

## AGENDA ITEM 9.4

### CIVA JUDGING SUB-COMMITTEE REPORT

**John Gaillard, Chairman**



#### 1. Judge Selection Procedure

This year the revised procedure of inviting judges on the basis of their previous judging statistics was used for the selection of the seven CIVA Approved Judges.

This process proved to be quite problematical, with the process taking a lot longer than anticipated, this was mainly due to two reasons: -

- a) Incorrect e-mail addresses being used to contact judges, this mainly being due to judges failing to advise of revised data.
- b) Aero Clubs either not being aware of the new procedure of Judges being invited on an individual basis rather than on a national basis, this causing additional nominations to be received other than those invited to participate.

Regardless of the above lists were finally established for all three contests to be held in 2010 and these were sent out to all concerned, namely CIVA Delegates and Judging Sub-Committee for approval, before proceeding to the next stage of filling the final three places on each judging line by CIVA Invited Judges (those judges either unsuccessful in round 1 of the procedure or judges without established CIVA international data.

After the completion of the second round of the selection process, it appeared we would have the opportunity of having complete judging lines at all three contests, this however was not to be the case and only in one contest was a full complement of judges in place, reasons for this situation are given below in contest order: -

#### Finland - Advanced and Unlimited Glider

The Russian Judge Pimenov simply failed to appear on site, no explanation has ever been forthcoming. The Polish Aero Club announced before the contest that the judge and assistant were not in a position to pay entry fees as CIVA invited judges and the Polish Aero Club could not assist.



### Poland – WAAC

Ten judges present, however all entry fees were paid by the Polish Organisers, which together with the CIVA Bureau decision to pay travel expenses to all judges regardless of whether CIVA appointed or invited, meant that there was no financial implications for the CIVA invited Judges.

### Czech Republic – European Unlimited

At this contest ten judges were allocated at one point, but the organisers were not in a position to absorb the entry fees for the invited judges, this led to an appeal to the CIVA President from Ukraine for assistance, which could not be accommodated. In addition one of the CIVA selected judges dropped out at short notice, due to circumstances beyond CIVA's control.

A third Judge from Spain was prevented from attending as a CIVA invited Judge, due to some difficulties within Spain, which also led to no Spanish Team entry either, the Spanish pilots who participated in the contest being individuals flying H/C. This left all this led to only seven judges participating.

### Conclusion

Despite the difficulties experienced this year, there is no reason not to continue with the same procedure for the coming year, the data base should now be improved for the judges, however CIVA needs to address the situation with regards to Judges entry fees and travel expenses and a clear policy established to avoid similar complications for the coming year.

## **2. Policy on Judges entry fees & travel expenses**

### Background

Reference to previous CIVA meetings where discussions have arisen over the ever increasing entry fees for competitors, have established that a policy of requiring contest organisers to pay for only the seven CIVA Judges was established, with the three additional CIVA invited Judges being required to pay an entry fee, this was clearly established and agreed as a measure to reduce contest costs.

Similarly a new procedure was established to pay a contribution to the CIVA Judges traveling costs based on actual expenditure, rather than the previous stipend paid regardless to actual expenditure involved. Incidentally it was intended that judges should be independent of their own aero clubs wherever possible, but should expenses continue to be paid for such judges by home Aero Clubs then such judges should not receive CIVA expenses as well.



### 2010 Contest reality

Obviously there is a resistance from those judges (CIVA invited) to have to pay an entry fee, this led to a difference in the way judges were handled in the Czech Republic to those in Poland, which is not really that satisfactory.

This should not be viewed as a criticism of the Czech organisers, who were simply in a different position to the Poles where a record entry had ensured a good income from entry fees. However Judges should not be put in the position where a contest is favoured due to financial considerations.

### Recommendation

CIVA needs to establish a firm policy both to: -

- a) Judges entry fees for Invited Judges
- b) Travel expenses for invited judges (agreed for 2010 by the Bureau)

It is recommended that we do not burden organisers even further by insisting that entry fees for invited judges be paid; this will simply make the task of organising even more difficult and drive up entry fees even further.

It is recommended that CIVA should consider the entry fees by invited judges to be part of a development policy to extend the International Judge data base even further by suitable candidates actually participating in Championships with the more proven judges (this has worked out extremely well in Poland this year) and as such the WPGA Reserve Fund held by the FAI should be used for this purpose, as this would be actively be a practical Development Programme.

This would ensure the use of funds accumulated by CIVA at the WGPA on the basis of its active support to be put to good use in the very arena where most of these funds were accumulated by CIVA providing judges and officials to WGPA competitions. The amount in the reserve fund should be sufficient for at least seven to ten years support and would be money well spent in developing judging excellence.

