereafter the process was opened up to all CIVA Delegates with a request for further applications from suitably qualified persons (must already be on International Judges List – reviewed at every CIVA Plenary meeting).

Final voting then took place, the results of which are attached as an annexure.

Proposed Change to conferencing procedure for Judging Board, where there is a need to hold a video conference, due to a mixture of scores and HZ.

It has become apparent, that judges have a strong tendency at such conferences to stick to their original position (possibly defending their RI rating), obviously in a conference if the evidence is a matter of absolute fact e.g. in an eight-point roll, only seven points then no problems exists, but anything that becomes a matter of opinion is clearly a different matter.

Two recent examples come to mind, both which I observed personally: -

1st Gliding last year Hungary

Certain figures produced a mixture of HZ and scores (the so-called teapot) comes to mind, at the numerous conferences virtually no judge changed their original position, to the obvious frustration of the Chief Judge and therefore the HZ's never carried. It became clear to me (I was an assistant judge) that these conferences were really a waste of time.

2nd EAAC - Czech Republic

Here I was more directly involved (being a scoring judge), I had HZ two consecutive figures for being 90 degrees off heading, for the first figure the pilot was meant to exit cross box, but in fact exited , downwind (in my opinion), the video clearly showed the competitor did not exit towards the judges but rather downwind, the Chief Judge estimated only eighty degrees off line (not ninety to warrant a HZ) five judges had given 0,0 and two scores of 6,5 and 7,5 the Chief

Judge elected not to invoke changing the 0,0s to HZ on the basis that these judges hadn't specifically mentioned one error only, a vote produced no change, the competitor actually received a very small score for a figure clearly flown incorrectly. The Jury were present during this review, but cannot vote, one confirmed that the competitor had flown over his head in a down wind direction.

The next figure (in my opinion) now commenced 90 degrees off heading or (80 degrees in the Chief Judges opinion), the required figure was a quarter upward turn, but the competitor instead flew a half roll, thus bringing him back into the correct orientation, the video clearly showed a half roll or certainly not a quarter roll, yet I was the only HZ, a vote produced no change.

I am absolutely confident that if this matter had been referred to the Jury, two HZs would have been confirmed, this was after comments from a jury member present, but the system does not allow this unless a protest is involved.

Please do not understand, this is just not me sounding off about a situation I was not happy with personally, often as a Chief Judge this situation has arisen often and unless a situation is absolutely clear, judges almost inevitably stay with their original position and it is difficult to overrule in such circumstances.

It is therefore recommended, that in future instead of holding conferences with all the judges, the Chief Judge and at least two jury members, make a call to either confirm or deny an HZ in these circumstances, this should be restricted simply to confirm or not, at no time should scores be modified by the Jury, just either HZ or not.

This matter has been discussed with CIVA President Nick Buckenham, who is also making a proposal as CIVA President, clearly some action is required.

John Gaillard