



CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

Competition:	3rd FAI World Cup of Indoor Skydiving
Event:	Artistic Events: Solo Freestyle 2 way Dynamic
Location:	Zallaq,, Bahrain Gravity Indoor Skydiving
Date:	October 26 - 29, 2018
Panel of Judges	CJ - Jami Pillasch EJ Solo Freestyle - Thi Bich Van Ha Panel Judge Solo Freestyle - Mary Traub (new) EJ Dynamic - David Petracco Panel Judge Dynamic - Joel Strickland Panel Judge Dynamic - Radek Meduna Panel Judge Dynamic - Vojtech Fikar Panel Judge Dynamic - Marcin Sen
Scoring Equipment Used:	InTime
Details of the Judges Work: (including judging statistics)	<p>Solo Freestyle : 30 total teams Open - 18 original teams. 17 teams competed as one team withdrew injured prior to meet. Junior - 13 teams competed. 7 rounds were judged by the 3 judge panel. Difficulty was assessed prior to competition and many flights were judged during the seminar. Approximately 290 flights were judged in Solo Freestyle.</p> <p>Dynamic: 19 total teams Dynamic 2 way Open - 18 original teams. Ended up with 19 teams as the 1 Junior team present moved up to Open. The Junior category was removed. Dynamic 2 way Junior - 2 original teams. This event was removed. Dynamic 4 way Open - 3 original teams. This event was removed due to lack of teams. Dynamic 4 way Junior - 0 original teams. This event was removed due to lack of teams.</p> <p>There were some challenges made during the competition, but they were handled well. The tiebreakers were efficiently completed. The bracket system used worked well. InTime places the tie breakers in Round 6 which causes some confusion, but it was explained for understanding.</p>
Recommendations for Organizers:	<p>Gravity and the Organizers did a fabulous job. The tunnel is beautiful and spacious so the competition was comfortable for spectators and judges. The Organizers (Mariam and group) provided everything possibly needed. They were very receptive to any requests prior to the meet, during the meet. and after the meet. Everything provided for the judges was first-rate and classy. The hotel was lovely with an amazing breakfast. The food set up provided in the indoor tents was elegant with tablecloths and flowers. There were many choices of delicious food, too.</p> <p>The only problem I remember was with the competitors' music. I added to this problem by asking competitors' to send videos to me prior to the meet (48 hour rule). I thought this would assist the judges in preparing for the difficulty scoring. However I think it created some confusion for the competitors as they were</p>



CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

	<p>sending things 2 places and not really completing the process cleanly. It seems to be best if music is sent to the Organizers and videos to the CJ. This needs to be clarified between the CJ and the Organizer prior to the competition and listed in the Bulletin(s).</p> <p>The one upcoming issue will be space for the judges. Instead of only having 2 panels for AE there will now be 3 panels. 2 panels of 3 plus a CJ for Solo Freestyle and 1 panel of 5 for Dynamic is the rule for next year. Depending on the tunnel flight schedule this could necessitate an extra judging space. At the least another scoring system will be needed. Plus if Dynamic goes back to having enough teams for Open/Junior 2 way and 4 way there may be a need for a second panel of Dynamic judges.</p>
<p>Rules Changes – Proposals:</p>	<p>Some notes from competitor meetings. Most of these are related to Solo Freestyle.</p> <p>Difficulty:</p> <p>Request submitted videos to be in high quality. Request all to be sent in same video file format. Request the video to be shot in format that fills the screen. Request option to evaluate using slow motion.</p> <p>Gathering the videos for the 48 hours prior to competition rule is difficult and causes consternation among the competitors. A specific time should be listed for the 48 hours requirement. The videos were often of poor quality and most of the time only filled the center third of the screen. A specific process should be created to make this all easier - better quality videos can only help the competitors and judges. A request to have the TV monitor to be placed both horizontally or vertically should be made. This could alleviate the viewing in only the center third of the screen. Allowing slow motion for scoring Difficulty could also increase the validity of the scoring.</p> <p>Gender separation:</p> <p>This was discussed again. Perhaps if numbers increase this could be feasible. Still a split in thoughts of whether this is important or not.</p> <p>New moves:</p> <p>It was suggested that a method be developed for athletes to submit new moves and have them evaluated. Perhaps the Committee could do this? A concern was that this evaluation would stay secret until the new move was performed in a competition.</p> <p>Inquiry system:</p> <p>There was talk about creating an inquiry/challenge system. This seemed to be mostly about Difficulty Scores. The creation of Technical Advisors might negate this need.</p> <p>Compulsories:</p> <p>It would be helpful for everyone if the compulsories were described more completely and that videos with a critique were available. For example on the HU Breaker when is</p>




CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

	<p>bending the legs too early? The more judging guidelines that are made the clearer the scores will become.</p> <p>Routine Description Sheet: It would be helpful if the competitor designates if they are starting or finishing on the net. Also note if wall touching is intentional. Deviating from the Routine Description Sheet/Video used for the Difficulty Scoring was discussed. How should these deviations be judged? Decrease in execution is how it is handled now. If this is to continue it should be written in the rules.</p> <p>Start and finish for timing: There are instances when the timing comes into questions. Examples are holding the handstand inside the door? Moving in and out of the tunnel at beginning or end of routine. When does time start and finish?</p> <p>Timing rules of 9.5 and 8.5: There needs to be a system of informing the performer when these deductions are taken.</p> <p>Score spread rule: It is a general practice to try to keep scores within a one point range, but not a rule. Some competitors thought it was a rule. Is this something we would like as a rule?</p> <p>Reverse placement rule: This rule needs to be clarified for the correct procedure. Is the rule by country or by the individual? For example - Kyra Poh from Singapore won Juniors last year, but moved to Open this year. So for Juniors this year does Yi Xuan Choo from Singapore take the number 1 spot or does Kaitlin Wittenberg who was 2nd last year take the number 1 spot? And what spot does Kyra take in the Open? Is she placed in the random draw? I believe this is also an issue for the FS event as the CJ asked me how we were doing it. Easiest solution is to just have a random draw for all until the final rounds.</p> <p>Dynamic: The one issue that arose after the meet was the tie breaker rule. Several of the World and Continental Records were set on tie breaker rounds which were disallowed per the rules. Since the draw does include the tie breaker round it is necessary to amend this rule. An amendment statement has been sent to the Rules and Regulations Committee to allow the tie breakers to count for achieving competition records. If moves to Open then Random draw for order.</p>
Personal Remarks:	<p>I have several comments so it is easiest to just bullet them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a strong need to train new Dynamic IA judges. The nominated list included only 7 names and 5 judges are required. One of these was the Meet Director for the World Cup and two others were unavailable. That left only 4 possible judges. Fortunately a training course was offered before the European Cup in Voss, Norway where 2 people passed. One of these judged in Voss where



CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

	<p>there was also a need, and I selected the second one to judge in Bahrain. There was a course offered in Bahrain, but I believe no one signed up.</p> <p>2. Creating an efficient method for gathering the videos and music prior to the competition is important. It will make the time for judges training and possibly giving feedback to the competitors more efficient. Plus requesting high quality videos and using the same video file format will expedite this process. Then having the proper orientation for the TV monitor can be set up.</p> <p>3. Overall the meet was exceptional. The judges all worked well and tried to award the best routines. Items to improve the judging have been discussed and these require coordination between the competitors and judges.</p> <p>4. As CJ of both events it was difficult for me to really watch the Dynamic Competition. When I was judging, Dynamic was competing. This will change as the CJ is no longer part of the judging panel, but for now it is so important that the EJ of Dynamic is totally competent. I was fortunate that David Petracco was the best. I have nothing but accolades for both of the Event Judges in Bahrain.</p> <p>5. I would also like to personally thank Mariam from Gravity and Adam, the Meet Director for their endless help and patience. The competition was successful due to their tireless efforts.</p>
<p>In accordance with the Sporting Code Section 5, 6.9.1.(11) this form is to be completed and sent to the Chair of the Judges' Committee and the IPC Recording Secretary within 30 days of the competition's completion</p>	
Name:	Jami Pillasch
Signature:	
Date:	11/26/2018