


70th FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, MOSCOW, RUSSIA, 25 – 26 JANUARY 2020			
Subject:	Chief Judge Report, 3RD FAI WORLD INDOOR SKYDIVING CHAMPIONSHIPS IN ARTISTIC EVENTS	Annex No.	20.1b
Author:	Jami Pillasch, Chief Judge, Artistic Events	Agenda Ref.	20.1b
Date:	20 May 2019	Total pages	6
 CHIEF JUDGE REPORT			
Competition:	3rd FAI World Indoor Skydiving Championship – AE		
Event:	Artistic Events: Solo Freestyle – Open and Junior 2 way Dynamic 4 way Dynamic		
Location:	Lille, France Weembi Skydiving Center		
Date:	April 16-21, 2019		
Panel of Judges	CJ - Jami Pillasch EJ Solo Freestyle Juniors – Ron Miasnikov EJ Solo Freestyle Open - Thi Bich Van Ha Panel Judge Solo Freestyle – Ray Williams, Tamara Koyn, Liz Warner, Bryce Witcher (new) EJ Dynamic - David Petracco Panel Judge Dynamic – Kristian Moxnes Panel Judge Dynamic - Radek Meduna Panel Judge Dynamic – Joel O’Donoghue Panel Judge Dynamic - Marcin Sen		
Scoring Equipment Used:	InTime Everything worked well. But it was discovered that the InTime system couldn’t properly report the jumpoff situation results. The screen showed the correct scores and placement, but when printing was attempted it reverted to scores from Round 7. Thankfully Thierry Courtin, Asst to the CJ, was able to figure out a way to correct this. This glitch was reported to InTime to be corrected.		
Details of the Judges Work: (including judging statistics)	Solo Freestyle: 37 total teams (7 teams more than 2018) Open - 23 teams competed. Junior - 14 teams competed. 7 rounds were judged by two 3 judge panels. Judges were split in 2 panels – one panel judged Juniors and one panel judged Open. Difficulty was assessed prior to competition and many flights were judged during the seminar. There was a jump off in the Open competition to determine the winner. One rejump was granted by the Meet Director. In Round 2 Tamara Koyn was replaced as the judge due to illness and missing the training. Ron Miasnikov judged Round 2 in her place. The AE judges did a wonderful job of scoring and maintaining scores across the Junior and Open categories.		


	<p>Dynamic: 31 total teams (12 more teams than 2018) Dynamic 2 way Open - 22 teams. There was not a Junior competition. Dynamic 4 way Open - 9 teams. There was not a Junior competition.</p> <p>The 5-judge panel did an excellent job of running an efficient competition with the large number of teams. David Petracco is an asset as an EJ and Dynamar user.</p>
<p>Recommendations for Organizers:</p>	<p>Weembi and the Organizers did a great job of running the competition. The quality of the tunnel was appreciated by the competitors and the competition site was comfortable for spectators and judges while judging. The Organizers (Patrice and group) tried to provide for every need. They were receptive to requests prior to the meet, during the meet, and after the meet. Thierry Courtin, Asst to the CJ was instrumental in helping the AE judges.</p> <p>This was my CJ note from last year. I think it needs to be addressed at every meet from now on. I was also informed that the CJ in 2016 stated in the CJ report that it was imperative for the AE judges to have a separate space for training, meeting and relaxing. In 2017 and 2018 there was a separate space. I was told that the CJ needs to request this prior to the Competition.</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>Having a separate space for the AE judges was an issue at this year’s meet. When I arrived I was shown the 3 containers outside. 2 were for the FS judges and the third was for the CJs. There was no space for AE judges. As AE CJ I really had no need of a space as my time was spent in the tunnel watching Freestyle or Dynamic so FS really ended up with all 3 containers.</p> <p>The bar upstairs had been cleared out for the Dynamic and Freestyle Judges to use while judging and a monitor was set up in the bar for inputting scores and video reviews. This system worked, but there was not enough space for chairs for both Dynamic and Freestyle judges, and any spectators could view all discussions. I tried to work something out prior to the competition, but nothing really worked. The Meet director did offer us a table in the Organizers room and did provide us access to the large media room for a few hours for training. We did get 4 hours in the CJ container for training also. The rest of the time we used the CJ’s room in the hotel or one of the rooms in the lobby. The judges made this work, but it wasn’t ideal.</p> <p>It is imperative the AE judges have a space for training. Difficulty scores must be assigned and training time and space for the Free and Compulsory Routines is needed. Since we were only using 3 judges for several years at Indoor Skydiving competitions, we need time to train more judges to be knowledgeable in Indoor Skydiving.</p>

