

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10



## CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

<b>Competition:</b>	18th FAI World Canopy Formation Championships
<b>Event:</b>	CF 2-way sequential, 4-way sequential, 4-way rotation
<b>Place:</b>	Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia
<b>Date:</b>	06 Oct -13 Oct 2018
<b>Panel of Judges:</b>	Chief Judge - Julia Sotnikova (Russia) Event Judge 2-way sequential - Gillian Rayner (France) Event Judge 4-way sequential - Natasha Higman (UK) Event Judge 4-way rotation – Exi Hoenle (Germany) Judge – Mario Fabretti (Italy) Judge – Gail Bradley (Australia) Judge – Agnieszka (Aggie) Sobczynska (Poland)
<b>Equipment Used:</b>	InTime Scoring System
<b>Details of the Judges Work: (including judging statistics)</b>	<p>All judges arrived on time for the judges conference. The conference took place on 6th October. The scoring system was all set up by the time of the conference, practice jumps loaded, set up for the competition complete.</p> <p>The judging room was ready with all necessary equipment provided. The Organizing staff was very helpful and made minor adjustments to the facility in no time. That was no separate judges room but rather part of the larger hangar, but the mobile partitions were used, sound absorbing, which made the facility very convenient and isolated enough for judging.</p> <p>All judges were accommodated in a luxurious 5 star apartment hotel. CF judges were most conveniently accommodated – sharing the apartment, but having their own rooms within the apartment (including the private bathroom). Quoting one of the CF judges: “not sharing really made a difference”. If single accommodation for judges is not made IPC standard, it will be great if future organisers offer a choice to the</p>

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

judges: double accommodation or a single accommodation for which the judge will have to pay a difference. That would really give judges a good option.

Shuttle service was organized from the hotel to DZ. Not having a designated vehicle for the panel sometimes made it tough on the schedule with other panels, but that was manageable. Great support from the Assistant to Chief Judges, Neil Fergie.

Due to the 1<sup>st</sup> day schedule and a very early opening ceremony, the judging conference was much shorter than usual. That gave enough time to discuss the specifics of the rules and judging situations, but the practical part had to be cut off, hardly had time to judge official practice jumps. We would have really liked to have the judges conference longer by several hours.

The organisers offered all the participants to use a great competition App with all vital competitions info (bulletins) and daily updates. That would also be great if the Chief Judges could use it as a means of fast communication with their panels (in a specific group) and with respective CF team managers (based on the contact data submitted by participants to the Organisers).

Quality wi-fi access was also provided to all competition participants on DZ.

Competition statistics:

#### **2-way sequential**

- total of 16 teams and 12 Nations (FRA, QAT, RUS, USA, FIN, CAN, GER, AUS, ITA, GBR, CZE, POL; two 2-way teams from FRA, USA, RUS, AUS)
- total of 8 rounds made, 131 competition jumps judged, including 3 rejumps.
- 2 continental records set:
  - North American Continental record – USA-1 team, 20 points
  - Asian Continental record – Qatar team, 33 points
- 2 National records set:
  - Finland – 19 points
  - Italy – 10 points

#### **4-way sequential**

- total of 4 teams and 4 Nations (AUS, QAT, RUS, USA)
- total of 8 rounds made, 32 competition jumps judged
- 1 continental record set:
  - North American Continental record – USA team, 9 points

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

	<p><b><u>4-way rotation</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>total of 5 teams and 5 Nations (AUS, QAT, RUA, GBR, USA)</li> <li>total of 8 rounds made, 42 competition jumps judged, including 2 jump-offs (a tie for the 1<sup>st</sup> place between RU and QAT teams)</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendations for Organisers:</b>	<p>1. Ensure there's sufficient time for the judges conference.</p> <p>2. If single accommodation for the judges is not made the IPC standard, it will be great if the future organisers offer a choice to the judges: double accommodation or a single accommodation for which the judge will have to pay a difference. That would really give the judges a good option.</p> <p>2. Continue using the App, but develop it further (if possible) allowing also for the Chief Judges to communicate with their panels, and with respective CF team managers (based on the contact data submitted by participants to the Organisers)</p>
<b>Rule Changes Proposals:</b>	<p>Proposed CF Competition Rules changes, as discussed at Competitors meeting following the completion of the Meet.</p> <p><b>2.1 FORMATION</b></p> <p><i>Current wording:</i> Consists of two (2) or more jumpers and canopies linked by grips, correct or not.</p> <p><i>Proposed wording:</i> <b>Consists of competitors linked by grips. (definition used in FS competition rules)</b></p> <p><i>Rational:</i> CF teams are given 30 seconds to build the 1st formation - for safety purposes. If current wording of this rule in combination with the current wording for start of the working time strictly applied to 4-way events, the judges may just as well find themselves in the following situation: 4-way building formation #1 within 30 seconds have #3 performer dock in the wrong place and releasing to correct. According to the current definition of the CF formation and start of the working time, the judges will have to start timing, which is definitely not in the spirit of the rules for the 4-way events. Thus, the proposal is to use a more generic definition of the formation to bring back the spirit of the rules and officially allow the 4-ways to complete their 1-st 4-way formation and only then have the scoring clock started for them.</p> <p><b>2.3 CONFIGURATIONS</b></p> <p>2.3.1 Stack</p> <p><i>Current wording:</i> The shoulder of the upper jumper must be above the upper surface of the lower canopy. A grip must be on an "A" line attached to the centre cell.</p> <p><i>Proposed wording:</i> The shoulder of the upper jumper must be above the upper surface of the lower</p>

