

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8



CHIEF JUDGE'S STANDARD REPORT

Competition:	5th FAI World Cup of Wingsuit Flying 3rd FAI European Wingsuit Flying Championships
Events:	Wingsuit Performance Wingsuit Acrobatic
Location:	Prostějov, CZE
Date:	15-22 August 2025
Panel of Judges:	CJ – Steve Hubbard (USA) EJ Acro – Linda Makela (FIN) EJ Performance – Michael Cooper (CAN) Judge – Michaela Belde – (GER) Judge – Yves Letourneur – (FRA) Judge – Marco Bulmer-Rizzi (GBR) *New* Judge – Sudeep Kodavati (IND) *New* Assistance to CJ – Jan Kleibl (CZE) Technical Scoring Director – Thierry Courtin
Scoring Equipment Used:	Wingsuit Acrobatic – InTime Scoring (with Flysights as PLDs) Wingsuit Performance – SkyDerby (with Flysights as PLDs) Position Logging Devices A quick note regarding the PLDs. This was an especially sensitive area following the 2024 World Championships in Beaufort, NC, USA, where there were a significant number of rejudges in both the Speed Skydiving and Wingsuit Flying competitions due to the performance of the GPS, and something that we all hoped was a one-off problem and not something bigger. This year, there were nearly 400 competition jumps made between the Acrobatic and Performance events and the total number of rejudges due to GPS issues was 1. This equates to a failure rate of 0.0025%. It also all but proves that last year's issues were out of anybody's controls and should go a long way to instil confidence in our chosen devices.
Details of the Judges Work: <i>(including judging statistics)</i>	Number of competitors: Wingsuit Acrobatic – 6 NAC's, 8 teams, 24 competitors Wingsuit Performance – 16 NAC's, 37 competitors Number of Jumps judged: Wingsuit Acrobatic – 56 competition jumps, 0 rejudges Wingsuit Performance – 333 competition jumps, 1 rejudge Leading up to the competition, Michael Cooper and I attempted to do some testing in SkyDerby, since it had been some time since the last time either of us had run an event on the scoring system. In hindsight, I'm very happy that we did. We identified a significant number of issues, and some of them were very critical to the competition. I informed the WS and Judges Committees, as well as the competition

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

organizer and the FAI Controller of these issues and we put forward a plan with Aleksandr Kunin (creator of SkyDerby) that included several follow-up meetings and a backup plan to use InTime Scoring if SkyDerby was not updated and corrected before the start of the competition. Eventually, SkyDerby was updated to a point where, despite there still being several outstanding items that needed to be updated, I felt comfortable running the competition using it, at which point, I informed all of the relevant parties and proceeded forward.

To prepare the judge panel for the Acrobatic competition, the judges were all sent a written exam, and a set of previous competition jumps to judge prior to the competition. This got them looking into the competition rules and allowed the Acrobatic EJ and I to establish a baseline that would be used when we arrive on-site for the Judge Seminar day.

The judges stepped up and performed at a very high standard, working extremely well with each other with very little oversight needed by me or either of the EJs. A very special thanks goes out to Stawomir Choroszuca (POL) and Jan Nejedly (AUS), who came to the competition having just received their judge ratings (POL National and FAI, respectively) and they wanted to experience an FCE first-hand. Without their help throughout the days, it would have been much more complicated and challenging to run the competition.

Prior to the start of the competition, I informed the jury of two things, one which needed their interpretation and decision on.

1. I informed them of the confusion that had come up following the Nordic Championships regarding the judging of the Acrobatic compulsory sequence “O”. There needed to be a change to the way the judges display the scoring for this sequence, which would show the competitors how all of the chances to receive a point in grips were decided. It wouldn’t change how the competitors perform the sequence, nor how the judges would judge it – just simply how it would be displayed on the scoreboard. The jury advised that this sounded perfectly reasonable and made sure that I would go over this with the competitors in the pre-competition competitors meeting, which I had already intended on doing.
2. In the performance event, one of the largest changes made between 2024-2025 was that “Modifications relative to the wingsuit manufacturer’s design are not permitted, except those explicitly permitted in the competition rules.” In the days leading up to the competition, the judge panel noticed that a large number of competitors had tape that had been added to various places on their wingsuit. As small as an effect as this would have, it could still be considered a modification, since it did not come from the manufacturer. This was presented to the jury who subsequently released a decision that any tape that that was not added in accordance with WS CR 3.2.2.1 should be considered an unauthorized modification

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

and would need to be removed. This decision was shared with the competitors and applied during the competitors' equipment inspection (More on this later).

