

AGENDA ITEM 6.3

REPORT OF THE CHIEF JUDGE

XXIV. WORLD AEROBATIC CHAMPIONSHIPS

Granada, Spain

24 June – 4 July 2007

John Gaillard



The Board of Judges consisted of the following:

Gaillard, John	-	Chief Judge
Hill, Graham	-	Assistant Chief Judge
Bowley, Jenny	-	Chief judges workstation assistant
Weaver, Fred	-	Line Judge Coordinator

Judges

Alvarez, Luis	-	Spain
Bajzik, Stanislav	-	Czech
Brochard, Georges	-	Switzerland
Drokina, Valentina	-	Russia
Dungan, Greg	-	USA
Graf, Hannes	-	Germany
Hawthorne, Quintin	-	South Africa
Itier, Francis	-	France

Judges Briefing

A questionnaire was issued at the judging briefing and all the questions were thoroughly discussed, during the briefing, no problems arose from this exercise.

During the course of the briefing the Contest Director asked that the judges approve an extension of the aerobatic performance zone to take into account the density altitude of the airfield, this was referred to the International Jury, which was apparently taken as approval by the Board of Judges, which of course was not the case.

Line Judging

Line Judging had been an issue before the contest, where the organisers had proposed that no line judges be utilised and CIVA had insisted that they be present. What was apparent from



the outset was that no proper preparation had taken place for line judges, which resulted in no proper paper work having been prepared by the organisers and no proper sighting devices having been set up in the appropriate places.

It was decided that normal CIVA procedures would be put in place with regards to two different radio frequencies on diagonals thus requiring confirmation of line outs, these to be called in to the Chief Judges workstation in real time, thus allowing calls to be validated by the Chief Judge. However in practise due to radio communication problems, this system frequently broke down, a language problem was also a factor, as a result each flight was confirmed after the flight using Nuria Quintana as an intermediary she was effective in this role. A problem in the Q Programme soon emerged as line judges were reporting difficulties in ascertaining outs as they only had two small flags as equipment, making the task almost impossible in marginal cases. Subsequently the International Jury scrapped the line out penalties for the Q Programme, by the end of which more appropriate devices were employed.

Line judging remained an ongoing problem throughout the contest and although I am confident that the calls as transmitted to the Chief Judge's workstation and noted ultimately by Weaver were correctly noted, the same confidence does not apply to the line calls per se. On numerous occasions an out call was not confirmed by the alternate line judge and could therefore not be submitted as a penalty. The problem with line judging was brought to the International Jury's attention at least twice and possibly more during the course of the contest.

At the very end of the contest, I was approached by Robert Chomono, who was now acting as head of the Jury in the absence of Mike Heuer, as he had received two protests from the British Team about out calls which they claimed were impossible. On investigating, I agreed with them as the out calls were for the very first figure which I could recall being placed centrally for both pilots, clearly something was terribly amiss and I recommended to Robert that he uphold the protests.

CIVA needs to address the line judge issue as a matter of urgency, until a form of electronic or other device is available and given that the employment of neutral international line judges is not really feasible, I believe to have untrained local line judges leads to more problems than it is worth, reference to the distribution of line out calls in Spain may well tell a story, one team it would appear was far more successful in flying in the performance zone than all the others!

Recommendation

That if no electronic method or neutral International Judges are available, Line Judges should not be utilized.



Judging Performance

Once again JPIs were not available at the end of this contest due to errors in the system, this situation needs also to be addressed as a matter of urgency, especially as a system already exists where the required information can readily be produced.

Judging performance therefore had to be assessed manually by extracting information from the scoring system, this however did show some clear trends.

It would appear that we had a mixture of very competent judges, some incompetent judges and some that were trying to influence the system to their own countryman's favour, this last group may or may not be competent in other respects of their judging.

Although not reduced to a JPI it is possible to highlight some of the CIVA indexes, which go into creating a JPI and total sequence anomalies where a judges score has been thrown out in its entirety either high or low. As it is not my intention to embarrass individuals, I will not identify judges by name but rather by a letter, three judges appear to be very competent having ten or less total sequence anomalies and importantly having no pattern to these anomalies i.e. they were at random, as below

Judge D had 6 anomalies and 0 for his own countrymen

Judge F had 8 anomalies with no pattern and had no countrymen flying

Judge B had 10 anomalies with no pattern and 1 high for his own pilots

In this group Judge H is fairly random, Judge C is definitely showing bias, Judge E again is defiantly showing bias, Judge A is showing less bias, but is all over the place with his scoring, Judge G simply appears to be attempting to manipulate the results.

Judge H had 13 anomalies including 3 high for their own countrymen

Judge C had 13 anomalies including 7 high for their own countryman

Judge E had 18 anomalies including 7 high for their own countrymen

Judge A had 19 anomalies including 3 high for their own countrymen

Judge G had 20 anomalies including 8 high for their own countrymen

And 5 low for their countrymen's main opposition

In the later group there is one Judge A who I believe is simply incompetent, I had cause in the last unknown flight to call a conference, not to establish any particular fact, but to try and make this judge understand that he was giving an 8,5 to a figure where other judges were giving soft zeros and very low scores, he simply is not seeing the errors and scores within a narrow band, once the JPI gets produced for this contest it is unlikely he will be selected again. However what is perhaps more worrying is judges C, E and G who appear to be favouring their own pilots, this cannot continue to be coincidence. Judge G is simply playing games and will surely have a seriously low JPI when it is produced, we do not need this kind of behaviour on a judging line.



One Judge E was giving a massive amount of soft zeros which resulted in multiple errors which would have appeared on FPS totals had it been published, as a comparison Judge D (who came out on top of total sequence anomalies list) i.e. good judging had 20 errors, whilst Judge E had 115 errors.

Recommendation

That CIVA must ensure that accurate JPI figures are available at each contest; utilising alternate software if such is available to ensure such figures are issued.

Closing Ceremony

It is normal procedure at the closing ceremony to present trophies and certificates to the winners in their various categories and to thank officials and judges for their participation in the event. Unfortunately in this championship the thanking of officials was woefully inadequate, about 50% of the judges were thanked and given tokens of appreciation, but others were omitted including myself as Chief Judge and I believe the Contest Scoring Director. This may have been an administrative omission but perhaps indicates the level of competence of the organisation, which was experienced throughout the contest.

Again the morale of those giving nearly two weeks of their time and money and not even being thanked for their efforts is really adversely affected.

Recommendation

That CIVA task the Royal Aero Club of Spain to make amends to those Judges and Officials not thanked in the appropriate manner, by issuing an apology to those concerned and ensuring that the mementoes issued to some officials be retrospectively issued to all officials as appropriate.