

<i>Subject:</i>	<b>JUDGES' WORK IN ACCURACY LANDING COMPETITIONS</b>	<i>Annex No. -</i>	<b>29</b>
<i>Author:</i>	<b>Jiří Blaška, IPC Delegate, Czech Republic</b>	<i>Agenda ref. -</i>	<b>13.2.3</b>
<i>Date:</i>	<b>02 December 2014</b>	<i>Page -</i>	<b>1 of 3</b>

## **Agenda item for IPC Plenary meeting 2015**

### **The Czech Republic**

#### **Topic: Judges' work II.**

I, Jiri Blaska as a parachutist, as a participant in the World Championship who the sanction fee was paid for (although it is not literally stated in the rules, I believe that I would defend that the person who a sanction fee has been paid for has the right to file a protest through Head of Delegation), as Head of Delegation and Coach of Denmark, but mainly as a long-time member of Style and Accuracy IPC Committee, filed a protest on the work that the judges had shown during their judging of a sporting performance in the accuracy landing. No one was listening to any other arguments.

I would like to say first that this protest was not filed in favor of one or several athletes against some other ones. If this happened, I am very sorry about that, the same as I feel sorry about the athletes having suffered for judges' mistakes (as one French athlete told me rightfully). My best charge, Danish sportswoman Pernille Lykke, suffered for my protest, as she had a real chance of winning a medal, yet my protest spoilt her first jump.

I believe that if JURY had reacted to the conditions and way of judging the sporting performances of athletes already in the official training, if they had not waited until the official protest was filed, if they had followed the valid rules, the sportsmen would not have suffered for the situation, and the judges would have performed their work in accordance with the rules from the first competition jump.

I must say that I filed the protest only after exhausting all the other options to achieve the compliance with Article 6.1.1.1 that would correspond with the way the author of the article himself imagines its implementation. I filed the protest with the consent of another two members of Style and Accuracy IPC Committee who were present at the World Championship, and also being aware of the fact that I had dealt with a similar situation before the First Category Event in 2013 where another long-time member of Style and Accuracy Committee, Igor Tiorlo, had agreed with my request for the implementation of Article 6.1.1.1 by judges in practice as well. Above all, I filed that protest after a clear expression of consent by loud applause from the majority of participants in the meeting of heads of delegation and team captains before the competition. The judges present and

<i>Subject:</i>	<b>JUDGES' WORK IN ACCURACY LANDING COMPETITIONS</b>	<i>Annex No. -</i>	<b>29</b>
<i>Author:</i>	<b>Jiří Blaška, IPC Delegate, Czech Republic</b>	<i>Agenda ref. -</i>	<b>13.2.3</b>
<i>Date:</i>	<b>02 December 2014</b>	<i>Page -</i>	<b>2 of 3</b>

headed by Event Judge completely ignored this opinion expressed by experts. They did not comment on the situation and did not absolutely take into account my warning that if the judges did not indicate and determine by simple majority each landing of a sportsman, I would write a protest after the first jump. I consider especially the judges' disregard for the general opinion of most participants, the heads of delegation and team captains rather unsporting and noncollegial.

In my opinion, judges have two main tasks:

- 1) Ensure that sporting performances of all athletes were made in regular conditions, i.e. in those which cannot affect the quality of performance in a negative way.
- 2) Rate the sporting performance, assign it the value (points, time, centimeters), and according to this value rank the performances from best to worst.

In my opinion, the correct implementation of Article 6.1.1.1 is related to these two main tasks of judges. This can be documented by many examples from my experience. The rule says that "three judges at or near the target will indicate and determine by simple majority if the first point of landing is on the AMD". There is not written that three judges will indicate and determine if the landing was out of the AMD and will NOT indicate and NOT determine if the landing was on the AMD. Can someone explain to me what the difference for spectators and competitors is between when judges are not indicating and not determining the landing on the AMD and when they are not doing anything or showing lack of concentration? Now I understand that judges, who actually do not have to indicate and determine anything, need no camera recording in order to make decisions.

Nowhere is it written that one of these three judges is the speaker and the two remaining are "butterflies", as Event Judge at the World Championship titled them and accordingly assign them tasks that are nowhere described in the Sporting Code. In order for someone to read immediately after the landing a number on the screen without a clear and visible "indicate and determine by simple majority..." procedure, as it is required by the rules, and in order for someone to only adjust AMD after the landing of a team, we do not have to buy for sanction fee such flights as those from China, Australia and Sweden (these judges were at the landing area when I brought to their attention that they were not working in accordance with the rules). For the prompt reading of numbers from the display and the adjustment of AMD on the landing area we can hire some helpful volunteers from neighbourhood for a few euro, and consequently we can consider lowering the sanction fee for participants in the competition. IPC from economic reasons cannot afford the rule: "No judge, no team." We pay judges costs ourselves.

<b>Subject:</b>	<b>JUDGES' WORK IN ACCURACY LANDING COMPETITIONS</b>	<b>Annex No. -</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Jiří Blaška, IPC Delegate, Czech Republic</b>	<b>Agenda ref. -</b>	<b>13.2.3</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>02 December 2014</b>	<b>Page -</b>	<b>3 of 3</b>

Can someone, besides John Hitchen, explain to me, why in 2001 and 2002 the content of the rule 6.1.1.1 was changed just by addition of the English words “indicate and determinate by simple majority if the first point of landing is on the AMD”? Before these changes, my opponents could be right (even if it is a violation of the general rules of fair play), but making these changes had its meaning, so please respect their author's view as I respect him. In addition, judges' clear indication is in the spirit of fair play and this is the main reason for my effort to achieve the clearly visible judging process. The meaning of the English words “indicate” and “determine” was explained to me during the process of their addition to the rules in Lausanne in 2002 by the Englishmen Roger Flynn and John Hitchen with English monolingual dictionary, so why not believe them?

Judges should not facilitate their work and they can make an interpretation of the rules only with the agreement of their authors, and that is an expert committee – in this case, Style and Accuracy Committee. This rule has been written and is constantly being edited by the Committee under the leadership of John Hitchen and it would be polite to ask all the committee members who once created the wording of that article for sporting rules and have edited it twice since then for its explanation and interpretation. I do not understand why this should be done for us by someone else? Then we can dissolve the expert committee and cancel the system of creating and approving the rules. The rules will be written by one expert as he likes, the others will be commanded to observe them and their implementation will be determined by the very people who are to observe them.

If anyone has a problem with Article 6.1.1.1 after its edition in 2002 and wants to change it, there is nothing easier than to do so. Via IPC delegate, he or she can submit a proposal for a new version. In IPC we have a democratic procedure of approving changes in the rules. For instance: “If the screen displays the number 0 to 16, one judge will read and shout it for the scorer and two judges will adjust AMD after the jump of a team, and besides these, they do not have to do anything, because everything else is determined by the electronic system”. I would understand this and would not have any reasons for filing a protest.

I humbly ask for a discussion on the situation associated with the protest at the World Championship in Banja Luka at the open meeting and at the meeting of Style and Accuracy Committee.

Jiri Blaska – IPC delegate for the Czech Republic