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

canopy. A grip must be on an “A” line attached to the centre cell. **For the judging purposes, it is considered sufficient if one grip only is taken on «A» line, the second grip may be off-set if taken.**

*Rational:*

This is for the benefit of improving judging standard and alignment between judges of different Nations. Majority of judges are not native English speakers. It is rather difficult to understand subtle meaning of the English language sometimes. Since rules have to be read precise and unambiguous, extra clarification and extra wording required to be on the same page.

## 2.4 INTER

*Current wording:*

The stage between two formations. An inter must be flown and remain intact with the correct grips. <sup>[11]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

*Proposed wording:*

**Inter: is an intermediate requirement within a block sequence which must be performed as depicted in the dive pools. (definition used in FS competition rules) AND, add notion and definition of an infringement, similar to one in FS rules, including scoring of the infringement in the inter**

**Infringement: is one of the following:**

**1. An incorrect or incomplete formation which is followed within working time by either**

- a total separation or,
- an inter, whether correct or not.

**2. A correctly completed formation preceded by an incorrect inter or incorrect total separation.**

**3. A formation, inter, or total separation not clearly presented.**

**If an infringement in the scoring formation of a block sequence is carried into the inter, this will be considered as one infringement only, provided that the intent of the inter requirements for the next formation is clearly presented and no other infringement occurs in the inter.**

*Rational:*

To get rid of the automatic double bust for the same mistake and motivate the teams to correct the mistake.

CF teams are punished twice for the same mistake in the following situation: if there's a block of 2 formations with a designated inter, and there's a mistake in 1 or more grips (taken on the incorrect line, or double lines, etc), the mistake is further carried in

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

the inter , and since the inter has to be flown intact, there's no chance or motivation for the team to correct the mistake. So, the team will not be given a point for the formation 1 on the block due to bad grip, and will get further penalty for formation 2 in the block due to incorrect inter. Alternately, if the team will try to correct during the inter, it will be considered as a break (not intact) and also penalised. Thus, the proposal is to eliminate automatic double bust and motivate the team not to carry the mistake from the 1st formation in the block to the inter.

## 2.8 WORKING TIME

### *Current wording:*

The working time begins at the moment of the first separation of a grip from the first formation whether correct or not, or 30 seconds after exit of the first team member, including the team's Videographer, whichever is first.

### *Proposed wording:*

The working time begins at the moment of the first **complete** separation of **a grip—all grips, including assistant grips**, from the first formation whether correct or not, or 30 seconds after exit of the first team member, including the team's Videographer, whichever is first.

### *Rational:*

CF teams are given 30 seconds to build the 1st formation for safety purposes. Often the 1st dock for the first formation is in «incorrect» place, thus a jumper begins to «shift» to the right position. The rule works adversely for the cases when in 4-way or 2-way in stack configuration there are 2 grips on the center lines OR the competitor's shifting from the incorrect position to the correct one before the release. According to the current wording of the rule the start of «shifting» or release of the first grip whereas the second is there and the formation remains intact shall start the working time, though this is ruining the initial idea of 30-seconds given to the competitors to build the first formation safely and have time to adjust.

The proposal is to go back to the spirit of the rule, allow time for safe building of the 1st formation, and start working time on COMPLETE release of grips.

## 3.5 DETERMINATION OF WINNERS <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

### *Current wording:*

3.5.2 Where more than one round is completed, the team that has the best score calculated as follows: <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

3.5.2.1 the highest aggregate number of formations in all the completed rounds.  
<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>3.5.2.2 tie break round (if possible) for the first three (3) places only. <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

3.5.2.3 the highest number of points in any completed round for each team.

3.5.2.4 the fastest time (measured to hundredths of a second) to the last common

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

scoring formation within working time in the last completed round.

