

Subject:	Formation Skydiving Agenda			Annex:	<b>8B</b>
Author(s):	Fiona McEachern, Committee chair			Agenda ref.:	<b>11</b>
Authors representing:				Doc. nr:	<b>1</b>
Date:		Repl. doc. dated / version:	N/A	Page	<b>1 of 2</b>

## Agenda FS Committee

Poland

2005

## 1. Dive Pool changes

- 4-way block 12 to be modified or replaced
- 4-way block 13 to be modified
- 8-way block 12 to be changed or modified
- other

## 2. Rule modifications (subject to 3 below)

4.8.3 Each point will only attract a maximum of one infringement. So, two wrong grips on a single point is still one infringement.

5.4 This rule will be clarified so only one review per jump is allowed.

## 3. Scoring Systems

We have received a proposal to change the scoring system. The basis of this proposal is that judges will only score correct, judgeable formations, with appropriate inters or total separations as required. There is no loss of points for an incorrect formation. If a formation is not correct or not able to be judged then no point is given. An omitted formation or inter would attract a penalty (suggested to be 20% of the final score, but other penalties are possible). This has an advantage of simplicity in explaining how our sport is judged both to non jumpers and new competitors. It is also similar to CF sequential. A disadvantage is that it may be much harder to separate the teams that are close. The committee will decide if the rules should change in accordance with the proposal.

## 4. Electronic scoring systems.

The committee has been asked by the IPC President to clearly define how electronic timing should operate. Some options were presented. The first is incorporated into Omniskore and discards the first and last start times then uses an average of the three in the middle, if they fall within a certain range, which is usually set at 0.3 seconds. The average of the 3 is taken and the tape is stopped a fixed time later, as defined by the competition rules. If the middle three do not fall within this range, then there is a false start and the tape is rewound to try again. A second option has the closest 3 times used to determine the start point. Another option is to have all judges with their own individual start point and own end point, as is done with manual judging.

We also wish to look at the possibility of only using the first timing where the jump is watched more than one time by the judges. Currently, each viewing has its own start and stop timing.

## 5. Wild Card option.

We will investigate the possibility of each team having one or more reviews per competition without recourse to the jury. Questions this raises are:

- One review only or more?
- Only able to review own team, or others?

Subject:	Formation Skydiving Agenda			Annex:	<b>8B</b>
Author(s):	Fiona McEachern, Committee chair			Agenda ref.:	<b>11</b>
Authors representing:				Doc. nr:	<b>1</b>
Date:		Repl. doc. dated / version:	N/A	Page	<b>2 of 2</b>

- New panel or same panel?
- Time frame?

#### 6. Viewing of the jump by the Judges

Options under consideration are:

- No change
- Once at full speed and once at half speed
- Once at full speed and a set period of time during which each judge could view their own tape as they wished in full speed.

#### 7. Development of a standard set of manifest calls.

#### 8. Review of Videographers position within the team.

At the WPC, no delegation had a videographer who was not a part of the delegation. Many of the female teams however did have a male videographer. At the competitor's meeting there were two separate philosophies on the role of the videographer. The videographer was considered as a recorder of performance only by some and by others, as an integral part of the team. The majority of the meeting was not in favour of change in this area, feeling there was nothing to gain and small nations could be placed at a disadvantage