### **3. Treatment of Judges at Contests**

Mike Heuer has received a written complaint from Lyudmila Zelenina about how judges are treated at contests, mainly the concerns are accommodation (at WAAC the Hotel was in a noisy area near the Train & bus station and over a supermarket) causing difficulties in sleeping, expenses were also of concern. Mike Heuer has suggested a discussion takes place at the CIVA meeting, thus the inclusion in this report as a topic for discussion.



**4. CIVA International Judges List**

It is recommended that the distinction between Gliding and Power Judges, be removed from the International Judging list.

**5. Change of procedure for Perception Zeroes (Soft Zeroes)**

It is recommended that CIVA adopt the recommendation of the Judging Sub-Committee to change the procedures with regards to perception zeroes as per the attached document below: -

**Perception Zero handling – Proposal**

*Here we examine the unusual risk to the judges Ranking Index (RI) when they are required to apply CIVA 'perception' criteria, and provide a simple solution that replaces the ambiguous 'Soft Zero' with a PZ (perception zero) for figures that fail to meet the perception criteria. We will leave the natural mark 0.0 to signify figures that have been awarded a total marks downgrade of 10.0 or more, or where between 45° and 90° of error are seen.*

---

According to CIVA Section-6 Rules on the judging of classic Aresti figures, judges should be confident and forthright in their use of the Soft Zero (SZ) for “perceived” errors. Pilots must always fly to visually satisfy the relevant perception criteria – anything less should get a SZ.

However, discussions with both power and glider judges often reveals that many prefer to not give SZ's for flick-rolls, tail slides, spins, and stalls in loops/turns (for gliders) unless the “perception” error is so clearly obvious that it is undeniable. This is because even when a judge is satisfied that on balance a perception SZ should be given but he thinks that some other judges may not agree, to protect his RI he must quickly decide whether the SZ is likely to be the dominant decision accepted by FairPlay, or not. If the soft zero is rejected by FPS then the judges RI would be increased, a real deterrent to honest judging. The alternative that some judges adopt of applying a downgrade when they see a probable but not definite perception error does not meet CIVA judging rules and cannot be viewed as an acceptable option.

The risk to a judge's RI is especially evident when a high-ranking pilot flies a figure and a judge awards a SZ because, on balance, he doubts that the perception criteria have been met, but the majority of other judges ignore the situation or are over-cautious and give a simple downgrade. In such cases the SZ is likely to be found anomalous by FPS, and perhaps 10% of



the SZ judge's score may work against him in the ranking of that pilot. For a low scoring pilot the RI damage is less because the scope for rank change will be smaller.

### **What exactly is a soft zero?**

It is confusing and inappropriate to award the same (soft zero) mark to zeros driven by perception criteria and to those occasions where between 45° and 90° of cumulative error is seen and the downgrades within the figure total ten or more – these are radically different situations for which unambiguous and different judgements should be recorded.

- In the “Perception Zero” situation the judge is saying that part of a figure did not meet the criteria specified by the CIVA judging rules, so effectively the wrong figure has been flown. Unlike the Hard Zero this is always a subjective decision and cannot be proven by reference to a video and the Chief Judge cannot cast a deciding vote.
- When a judge awards a mark of 0.0 for cumulative errors, this means that the correct figure was flown but so many errors were observed that the figure deserves a real score of 0.0 marks.

These are two different situations, and it would certainly improve the quality of the FPS data analysis if we clearly distinguish between Perception Zeros and 0.0.

### **What can we do about this situation?**

This document discusses a proposal that we dispense with the misleading term “soft zero” and simply write “0.0” where more than 9.5 downgrades are assessed, but that we identify figures where a “perception” zero should be awarded with the letters PZ so that these marks can be handled differently when calculating judges RI's. The PZ would apply only to flick-rolls, tail-slides, spins and – for gliders – stalls in rolling turns and looping segments, where the judge *perceives* they have not met the CIVA criteria.

Note that this is only a change in the way marks are recorded and then processed in the FPS software when the RI is calculated. Judges already have to make these same decisions, whether a figure deserves a perception zero or a ‘no-marks’ 0.0. They won't have to do anything differently in terms of how they judge, except tell their assistant if the score is a Perception Zero (didn't flick, slide etc.) or a 0.0 (cumulative errors).

Whatever we do must not in any way affect the existing FairPlay system for calculating the results through the ranking of pilots' final scores in descending order.

### **Why do this?**

The primary aim of this move is to encourage judges to mark freely and without fear of impact to their RI when – on balance – the perception criteria for a manoeuvre are not met, even if they feel that other judges may not agree. In these situations a judge must not be influenced by what he thinks his colleagues will do, he must be unconstrained to apply whatever downgrade he thinks is correct.