*Proposed wording: (definition used in FS competition rules)*

If two or more teams have equal scores the following order of procedures will be applied to determine the final placings:

- i. one tie break round, if possible (for the first three placings only). The tie break round will be the next drawn round of the competition,
- ii. the highest score in any completed round,
- iii. the highest score starting with the last completed round and continuing in reverse order, round by round until the tie is broken,
- iv. the fastest time (measured to hundredths of a second) to the last formation scored without infringement by both teams in the last completed round. Starting time must be that used for original evaluation of the jump.

*Rational:*

It's been a long time since CF had any tie breaks, especially like this year for the 1st place, thus we never really had troubles past jump-off. This year, we found ourselves in the situation, that weather might not have permitted for the jump-off. In case jump off had not worked/ was not possible, there was no official TECHNICAL means (as per the current rule wording) to determine the winner. The CF scoring system does not cater for this. The jumps then would have to be re-judged using the artificial speed competition (which is not by the rules and would have required Jury decision). FS had similar problem not long ago and subsequently amended the rule, which led to the update in the scoring system, which allows to use original evaluation and has no need for re-judging. Thus, the proposal is to use the best practice from FS for determining the winner, and align the rules between the disciplines further.

#### **4.4 END OF WORKING TIME**

*Current wording:*

After working time has elapsed, only the drawn sequence for that round may be performed. If any other canopy formation is performed the team will receive a score of zero for that round. The organiser shall supply a qualified person to monitor teams for this possible occurrence. This decision is no grounds for a protest. <sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>

4.4.1 The Chief Judge is responsible for appointing a qualified person to monitor that rule 4.4 is followed.

4.4.2 In the event that the CJ cannot appoint the person supplied by the Organiser for pertinent reasons (eg person has other responsibilities or is not suitably qualified) the Organiser shall provide an alternative person.

4.4.3 If the same team is observed to have broken rule 4.4 a second time, the appointed observer will notify the Chief Judge. The team concerned will be disqualified from the competition. This decision is no grounds for a protest.

*Proposed wording:*

After working time has elapsed, only the drawn sequence for that round may be performed. If any other canopy formation is performed the team will receive a score

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

of zero for that round.

To prove that this is followed, the team's videographer is required to video at least one performer up to the height of 300 m, OR shall video all the team members, whichever he chooses.

The recordings of all competition jumps by the team shall be stored by the team's videographer till the completion of the Meet, and presented to the Chief Judge at request, if need to validate the sequence performed after the working time arises.

*Rational:*

There's absolutely no practical way to guarantee that the rule is followed in the current wording. The person supplied by the Organiser has no official status with the Judges panel, has no official qualification confirmed. Normally, this person will have other official duties within the competition organisation, and hard to guarantee to be available at the time of CF jump. Since there's no official recording/ way of documenting of what being seen, it's a word against word: of the official observer (with all the limitations to his status and capacities as listed above) and the registered competitors. This situation is very hard to solve with the current set-up, if we do not want to increase costs and bring a dedicated FAI CF judge for this specific person. Since the competitors are completely against removing this rule, a compromise solution proposed, with the consent of the majority of the competitors present.

#### **4.8 EXIT PROCEDURE**

*Current wording:*

4.8.3 The exit of the first team member must be clearly shown on the team's video recording. Failure to clearly show the exit of the first team member will result in a score of zero for that round. <sup>{1}</sup><sub>{SEP}</sub>

*Proposed wording: (definition used in FS competition rules)*

The chronometer will be operated by the Judges or by a person(s) appointed by the Chief Judge, and will be started as determined in 2.8 . If Judges cannot determine the start of the working time, the following procedure will be followed. Working time will start as the videographer separates from the aircraft and a penalty equal to 20% (rounded down) of the score for that jump will be deducted from the score for that jump.

*Rational:*

Further synchronisation with FS rules, applying best practices. The videographer is a team member, as much as the performers. Applying this notion, the current way to evaluate the work of a team member looks unbalanced. A mistake by a performer will result in max 2-3 points (double bust/ omission), which is still some % of the total jump score, whereas a mistake by the videographer costs 100% of the total team performance. Exit from the airplane is not even start of the working time for CF, it's just the start of 30 seconds for safely building the 1st formation, thus it does feel very unfair to penalise the team by 100% of the jump score for not showing the exit.

#### **6.3 VIEWING**

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

*Current wording:*

The judges will watch each performance once at normal speed. At the request of any working judge, a second viewing at normal speed or reduced speed at 70% may be made. A third (3rd) view of part(s) of the jump at normal or reduced speed at 70%, may only occur at the discretion of the Event Judge.