The equipment inspection was performed on the competitors' official practice day. This was also the same day as the opening ceremony and the pre-competition competitor's meeting. The way it was scheduled helped control some of the complexity of the day, and I would suggest future CJs do things in a similar fashion. We spent the first hour of the day inspecting all of the Acrobatic competitors' equipment (a requirement that they would like to be removed – see my rule change suggestion below). I then proceeded to schedule 6 competitors every 30 minutes, using reverse order of competitor number (this schedule was released to the competitors before their departure on the previous day, so they knew when they needed to be on-site for inspection). All of the judges and the 2 "helper" judges were used during the inspections, which ultimately took approximately 6 hours to complete. This was the smoothest inspection process that I can recall, and I appreciate everyone who helped make it so.

When competitor #01, the final competitor to be inspected, had his equipment inspected, the outside edge of his wingtips had significant damage – this was the same place that many competitors had applied tape to stop similar damage from occurring. In consultation with the EJ and Judges Panel, we all agreed that this was very unsafe for this competitor to fly. I approached the Jury and explained to them the situation and had them inspect the wingsuit in question. The Jury then decided to retract part of the previous decision regarding tape – they will permit tape on similar suits with similar wingtips, but where the damage could occur. This decision was posted by the Jury and released to the competitors.

Due to the growing complexity of the pre-competition equipment inspection, this has started to take up a significant amount of the official practice day, which in turn limits the availability for the judges to judge official practice jumps. Therefore, it is my suggestion that the requirement to judge official practice jumps be removed, freeing up the judge panel to complete their pre-competition responsibilities. This was discussed with both the Acrobatic and Performance competitors at the post-competition competitors meeting, and both sides agreed with it, so long as there is no change to the inclusion of two practice jumps with registration.

On the second day of competition, there were some issues regarding weather that impacted the performance event and resulted in a competitor getting several "go-arounds" and one where the competitor did not jump and rode the aircraft down. This competitor was put on the next competition load and was able to complete his jump successfully. Once weather had grounded the competition for the rest of the day, the Meet Director approached me and asked what his rights were regarding restricting go-arounds, etc. We reviewed the competition rules together and found SC5, 5.2.8. The MD decided that moving forward, a competitor who got to the door and was unhappy

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

with the conditions would be permitted just one go-around and if he was still unhappy, he would ride the aircraft down and have a discussion with the MD. The MD would decide whether there were pertinent reasons for the competitor to not exit, at which point 5.2.8.5/5.2.8.6 would be enforced accordingly. All of the performance competitors were briefed on this decision and how it would be enforced moving forward, which triggered a response from some of the competitors asking about whether or not the previous competitor who got multiple go-arounds violated the rules in doing so. I had a discussion with the MD and we determined that no rules were violated – this was explained to the competitors the following morning and the competition proceeded to its completion with no further issues on this issue. In the future, this issue should be thoroughly explained to the competitors at the pre-competition meeting.

On the third day of competition, the Meet Director had some confusion regarding WS CR 4.2.1, which governs the change from one event to the other. The MD interpreted 4.2.1.1 as “any competitor competing in both events” must be released ... and the CJ interpreted it as “all competitors” must be released ... Ultimately, a compromise was made, and the competition proceeded. There needs to be some clarification in the WS CRs to prevent this from occurring in the future. See my rule change suggestion below.

Complaints

There was 1 written complaint filed with the Chief Judge regarding a wingsuit that was approved by the judge panel. I wrote a written response to the two complaining competitors and had a discussion with them upon delivering my formal response. They were advised what the next steps would be if they were not satisfied.

Protests

The aforementioned complaint was elevated to a protest after the competitors found themselves dissatisfied with my response to their complaint. The jury handled the protest accordingly and ultimately upheld the decision made by the judge panel.

