

**75<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 1-2 FEBRUARY 2025, ROME. ITALY**

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Chief Judge's Report – World Championships of CF, Prostejov	<b>AGENDA #</b>	15.2
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Natasha Higman, Chief Judge		
<b>DATE:</b>	10 September 2024	<b>PAGES:</b>	Page 1 of 3



## CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

<b>Competition:</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> World Canopy Formation Championships
<b>Event:</b>	2-way Sequential 4-way Sequential 4-way Rotations
<b>Location:</b>	Prostejov, Czech Republic
<b>Date:</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> - 7 <sup>th</sup> September 2024
<b>Panel of Judges:</b>	CJ: Natasha Higman EJ 2-way: Jenni Plumridge EJ 4-way Rotations: Agnieszka Sobczynska EJ 4-way Sequential: Patrice Moyeuve Panel Judges: Tanya Murnock, Randy Connell, Gary Taylor
<b>Scoring Equipment Used:</b>	InTime
<b>Details of the Judges Work:</b> <i>(including judging statistics)</i>	There were no re-jumps or jump-offs. The total number of competition jumps judged were: 96 jumps 2-way Sequential 56 jumps 4-way Sequential 32 jumps 4-way Rotations  The team included three judges who had not previously judged CF at FCEs. Their performance was equivalent to that of those with FCE experience.  I gave individual feedback to all EJs 1:1.  The team of EJs and I gave individual feedback to the panel judges.  I would be happy to judge with any of the team again at future events.
<b>Recommendations for Organisers:</b>	The <b>room</b> had been set up for a panel of 3 judges. On my arrival and reminder of the panel size per the rules, the set-up was extended to enable the full 5-judge panel to work. However, the room was very small, possibly because during the set-up fewer judges were expected. The lighting was also not good, from the Event Judge's desk it was not possible to properly view the footage due to glare. The EJs therefore needed to stand behind a panel judge to properly view the footage.  The room opposite the one used for the judges, allocated to the Jury and FAI Controller, had better lighting as it had blinds rather than curtains. They also allowed for better temperature management in the room. Jury work is important, however less certain than that of the judges. If there are no protests and few records, the jury has no work.

**75<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 1-2 FEBRUARY 2025, ROME. ITALY**

<i>SUBJECT:</i>	Chief Judge's Report – World Championships of CF, Prostejov	<i>AGENDA #</i>	15.2
<i>AUTHOR:</i>	Natasha Hlgman, Chief Judge		
<i>DATE:</i>	10 September 2024	<i>PAGES:</i>	Page 2 of 3

	<p>The judges will however always have work. Their comfort and space for them to work should take priority. My takeaway from this experience is to be more insistent that the judges move to the room best suited before the competition starts.</p> <p>There was <b>no dedicated on-site support</b> for the InTime scoring system. Remote support had been provided to the organiser in advance of the competition, and the organiser provided a video controller who was able to assist teams with the submission of their footage. The video controller was competent at the tasks required of them per the rules. In practice in the past, the video controller at competitions has often also been trained in providing on-site system support. This was a coincidence rather than a requirement.</p> <p>Unfortunately, some of the initial preparation actions required for the system had not been taken on all the computers (disabling firewalls, anti-virus, and background synchronisation tasks). This meant that the system initially was very slow, preventing a reasonable turnaround time for scores to the teams (2 hrs to convert 12 jumps). All the computers being used were also usual working computers on the dropzone. This meant that most had insufficient disk space to handle the number of very large video files which the CF rules require. Furthermore, there was no spare computer available. Although we did swap a computer for the dubbing task, it had been in use for Style and the computer we stopped using for CF was then used by the Style judging team.</p> <p>Between me and two of the EJs (Aggie and Jenni) we had some scoring system technical knowledge. Together with the IT support person at the dropzone we were able to troubleshoot and resolve some of the issues, having obtained remote support from Dirk Ventner. On the first competition day 6 hours of judging time was lost, on the second a further 2 hours were lost when the networking of the computers failed. On the third day we were still using some workarounds to manage disk space, however, decided that was preferable to possibly de-stabilising the system. We were also aware that Dirk was not available even remotely that day as he was travelling to the US.</p> <p>I suspect that if an InTime support specialist had been on site, some of the problems we encountered would have been anticipated and prevented. In any case, it would have reduced the reliance on existing knowledge within the judging team of the scoring system to resolve the issues encountered. The situation meant that Aggie, Jenni and I had no effective breaks, as we were either fixing the IT system or judging. The competitors were very understanding of the situation and fully understood that on the first two days, we did not judge their last round in the evening, but deferred it to the next morning. I am thankful for their consideration of the situation we were in.</p> <p>I recommend that organisers are required to have <b>on-site scoring system support</b> available when hosting Canopy FCEs.</p>
--	--

**75<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 1-2 FEBRUARY 2025, ROME. ITALY**

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Chief Judge's Report – World Championships of CF, Prostejov	<b>AGENDA #</b>	15.2
<b>AUTHOR:</b>	Natasha Higman, Chief Judge		
<b>DATE:</b>	10 September 2024	<b>PAGES:</b>	Page <b>3</b> of <b>3</b>

<b>Rule Changes – Proposals:</b>	<p>These suggestions come from the judging team. During the Competitors' Meeting, further ideas from the competitors were discussed. These will be reported to the CF Committee directly.</p> <p><b>S5</b></p> <p>This was the first competition since removing the slate requirement. The judging team considered how we would identify different teams if footage was accidentally loaded into the incorrect slot. This is particularly pertinent when a NAC enters 2 teams. Merely being able to identify the NAC would not be sufficient.</p> <p>The organiser had provided slates rather than stickers with team numbers. We therefore decided to proceed as had been done in the past with slates being shown. This resulted in longer videos, which exacerbated the problem with the slow computers.</p> <p>Maybe the rules should provide organisers with alternatives from which they can choose to identify if not using slates.</p> <p><b>CF rules</b></p> <p>Since the introduction of the requirement for videographers to keep track of their teammates on the full descent, there have been no further accusations of teams practising subsequent rounds after the end of working time. Especially with the requirement for 50fps, a 10-minute video is very large and takes up a lot of disk space. The Committee may want to consider whether this rule should remain.</p> <p>It is unclear whether a stack/plane formation is acceptable during an Inter in 4-way sequential. The judges' team suggests clarification, one way or the other. This may become unnecessary if the Rotations event is removed and the stack/plane definition is removed with it.</p>
<b>Personal Remarks:</b>	<p>The IT system issues made this a very exhausting competition for the whole judging team. Fortunately, the judging itself and the interaction with the competitors and organiser was very positive and overall it was enjoyable.</p>
<p>In accordance with the Sporting Code Section 5, 6.7.1(5) this form is to be completed and sent to the Chair of the Judge's Committee and the ISC Recording Secretary within 30 days of the competition's completion.</p>	

<b>Name:</b>	Natasha Higman
<b>Signature:</b>	
<b>Date:</b>	10 September 2024