



Ice Skating Australia Incorporated
Affiliated to the International Skating Union

2011-12 Technical Panel
Post-Event Error Correction Protocol

Incorrect Calculation/Input – Human Errors – Field of Play Decisions

For events conducted under the International Judging System (“IJS”), Ice Skating Australia has adopted a post-event error correction protocol (“Protocol”) for correction of specific types of human errors made by the technical panel or for errors pertaining to mathematical calculation.

Decisions made by judges and technical officials involve split second, informed judgments. When video replay is available to review a call, the decision is still one of judgment. These decisions are made on the spot by trained officials in the so-called “field of play.” Much like open judging under the 6.0 system, once the performance is finished and the officials have sent their evaluations to the accountants for calculation, the “field of play” is over and the decisions made by the judges and technical officials are final. Field of play will commence when the skater(s) name(s) is (are) called to begin the (their) performance and will end when the performance is concluded and he/she/they steps off the ice surface. All rules and regulations pertaining to the evaluation of that performance will be enforced.

“Human errors” are not to be confused with the issue of whether or not the decision in question is considered by all to be the correct one. Instead, “human errors” are mistakes such as a misspoken word(s) in the call, a missed element without a call, or an error in data input of a called element. Errors in mathematical calculation are mistakes in the input of scores, computer malfunctions or in the verification of a rule governing program content.

A. What type of error can be corrected after technical panel leaves the stand?

1. **Obvious identification error:** An error in the identification of an element (e.g., a toe loop called a loop; a double Axel called a triple Axel) not corrected before the technical controller authorizes the elements after the skater’s performance. See Scenario 3 on page 3.
2. **Error in data input of the field of play decision:** A mistake made by the data operator in entering a called element.
3. **Mathematical or calculation error resulting in incorrect calculation:** A mistake made in the results calculation process, including the input of scores, a computer malfunction or a mistake in rule verification governing program content.

B. What type of call may not be changed after technical panel leaves the stand?

1. Calls involving whether or not to downgrade a jump or throw jump.
2. Calls involving called levels of difficulty.

C. What happens if there is an equipment failure?

If there is a failure of the computers or the video used in the evaluation of skaters’ performances, the event referee has the authority to continue the event at the referee’s discretion after consultation with the appropriate event officials, with the balance of the event to be conducted with the use of available IJS protocol.

D. Who may initiate the process for changing a call or a data input error?

1. Referee of the Event
2. Technical Controller
3. Technical Specialist
4. Assistant Technical Specialist
5. Data Operator
6. Affected skater (i.e., the marks for that particular skater)
7. Coach of affected skater (i.e., the coach of the skater described in #6)

An appropriate form to initiate this review process must be obtained from the event referee, completed by the initiating party and returned to the event referee.

E. What is the process for correcting the human error?

1. The possibility that an error has occurred is brought to the attention of the referee of the event in question.
2. Analysis of the possible human error is undertaken as soon as the referee, the two technical specialists, the technical controller and the data operator (collectively, the "Review Panel") can convene (immediately after the segment has concluded or as soon thereafter as is reasonably possible should members of the Review Panel be officiating in the next event). No one other than the Review Panel shall be present during the review.
3. Only official competition data will be permitted to assist the Review Panel during their evaluation of a possible human error. Official competition data includes technical panel and/or judges' notes and may, in highly unusual situations, include official video replay clips or audio clips should they be available. The Review Panel shall have sole discretion to decide which official competition data they will consider and shall not be required to review official video or audio clips if they do not feel it necessary.
4. Correction of the human error will be made and the results for the segment reissued if all members of the Review Panel agree that an error was made.
5. Correction of a mathematical calculation error may be made by the event referee and/or the technical controller upon consultation with the accountant or technical accountant, if all agree that the correction is warranted.
6. Communication of the decision by the referee if the inquiry was brought to the referee's attention by a third party.