Unsportsmanlike Behavior

On the morning of the second day of competition, it was brought to the attention of the Chief Judge that several competitors had made some social media posts apparently mocking the decision reached by the judges and jury regarding the protest that was filed. Some investigation was done and it was found that there were 3 competitors involved. This situation was brought to the FAI Controller and Jury and after deliberation, it was recommended this behavior could be considered a violation of the various Unsportsmanlike Behavior clauses found in the General Section (GS 6.1.4) and SC5 (SC5 5.4.1, 5.4.2 (2) (c)). After a long discussion between the CJ and MD, it was decided that this behavior did not rise to the level of the other serious infringements found in the sporting code, however, it should not be left without a response.

The three competitors involved and one of the competitors' Head of Delegation (the remaining two competitors did not have a registered

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

	<p>Head of Delegation) were brought into a meeting with the MD and CJ where they were explained how this behavior was not acceptable and shown in the sporting code how this could have been handled by the meet officials, potentially resulting in their disqualification from the competition. One of the competitors involved, as well as their Head of Delegation, received the information very professionally, apologized for the lapse in judgement and assured us that it would not happen again. The remaining two competitors did not receive this information very well and remained confrontational, accusing the meet officials of “spying” on competitors, stating that they have the right to operate their social media pages how they see fit. The meeting was concluded and the competition continued with no further instances of similar behavior.</p> <p>Scores and publications</p> <p>There were no issues with the scores being published for Acrobatic. The technical scoring director handled this flawlessly.</p> <p>For Performance, there were some initial issues with publishing the results from SkyDerby to the official ISC results website. These issues were eventually resolved and no further issues were seen.</p> <p>There were some questions regarding when scores need to be published, both on the official scoreboard as well as the online-based results website, as there doesn’t seem to be any guidelines that pertain to the WS competition. Ultimately, it was decided that task-specific scores will be posted at the completion of any task, the overall scores will be posted at the completion of a round (3 tasks), and the national team and female scores will be posted at the completion of the competition. This should be formalized and added to the CJ Handbook.</p>
Recommendations for Organisers:	<p>With this being the third WS FCE that Martin and his team has run, it went as smoothly as expected and several things were improved from the last time an FCE was hosted here.</p> <p>Prior to the competition, I met with Martin several times to go over things, set expectations, discuss logistics and to just generally get on the same page on things that need to happen prior to and during the competition. I was in constant communication with Martin and his staff leading up to the competition, making sure that all of the judges had what they needed – I am happy to say that this is one of the areas of major improvement. There were some issues in 2023 regarding getting judges to the competition site, and this year, there were no issues at all. We had about half of the judge panel arrive via Prague, who then took a train to Olomouc – they were promptly picked up at the train station and brought to the competition site. The other half of the judges arrived via Vienna – they were met by a driver, despite one judge’s delayed flight, and transported to the competition site with no issues.</p> <p>Lodging</p> <p>The judges were again provided rooms in the Tennis Hotel, approximately 15 minutes from the competition site. This is the same</p>

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

hotel that has accommodated the judging panel in the last two WS FCEs. Breakfast and dinner were provided here, and while the breakfast remained the same as previous years (no complaints here – quite acceptable), the dinner seemed to be improved for the most part – there was a lot more variety day to day, which seemed to be much appreciated by the judging panel. I would also like to extend a thank you to the hotel staff for accommodating our early morning schedule, for which they prepared and provided breakfast earlier than they were originally planning.

The only complaint that I received is the same as in previous years. This hotel has no air conditioning. With temperatures reaching between 30°-34° throughout much of the competition, this made it quite uncomfortable for the judge panel.

Recommendation

It is my recommendation to check all bids to see if air conditioning is available in the judges' accommodations if temperatures are expected to be above 25°.

Scoring System

Unfortunately, this is a place where there have been consistent challenges at previous FCEs, and this competition was no exception.

There seems to be two issues that have continued to cause issues, year after year, resulting in losing significant time during the Judge Seminar day, affecting their preparation for the Acrobatic competition.

1. Networking issues

There were issues getting all of the various workstations and computers communicating with the main InTime server. This is very challenging to troubleshoot, since the problem(s) could be in one of several spots. This was eventually resolved by the Technical Scoring Director.