*For reference:*

*Each judge's Ranking Index (RI) is calculated for each sequence through comparison of the judge's ranking of each pilot against the final FPS ranking derived from all the judges' grades. Rank errors are combined with their score differences to calculate an RI number that is small if the judge's pilot ranking and score are close to the final FPS result, but increases as the rank and score differences grow more acute. All of the sequence RIs for each judge are averaged to provide the judges final RI for the event, and later used to assess the judge's suitability for consideration at future events. In general an RI below 10 is good, from 10 to 25 increasingly questionable, and with an RI above 25 a judge is unlikely to be considered acceptable for work at a major CIVA event.*

*It is natural therefore that judges should be concerned to maintain the lowest possible RI, and that zeroing figures for marginal perception errors does not raise their RI to the extent that they may not be offered further opportunities to judge at major events.*

**The proposal is:**

**For judges:**

- All fundamental CIVA rules and judging criteria remain unaltered.
- Two minor changes are required from judges and/or assistants on their Form-A's:
  - When a pilot fails to meet the relevant perception criteria for a manoeuvre and the judge awards a zero, this should be written as "PZ" on the Form-A. The judge must also state the reason for applying the PZ in the same way as already required for HZ's.
  - In circumstances where a judge cumulates more than 45° but less than 90° of error in a figure or assesses more than 9.5 downgrades, the grade given should be "0.0" to signify that all ten marks have been lost.

The chief judge should subsequently check that PZ's are applied only to manoeuvres where a perception error has been seen, and that a plausible reason has been given. The CJ has no other input regarding the presence of PZ's; they are subjective decisions made by individual judges and there is no requirement to review or "Confirm" them.

**For the scorer:**

- When the scorer enters the marks a perception zero will be stored in the database as "PZ" to distinguish it from normal zeros (0.0) and hard zeros (HZ).
- On all published materials the letters PZ will indicate that a perception zero has been applied, to distinguish it from a normal zero (0.0) and a HZ (a hard zero).



### **Within the FairPlay System:**

#### During the results calculation process:

- PZ's will be evaluated in exactly the same way that SZ's have been in the past, being set to a numeric value of 0.0 when FPS processing starts. Apart from this, the entire numeric / statistical calculation process remains unchanged.
- In any figure where one or more PZ marks are rejected as statistically unacceptable and replaced by a Fitted Value (FV), a flag is set to identify each PZ rejection for reference by the subsequent Judge / RI calculating process.
- The re-calculation of past events using the new system will therefore provide unchanged / identical results, the ability to handle 'old' SZ's remaining as before.

#### During the RI calculation process:

- Raw marks will be figure-grouped as they are now.
- Any AV's (Averages) that have been requested are as usual set to 'Missing'.
- In any figure where the outlier calculation process has flagged the rejection of a PZ, the judges' raw PZ will also be set to 'Missing'.
- Fitted Values are calculated and used to replace all missing data.
- Judge / Pilot scores are calculated as now for subsequent comparison with the panel FPS results, and continue to provide the basis for determining the RI for each judge.

Because unreliable PZ's have been removed and replaced by FV's, the RI for any judge whose PZ is rejected will remain unaffected.

### **Objectives and benefits:**

Pro:

- Perception zeros (PZ's) are clearly recorded separately from out-of-marks zeros (0.0).
- The application of PZ's will be easy because we already use the word 'perception' to describe those occasions when that type of assessment must be made.
- We will no longer have any possible confusion about when to apply the mark of 0.0 – it will always be when the number of downgrades reaches or exceeds ten.
- When judges see manoeuvres that fail to adequately meet their perception criteria, they will be able to respond confidently to these difficult and fleeting decisions without fear of subsequent damage to their RI.
- Judges awarding a non-zero grade to a figure where the PZ becomes the dominant mark will have their RI affected, and thus be encouraged to use the PZ when sufficiently in doubt about the perception criteria.



- Pilots are always given the “benefit of the doubt” by the established FP system, with PZ’s surviving as zeroes only when the dominantly accepted view of the panel is to award a PZ for a particular figure.
- Pilots will soon realise that the judges improved freedom to properly assess perception errors will lead to badly flown figures being zeroed more often, and this will encourage them to fly these manoeuvres better so that they avoid being awarded a PZ.
- Chief Judges will find it easier to assess whether their judges understand and are applying the correct criteria for perception zeros.
- Distinguishing PZ from 0.0 improves the quality of the data being entered to FPS, allows more appropriate data processing and will produce more robust analysis.

Con:

- A change in terminology must be accepted and understood by all those in the sport.
- Judges must be trained to apply the PZ when a perception zero is seen, and use 0.0 only when the total downgrades for a figure reach ten or more.
- Changes to the software are required to store and correctly analyse the new PZ format.

*NHB – Perception Zero handling*  
*October 2010 v1*