F. What is the timeframe for identifying and correcting an error?

1. For a human error made by the technical panel in the field of play involving the identification of an element, the error must be identified, analysed and a decision to correct it made as follows:
 - a. Initial Segment(s) of the event—immediately after the event segment has concluded or as soon thereafter as it is reasonable to gather the Review Panel before the Final Segment of the event begins.
 - b. Final Segment of the event—prior to the awards ceremony (which cannot be held until the official results for the event are signed by the referee).
2. For a human error made by the Data Operator in the input of a field of play decision of the technical panel, the error must be identified, confirmed and a decision to correct it made as follows:

- a. Initial Segment(s) of the event—immediately after the event segment has concluded or as soon thereafter as it is reasonable to gather the Review Panel before the Final Segment of the event begins.
 - b. Final Segment of the event—prior to the awards ceremony.
3. For mathematical or calculation errors, the error must be identified, confirmed and a decision to correct it made as follows:
 - a. All Segments of the event—prior to the awards ceremony.
4. **If an error that has been identified after the intermediate draw has been completed which results in a change in GROUPINGS ONLY, the segment will be redrawn by the accountant and referee prior to the next segment’s practice – all efforts will be made to notify the athletes of the new draw. The NEW warm up groups will be posted with general notification to the athletes. It is the responsibility of the athletes and coaches to remain informed of all changes.**

Examples

Scenario One:

A jump or a spin is identified incorrectly by the technical specialist and the error is noted by a judge (or the referee) during the skater’s performance.

Action:

The judge will notify the referee at the end of the performance. The referee will alert the technical panel prior to the call of the next skater—the field of play is still open pending review of the elements. The technical panel will check the call with notes or video replay immediately and make the correction if required. Referee will be notified of the action taken. If the referee learns of the judges’ concern only after the next skater has taken the ice, the referee shall inform the technical panel as soon as is practicable and the decision will be reviewed at the end of the event segment.

Scenario Two:

A skating element is identified correctly by the technical specialist, but the data operator inadvertently enters the element identification incorrectly. The technical controller authorises the elements without noticing the error. The error is brought to the attention of the referee immediately at the end of the event segment and prior to the awards ceremony. The referee communicates the concern to the technical panel.

Action:

Technical controller and specialists consult their notes and confirm that the input was incorrect. This is not a field of play error—it is a human error of input of a field of play decision. Input is corrected to reflect the element as called and the results are re-posted.

Scenario Three:

A skating element is identified incorrectly (e.g., a double toeloop is identified by the specialist as a double loop). The call was not questioned by the judges, referee or technical panel members. The technical controller authorises the elements without noticing the error. The error is brought to the attention of the event referee or technical controller immediately at the end of the event segment and prior to the awards ceremony.

Action:

Review Panel convenes to discuss the possible error immediately after the event or as soon as reasonably possible. All agree that the technical specialist misspoke in the calling of the jump element

and that the error went unnoticed and uncorrected—the call was intended to be a double toeloop. This human error in a field of play decision. The element is corrected to reflect the element intended to be called. If necessary, the results are re-posted. If the error is not noticed until after the awards ceremony, the time to correct the error has passed and the original call stands.

Scenario Four:

Elements are identified correctly; however there was an error in the calculation process, either in the computerised scoring system itself, the computerised or manual rule checking program, or during the input of the scores into the calculation computer.

Action:

If this type of error is found, the referee may make a correction after consulting with the technical controller of the event and the skater's score will be re-calculated. Because this type of error does not involve a field of play decision involving element identification, correction is appropriate upon until the time of the awards ceremony for the skater's event. If necessary, the results will be re-calculated and the skaters will be notified of the re-calculated results prior to receiving their awards.

Scenario Five:

Coach of Skater A reviews the protocol and takes issue with a called element in Skater B's program. Skater A's coach approaches the referee of the event in which A and B have just competed and tells the referee that Skater B's double lutz was under-rotated and should have been called a single.

Action:

Referee informs Skater A's coach that (1) the decision to downgrade a jump is a field of play call that involves the split second judgment of the technical panel and is not subject to the post-event review, and (2) as the coach of Skater A, she has no standing to challenge a call made in the evaluation of Skater B.