

<i>Subject:</i>	Proposal from Australia to CR re Number of Judges	Annex No. -	19.3.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gail Bradley, Australia Delegate	19.3.1	19.3.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	3

Dear IPC Bureau, Delegates and Alternate Delegates,

I make this proposal as Delegate – Australia. I would like to gain your support as it has multiple sources of input and good support, I believe, from the practitioners of Canopy Piloting, from members within the CP Committee and from the IPC Judges Committee.

This proposal is to change *Section 5, Rule 4.6.1* to increase the number of Canopy Piloting Judges on the official panel to nine (9 including CJ), instead of the current seven (7). There were good reasons for the reduction to seven, which I cover below, and equally good reasons now it has been tested, to increase the number back to nine.

If successful, this would see the removal/reduction of this rule from the CP CR:

7.1.3.1 The Organizer must provide and assign 4 additional persons to assist the judges during all the competition. All 4 persons must be approved in advance by the CJ, and should have a CP National rating, a FAI non CP rating or good knowledge of the rules.

History:

For a number of consecutive years in CP, the FCE competitions were held in USA or Dubai, requiring greater travel costs for the Judges and Jury and making each event net-negative in cost. They ran at a loss.

The CP Committee together with the Judges Committee proposed a reduction in the number of CP panel FAI Judges from 11 to seven, purely to save costs I believe.

It was thought that with the addition of four “helper Judges” provided by the Organiser that:

1. Helper-Judges could perform menial tasks like blowing the whistle, monitoring the wind meter, posting scores, and
2. This would put costs onto the Organiser and not onto the IPC, and
3. Would be a good cost-saving practice.

The new rule stated the Helper-Judges had to be either a qualified FAI Judge in any discipline, or a CP Judge in the local NAC, and they would therefore have the required expertise and knowledge to be a useful Helper-Judge. This was a good proposal and we all hoped it would work well and that Organisers would contribute with quality Helper-Judges.

However, for the past two years it has been tested, and the rules have been found to be poor, because the Organiser has not the motivation, plus there are other issues.

2017 and 2018 FCEs

At the 2017 World Cup in Dubai, the Organiser provided zero/nil Helper-Judges. The Panel of six FAI Judges plus Chief Judge had to run the competition, along with the lucky addition of two watching Judges and three Trainees to fill all the roles, for a total of 12. There were concerns expressed in his Chief Judge Report by Craig Bennett stating the size of the Panel (total 7) *could not have run this world competition without the addition of the five extra personnel*. Extra stress was added by running the Maximum Distance Event, and Accuracy, both of which stretch judging capacity, as did the absence of a nearby toilet meaning no one could be spared as it took too long to make a visit.

<i>Subject:</i>	Proposal from Australia to CR re Number of Judges	Annex No. -	19.3.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gail Bradley, Australia Delegate	19.3.1	19.3.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	3

At the 2018 World Parachuting Championships in Wroclaw, I have hearsay that Marylou Laughlin also expressed similar thoughts to her Judges.

Observations expressed by others include these negatives:

- The Helper-Judges are not directly reportable to the Chief Judge and do not own the same level of responsibility as the selected FAI Judges
- The Helper-Judges, while supposed to be performing menial tasks, actively participate in live judging and scoring. This is wrong because only FAI Judges should be doing that.
- The rules are not clearly written on what the Helper-Judges can and cannot do.
- The CJ has to approve the Helper-Judges, but they are not usually known to the CJ so how do they know if they fit or their qualities and experience? How can they choose good people?
- It is difficult for the Organiser to select the right people and is usually just a matter of “showing up” to be selected.
- In Poland, the selected Panel Judges were the only ones who could finalise scores and get them published, because scoring is a senior Judge’s task. In some situations, due to the need for Video Reviews and insufficient Judge numbers, scores were not published for up to six hours. This was not consistent with our Olympic push or need for media and spectator-friendly immediate publication of results.
- With the addition of four (4) Helper-Judges, the number on the panel ends up being 11 and why should the Organiser have to pay for these, not the IPC, and supply Judges who are less accountable to the Chief Judge?
- Some of the Helper-Judges in Wroclaw were there because of familial and love relationships, not because they were specifically appointed by the Organiser. They happened to “luck-in” by clever “lurking” which has never been the way to control the quality of our Judges.
- The Organiser has no real motivation to appoint quality Judges. This is the duty of the IPC Judges Committee and Chief Judge.
- The Organiser has still to accommodate and feed the four extra Judges whether they are IPC-appointed or Organiser-appointed, so there is the same cost to the Organiser anyway.

Proposal

I propose we abandon entirely the new rules, removing all reference to Helper-Judges, to give us nine (9) quality, CJ-controlled FAI Judges as our foremost priority. Adding two more FAI Judges back into the Panel takes costs away from the Organiser which is better for them, although it adds travel costs to IPC.

Financial Aspects

There is of course a financial aspect. While this is NOT the point of this paper, people will ask this question and I am well-placed to provide this information, for information and thought-stimulation purposes ONLY. It should not detract from the Proposal above.

<i>Subject:</i>	Proposal from Australia to CR re Number of Judges	Annex No. -	19.3.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gail Bradley, Australia Delegate	19.3.1	19.3.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	3

In Wroclaw, 100 Sanction Fees earned us €9,000 euros. The event ran at a loss of -€731 across the nine officials (6 Judges, 3 Jury) meaning average cost per person is €1,081.

With South Africa then Russia looming, the cost of (new) 11 officials (8 Judges, 3 Jury) will increase due to distance and numbers. We would need to attract 132 competitors at the above rate, to break even, or a 32% increase in competitors. As this is not likely yet, do we raise Sanction Fees 32% for CP only? Make it €130 per head to cover both CP and CP FS perhaps?

This might be an idea we can discuss, but I am reluctant to do so. If we do it for CP, do we also penalise Wingsuit? Or other loss-makers? Alternatively, do we increase Sanction Fees for everyone regardless of their discipline? Show no discrimination? This is a discussion for another place and time, and not the point of this paper. It simply makes the information known.

Instead, we can be focussing our efforts on cultivating our high-profile disciplines such as CP and, if cost is such an issue, using a little cross-subsidisation from other more profitable disciplines for the time being while the bigger question of Sanction Fees is reviewed elsewhere.

Summary

I believe cost is not the primary determination, and geography never must be, nor must the country of origin of our best CP Judges be allowed to dictate the quality of our judging. I believe that cost must not get in the way of timely and accurate results, which are our primary consideration, of course, after safety.

To get our results out quickly and accurately needs more Judges in CP.

If you asked our competitors what was more important, cost or quality scores, they would choose quality results every time. Sanction Fees figure low on their list in terms of their overall training costs which they expend to get the best, most accurate results they can.

Fortunately there is no rule that says every discipline must be profit-positive. We support each other across parachuting as always. Please support this proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Gail Bradley
Delegate - Australia