

## Annex 4

### Chief Judge's Report 6<sup>th</sup> World Games - Akita, Japan

This report is filed in accordance with SC 5 - 6.9.1 (11).

The work of the judges at this meet was, by any stretch of the imagination, unusual. Six judges were asked to officiate the three different disciplines, involving cross-qualification on the part of most. Although this did not place undue hardship on the judges it may have put some strain on resources when changing from one event to another. In effect, running three events, usually from the same aircraft load, tended to slow the judging process somewhat. Changing from the accuracy landing area to the inside judging room took little time but when changing between formation skydiving and freestyle there usually was a time lag of several minutes. As there was only one scoring processor on site this should have been taken into account in order to allow for changes in computer programs and judging teams. Also, better communication between the outside commentary and the judging area would have been helpful in more seamless scheduling. The judges remained flexible throughout the competition in order to assist the organizers and other meet staff with what was to be presented next on the program—patiently waiting for instructions to be relayed.

This competition was unusual in that, for the FS event, three judges were assigned to the panel and only two viewings were possible. This procedure seemed to work fairly well with only a limited number of jumps that may have possibly had different assessments if a third play were available. Three judges were also used for the Freestyle Skydiving event.

The judges were able to conform to FS CR 5.1 for less than 15% of the skydives. This was mainly due to additional time required for introductions and interviews of the competitors in front of the giant screen—for spectator appeal, and line-ups at the single dubbing station by videographers from both freefall events. CR 5.2 was applied during FS judging.

The accuracy-landing event suffered few hold-ups other than those that were weather related—the offshoot of an approaching typhoon. Directional changes in the wind created conditions that were seen as preventing some competitors from making a reasonable approach on the target. A number of re-jumps were issued in accordance with CR 6.1.2.4 & 6.1.2.5.

The “match” system which came into play after six qualifying rounds seemed to generate some spectator appeal but was too complicated to allow most to understand what was going on. Competitors, Meet Management and most others did not have a grasp of how the system worked. The very nature of the “match” system had some competitors making nine jumps on the final day of competition.

The equipment used during the freefall events was adequate. One “Omniskore” scoring processor, a VCR and three monitors were supplied for use by the judges. In addition, a fourth monitor was used at the EJ station. The fact that only one processor was used caused some delays when switching from one event to the other. Although changing to the different programs is a fairly simple operation, changing the panel of judges at the same time does lead to some extended time lags.

Use of a “giant” outdoor video screen was quite effective in entertaining the public during those times when there was a lull in competitive action. Replays of the earlier competitive dives and previous competitions were used during those lulls.

The accuracy event was completed with adequate, though minimum, equipment. A single 3cm Automatic Measuring Device was used for the complete competition, without any malfunctions. The 1.2 metre underlying pad described in the rules was not supplied. The target was as prescribed by the rules and a recording anemometer was in place.

The aircraft used for all disciplines was the Chinook 47J helicopter. This is a fine skydiving aircraft—easily accommodating a large number of jumpers on each flight. The ease of sending competitors from all three disciplines on each load may have contributed to some of the time-based difficulties during public presentation.

The organization of this competition was outstanding. Regular meetings of organizational staff kept the schedule running like a fine-tuned watch. Food, accommodation, and transportation were well planned and went off without a hitch. For future events of this nature, I would recommend that:

- Competitors should be made aware, before the competition, that they may be asked to participate in non-competitive skydives for spectator appeal, during the competition. This should be reflected in the rules. In some cases, these non-competitive jumps tended to deter competitors from remaining focused on the competitive events.
- If a seamless transition from one event to another is desired, there should be two scoring processors available for use by the judges.
- There should be an effective means of communication between the public commentator and the judging area.

Barry McAuley  
Chief Judge