*Proposed wording:*

The judges will watch each performance once at normal speed. At the request of any working judge/ **If a judgement call occurs**, a second viewing at normal speed or reduced speed at 70% **will** be made. A third (3rd) view of part(s) of the jump at normal or reduced speed.

*Rational:*

Further synchronisation with FS rules, applying best practices. To guarantee panel judges their right for the second viewing in case of judgement call.

**7.3 COMPOSITION OF DELEGATIONS***Current wording:***7.3.2 At a World Parachuting Championship or Continental Championship:**

- Two 2-way teams consisting of up to four (4) members, any of who may be the team Videographer.
- One 4-way Sequential team consisting of up to six (6) members, any of who may be the team Videographer.
- One 4-way Rotation team consisting of up to six (6) members, any of who may be the team Videographer.

*Proposed wording:*

- Two 2-way teams consisting of up to four (4) members, any of who may be the team Videographer.
- **Two** 4-way Sequential team consisting of up to six (6) members, any of who may be the team Videographer.
- **Two** 4-way Rotation team consisting of up to six (6) members, any of who may be the team Videographer.

*Rational:*

To increase participation in CF events. Will improve

- Economy for the Organiser and IPC since Meet set up costs will be spread over more competitors and total sanction fee will increase
- Sports development within countries, giving chance and hope for the 2nd best teams to attend the WPC (since World Cups are extremely rare for CF, especially due to limited number of European CF 4-way teams), which otherwise is impossible for nations with strong 4-way teams and kill the interest in the events.... This proposal was strongly supported by all



<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

competitors.

Sporting Code, Section 5

*Current wording:*

3.3.5 Large Formation Sequential Record

The record performance for the large formation sequential record is the number of persons (not less than 25% (rounded up) of the size of the largest formation record (World or Continental Regional, General or Female, as appropriate) at the time the sequential record is performed. VFS is also subject to a minimum number of 24) to complete a sequence of two or more formations, giving a separate record performance for each number of formations completed.

One written plan describing the formations and the transitions to be attempted and the personnel involved must be submitted in advance to the judges. The formations and the transitions must be completed as described with all named personnel in the formations.

All persons in the completed formations must be connected by at least one grip either taken by the person or taken on the person.

A grip is a handhold on an arm or leg (both as defined in the relevant Competition Rules) of another person.

In the transition from one formation to the next, at least 35% of the persons in the first formation must either release all of their grips and all grips on them must also be released or be a member of a released sub-group, consisting of no more than four persons.

None of the released grips included in this 35% may be retaken in the next formation. Each subgroup must be clearly presented and remain intact as a subgroup from the grip release until the correct completion of the next formation. Simultaneous separation during the transition is not required but total separation must be shown at some point in time during the transition as shown in the written plan.

*Proposed wording:*

... A grip is a handhold on an arm or leg (both as defined in the relevant FS Competition Rules) of another person, **OR is a hand hold or a foot hook on an "A" line or front riser (both as defined in the relevant CF Competition Rules)**

*Rational:*

As defined in SC5 par.3.1.1 (2) Large formation sequential record notion is applicable to FS, CF, VFS. Nonetheless, par. 3.3.5 holding requirements for large formation sequential record only gives reference to FS grip definition only. Thus, the proposal is to add reference to CF grip definition.

**TO BE ADDED**

*Proposed:*

Copy 7.2 from FS competition rules «Visualisation of the grip position»

*Rational:*

69<sup>th</sup> FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, LILLE, FRANCE, 26 - 27 JANUARY 2019

<i>Subject:</i>	CJ's Final Report on 18 <sup>th</sup> FAI WCFC, Australia 2018	Annex No. -	18.1.1
<i>Author:</i>	Julia Sotnikova, Chief Judge	Agenda ref. -	18.1.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	10

	Further alignment between CF judges and improving quality of judging. Clarification of the acceptable position of the grip: for judging purposes ankle considered part of the foot.
Personal remarks:	<p>From the CF panel to the Organisers our gratitude and appreciation for the fantastic competition!</p> <p>My thanks and appreciation to CF judges for the great job they done, their dedication and support. The best team ever!</p> <p>Special thanks to Gail Bradley who had a hard time changing hats of the Organiser and the Judge, and who managed to keep them completely separate! Thank you for being a great new member of the CF judges community!</p>

As per Sporting Code Section 5, 6.7.1 (6) this report is to be sent, within 30 days of the competition's completion, to <sup>[L]</sup>~~[SEP]~~ Chair of the Judges Committee<sup>[L]</sup>, IPC Recording Secretary, Chair/s of the parachute discipline/s which took part in the event

Name/Signature:	Julia Sotnikova
Date:	11.11.2018