

AGENDA ITEM 15.2

REPORT OF THE JUDGING SUB-COMMITTEE

John Gaillard, Chairman



Judge selection 2012

The selection process was the same as in recent years as follows:

1. Judges with an average ranking over the past three seasons of 5 or less are invited to indicate which contests they are available to participate in. Multiple contests may be applied for; this process ensures that the core of each judging line consists of experienced judges with a proven record.
2. When stage 1 is completed the balance of judges with RI data and then invited to indicate their availability and CIVA Delegates are also asked to nominate additional judges provided they are already on the International Judges list, which is updated at every CIVA meeting.
3. Any new applications without International RI data are asked to motivate their applications, preferably with data from a National Championship where the FPS system is utilised.

This process resulted in full judging lines being fielded at every contest held this year as follows:

YAKWAC - Russia

Maxen	-	Denmark	
Gedminaite	-	Lithuania	
Marengo	-	Italy	
Razhin	-	Russia	
Ponizil	-	Czech	- 1 st time as an International Judge
Zelenina	-	Ukraine	
Rudd	-	USA	- 1st time as an International Judge

<u>WAAC</u>	-	<u>Hungary</u>	
Gallaway	-	USA	
Zumaglini	-	France	

Auger	-	France
Gedminaite	-	Lithuania
Talabos	-	Hungary
Bartholdi	-	Finland
Virtanen	-	Finland
Razhin	-	Russia
Buckenham	-	UK
Hawthorne	-	RSA

EAC - Slovakia

Auger	-	France	
Liszkay	-	RSA	- 1 st time as an International Judge at Unlimited
Bezdenzhnyh	-	Russia	
Itier	-	France	
Brocard	-	Swiss	
Kotelnikov	-	Russia	
Bajzik	-	Czech	
Borowik	-	Germany	
Marengo	-	Italy	
Forney	-	USA	- 1 st time as an International Judge

WAGAC & WGAC - Slovakia

Hau	-	Germany	
Dovgalenko	-	Ukraine	- 1 st time as an International Judge for gliding
Pimenov	-	Russia	
Ponizil	-	Czech	- 1 st time as an International Judge
Bialek	-	Poland	- 1 st time as an International Judge for gliding
Dugas	-	France	
Louvel	-	France	
Kaiser	-	Germany	- 1 st time as an International Judge
Gawecki	-	Poland	
Kanao	-	Japan	- 1 st time as an International Judge

Comment

Out of the thirty-two judges that officiated at our championships this year, nine or 28% were serving for the first time at an International Contest or for the first time in the specific category, this clearly indicates that “new blood” is being introduced into the judging lines, whilst the majority were populated by proven and experienced judges.

These new judges met with mixed fortunes as far as their RI & ranking, in gliding three of the new judges finished ranked in the top five, making their invitation for next year

assured, in power only one of the four qualified for an automatic invitation at stage 1 of the selection process next year.

It can be stated I think without fear of contradiction, that the judge selection process has evolved quite successfully in the past decade or so and we now have the opportunity of fielding full judging lines, whilst still creating new openings for new judges.

Going back to the 1990s there was no pre-selection of judges at all, the organisers simply waited to see who would turn up. At Le Havre where there were more judges than the required ten maximum, judges drew lots to see who would be selected.

Two contests later at Oklahoma, which was the first time I was appointed Chief Judge at a WAC, fifteen judges arrived on site, many without any assistants at all who then started recruiting from the IAC volunteers available. At the three contests I had attended as a Judge, I had noticed what I considered to be a large difference in the quality of judges. In those days any difference in the score of zero (HZ was a long way from being invented) was simply resolved by conferencing by the Chief Judge and those judges in the minority simply changed their scores to an average or reserve mark. It became obvious that some judges consistently missed fairly obvious zeros. I decided to try and establish just how many of the judges who had offered their services were really competent, this was achieved by briefing one of the USA reserve pilots to fly the Known Compulsory with deliberate error (today an HZ) out of the sequence of fourteen figures, ten were to be flown with errors making the figure a zero, such as 1 ¼ roll instead of a ¾, a push humpty instead of a pull etc. However in all cases the figures ended in the right direction and maintained the basic shape. When the sequence was completed a de-briefing was held in a hangar with a full video review, the results were startling only two judges of the fifteen had identified all ten zeroes. There were two judges who had not identified any of the zeroes. This was in effect the start of a more logical manner in the judge selection process.

Sixteen years later, we pre-select all judges on the basis of performance, we also pay our judges travel expenses and we have come to expect judges to be absolutely competent. Our systems have also evolved with ACRO and FPS, we now having meaningful data that judges can use to improve their performance and identify problems.

There is still criticism of the RI system for ranking judges. Some say that judges are more interested in their RI and change their judging style accordingly. This really does not stand up to close examination. In order to get a good RI a judge has to get as close as possible to the final result in terms of the ranking, therefore scoring in a very narrow band for example will not really achieve this. I was pleased to see at WAAC that a judge who was being highly critical (as required in our regulations) achieved the best RI for the contest.

Systems can always be improved and are constantly being developed, but if we look right now at the situation we are in compared with what we were doing in the past, it is a vast improvement.