2. Workstation configuration

Upon arrival, the host had provided all the necessary hardware and computers to successfully run the InTime scoring system. The Technical Scoring Director got everything installed and functioning correctly, and everything seemed ready to go for the judges on their seminar day. When the judges finished their Performance training and moved on to their Acrobatic training, they ran into an issue when putting in their scores after judging a round. This issue is centered around the language settings on the computer they are working on. Some computers required a period (.) in the scores where some of the other computers required a comma (,), resulting in a difference of 8.5 vs 8,5. This caused issues with the way the InTime server handled the scores and ultimately made it so that the judge panel could not successfully input scores as a panel. This issue was again resolved by the Technical Scoring Director.


SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

	<p>Both issues were successfully resolved by the TSD, however, this resulted in us losing approximately half of the time devoted to WS Acrobatic training, which is arguably where the judges need to focus on the most during the seminar day.</p> <p><i>Recommendations</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The computer network that the InTime scoring system is run on should be a newly installed network, independent of any existing network(s) already running at the competition site. I think the issues being faced here are because InTime is being integrated into an existing network and that just complicates things, unless there is someone on-site with a thorough understanding of the configuration. 2. All of the computers involved in running InTime – the server, the judge’s workstations, the dubbing station, the public display computers – they all need to be set to the English language prior to arrival. This would fully resolve the issues that we have faced this year and in previous years. <p>Looking at the bigger picture of the whole competition, I think this was the best WS FCE that we have had to date, and that is due in no short part to Martin and his team’s hard work and efforts throughout the week, so a big thank you to Martin and everyone involved.</p>
New Records Achieved	<p>WS Performance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. World & North American Continental Record – Time Alexey Galda – 112.0 seconds 2. Asian Continental Record – Time Farhan Raihan – 106.2 seconds 3. <i>Several national-level competition records</i> <p>Wingsuit Acrobatic</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. World & North American Continental Record – Longest Sequence (Female) USA-3 (Elizabeth Brott, Laurel Hargis, Rebecca Jordan) – 12 grips 2. European Continental Record – Longest Sequence ESP-1 (Carolina Lara Silva, Cristina Nuñez Pabon, Paloma Bustos Bedoya) – 10 grips 3. <i>Several national-level competition records</i>
Rule Changes – Proposals:	<p>WS Acrobatic:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove judge requirement from training jumps, maintain 2 training jumps included in registration. 2. Teams may submit jumps prior to competition to be judged during the judge seminar day – scores will be made available to teams prior to official practice day. 3. Removal of maximum exit altitude – leave to meet director discretion but exit altitude must be provided to teams prior to jump.

76th FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

SUBJECT:	Chief Judge Report – World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, Prostějov, CZK	AGENDA #	19.2
AUTHOR:	Steve Hubbard, Chief Judge		
DATE:	29 August 2025	PAGES:	8

	<p>WS Performance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove judge requirement from training jumps, maintain 2 training jumps included in registration. 2. Disallow adding material to wingsuits from any potential fitment-related permitted modifications. 3. Create a “panel” of competitors on-site at competition to approval any suits that judges deem questionable. (several options – random panel of 5, one competitor per delegation, majority vote, 2/3rds majority, etc) – widely supported by competitors 4. Require all scoring systems to make competition .csv files available for download
<p>Personal Remarks:</p>	<p>This was quite a unique experience for me, with this being my first time serving as Chief Judge.</p> <p>The less-than-ideal situation earlier in the year which resulted in a late change to the CJ position really put me behind schedule from the very start. I am proud to say that I think everyone involved – the Organizer, the FAI Controller, the Jury, the Judges’ Committee, the WS Committee, the two fantastic Event Judges and the judge panel, Faye Kimble at the FAI, Claire and Dirk from InTime, Aleksandr Kunin from SkyDerby – everyone supported me when I needed it and helped me get caught up in short order. I honestly do not believe I could have done it without everyone’s support, so I would like to personally thank each and every one of you.</p> <p>I learned so much from this experience, which I will take forward with me throughout the rest of my judging career and I hope that I have the opportunity to serve as Chief Judge again in the future, as I have identified several ways where I can improve from this year.</p> <p>Thank you to everyone for having the trust and belief in me to step into this role and make it a success, and I hope that everyone agrees with me that this is exactly what it was – a major success.</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>	

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Steve Hubbard</p>
<p>Signature:</p>	
<p>Date:</p>	<p>29 August 2025</p>