	<p>Judging time: Freestyle is trying to judge live. After the judging took a bit longer for Rounds 1 and 2 I started timing the judging. One panel finished in 2 minutes and the other took 2 minutes 30. This was the average from the start of the Round until it finished. The Meet Director took this into account and adjusted the schedule accordingly. The actual judging time averaged about 30 seconds.</p>
<p>Rules Changes – Proposals:</p>	<p>Some notes from competitor meetings. Most of these are related to Solo Freestyle.</p> <p>Difficulty, videos, routine description sheets: 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 deadline 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. Next year the time has been changed to 72 hours. There still needs to be a process for collecting the videos – perhaps a Dropbox file.</p> <p>It also becomes important for the Routine Description Sheets to be turned in early. Sometimes we only get the Compulsory Order, but receiving the routine description clearly helps with Difficulty scores.</p> <p>Gender separation: This was discussed again as the number of teams increased.</p> <p>New moves/Compulsories: 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. The suggestion was made to film the compulsories and post examples with comments and scores attached. The more judging guidelines there are the clearer the requirements will be for the competitors. An offer was made by Rafa to host a workshop in August to create new compulsories. Great suggestion!</p> <p>Inquiry system: 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. The CJ and EJ did work out Difficulty groups prior to the competition. Then technical advisors (Harvard Flaar and Josh D) came in and worked with the judging panels to create the final scores. The judges find it helpful to meet with the Technical Advisors.</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?? 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. This year we went by the country.</p> <p>Silvia Lacna will be joining the AE committee. This is a positive move as she has experience as a competitor.</p> <p>Music test: Perhaps it should be written in the rules that a music test needs to be given each free round. This is done while the judges are scoring so it doesn't slow up the competition. It is just done to ensure that the correct music is being played for the competitor.</p> <p>Speed Settings: The question of how to implement the 3 minutes speed setting came up at this meet. Should the competitor be given 3 1 minute flights, or 2 1 ½ minute flights or 1 3 minute flight. If this is not defined in the rules it should be explained in the Bulletin. Most Freestyle competitors prefer the 3 1 minute flights as they can then practice a free routine and the 2 compulsory routines. This may be less important as the new rules are allowing tunnel time for each team prior to the competition.</p>
--	--

	<p>AE as a separate World Meet: There was discussion about the possibility of having a separate World Meet just for AE. Of course, this would depend on the number of teams and expenses.</p>
<p>Personal Remarks:</p>	<p>I have several comments, so it is easiest to just bullet them.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is still a need to recruit and train AE Indoor Skydiving Judges. The nominated list included 14 Freestyle Judges and 5 Dynamic judges (one is a crossover). 5 Freestyle judges declined, and the majority of those left were US judges which made it hard to have country diversity. I understand there is a clinic to be held this year that should help increase the number of judges. One Dynamic judge of the 5 nominated declined which only left 4, but I was able to find a rated official and get permission from his country to meet the 5 judged panel. Prior to the Competition a clinic was held in Brussels and there are now 6 new FAI rated Dynamic Judges so this should solve finding strong judges. 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. 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. 4. Being a non-judging CJ gave me time to observe both the Freestyle and Dynamic events. Having 2 panels for Freestyle did help with the efficiency and timing of the judging. I was fortunate that David Petracco was EJ for Dynamic as he runs the Dynamar system which is used by both the Dynamic and Freestyle judging. Bich and Ron worked together well to ensure the scores were comparable for Juniors and Open. The Event Judges did an exceptional job. Since Dynamar was used it enabled the Freestyle judges to see 2 views of the Compulsory Rounds if needed during the review. 5. Timing of the routine has become the role of the judges. With the Dynamar system we are able to time with the lights. A back up timing is also performed by a judge or assistant. Without the Dynamar system it might require 2 timers for efficiency. Having Dynamar is an asset for both Freestyle and Dynamic. 6. Impressively both Freestyle and Dynamic were judged live. Reviews in Dynamic were handled as quickly as possible. Reviews in Freestyle were used only for the Compulsory Rounds. It would be helpful if extra time was allowed following the Compulsory Rounds so the scores can be posted prior to the next round. 7. I would also like to personally thank Patrice, Thomas, Sarka (she was so efficient in tracking records) Elisabet and Thierry for their endless help and patience. The competition was successful due to their tireless efforts.

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

Name:	Jami Pillasch
Signature:	
Date:	05/20/2019