There are proposals on the table at CIVA to do away with the system of grouping the pilots after the Q Programme, I believe that inevitably some judges are influenced and one judge has come right out and said so, for this reason I support the move to go back to random flight order.

Judges Travel Allowance

Earlier on in the year a clear statement was issued to all judges concerning CIVA Travel Allowance Policy, it would appear that this has not been adhered to by everyone and this is now causing a problem, especially from those who have elected to drive to competitions and submitted claims far in excess of the lowest airfares for the same route.

This situation needs to be resolved before the next season commences.

As we now select judges early in the year, there is no reason why good prices for obtaining an early ticket cannot be obtained and the required refund made long before the contest takes place. The practice of handing in travel expense claims at the contest should be discouraged.

Judge Performance Data averaged over the past three years

Attached are the judging statistics over the past three years, these will be used in the judge selection process for the coming season.

CIVA Judging Sub-Committee RI Statistics 2010-2012

Judge	Country	Average	2012 WAAC	2012 RI	2012 EAC	2012 RI	2011 WAC	2011 RI	2011 EAAC	2011 RI	2010 WAAC	2010 RI	2010 EAC	2010 RI
Auger	FRA	1.67	3	13.76	1	11.03			1	8.42				
Zumaglini	FRA	2.00	2	13.60										
Liszkay	RSA	2.00			2	13.18								
Bezdenezhnyh	RUS	2.67			3	14.09	1	9.75					4	7.26
Kotelnikov	RUS	3.25			7	15.03	2	10.45			1	11.42	3	6.15
Itier	FRA	3.33			4	14.66	4	11.65					2	5.67
Gedminaite	LIT	4.25	4	15.43			5	11.76	2	9.80	6	15.65		
Zelenina	UKR	4.25					6	11.95	5	13.90	5	14.27	1	5.41
Virtanen	FIN	4.33	7	17.24					3	10.71	3	12.49		
Bartholdi	FIN	4.50	6	16.01			3	11.20						
Gallaway	USA	4.50	1	10.66			8	14.77						
Brochard	SUI	5.00			5	15.00							5	6.63
Courtois	FRA	5.50							7	14.67	4	12.55		
Razhin	RUS	6.00	8	17.71					4	12.37				
Bialek	POL	6.00							10	22.82	2	12.12		
Orlickas	LIT	6.00							6	14.49			6	10.3
Talabos	HUN	6.75	5	15.99			7	13.24	8	15.84			7	11.7
Maxen	DEN	7.00									7	15.74		
Bajzik	CZE	7.00			7	16.18								
Borowik	GER	8.50			8	16.37					9	18.08		
Buckenham	GBR	9.00	9	20.71										
Gaillard	RSA	9.00					9	20.13						
Hawthorne	RSA	9.00	10	21.60							8	17.79		
Kuechler	SWI	9.00							9	20.51				
Marengo	ITA	9.50			9	21.25	10	23.67						
Adams	USA	10.00									10	27.32		
Forney	USA	10.00			10	25.34								
		Ranking	Hungary	WAAC	Slovakia	EAC	Italy	WAC	Slovakia	EAAC	Poland	WAAC	Czech	EAC

YAK52 Contests				
Judge	Country	Average	Russia	2012
		Ranking		RI
Maxen	DEN	1	1	7.45
Gedminaite	LTU	2	2	8.06
Marengo	ITA	3	3	9.86
Razhin	RUS	4	4	10.35
Ponizil	CZE	5	5	11.06
Zelenina	UKR	6	6	17.16
Rudd	USA	7	7	30.61

Gliders														
Judge	Country	Average	WAGAC	2012	WGAC	2012	WGAC	2011	WAGAC	2011	EGAC	2010	WGAC	2010
		Ranking	Slovakia	RI	Slovakia	RI	Poland	RI	Poland	RI	Finland	RI	Finland	RI
Bajzik	CZE	2.00					1	6.75	1	9.77	3	12.60	3	9.84
Hau	GER	2.00	1	10.04	1	10.36	4	13.10	2	15.81	2	11.40	2	9.56
Iambert	AUT	3.00					2	12.39	5	18.27	4	13.51	1	9.19
Ponizil	CZE	3.00	4	11.73	2	11.01								
Bartholdi	FIN	3.50									1	10.29	6	14.10
Courtois	FRA	4.00					5	13.41	3	16.13				
Dovgalenko	UKR	4.00	2	10.61	6	15.00								
Pimenov	RUS	4.00	3	11.47	5	13.77								
Bialek	POL	4.00	5	14.26	3	12.04								
Dugas	FRA	4.75	6	14.44	4	12.64	3	12.53	6	20.33				
Arvidsson	SWE	5.00									6	15.68	4	12.93
Gaillard	RSA	6.00									5	14.58	7	16.35
Kaftan	CZE	6.00					8	19.99	4	16.32				
Buckenham	GBR	6.50									8	17.50	5	13.41
Maxen	DEN	7.00					7	16.30	7	23.54				
Louvel	FRA	7.50	7	17.23	8	17.36					7	16.31	8	17.99
Kaiser	GER	8.00	9	17.48	7	16.72								
Gawecki	POL	8.50	10	19.49	10	25.22	6	13.58	8	26.62				
Kanao	JPN	8.50	8	17.41	9	18.31								