

Communication No. 2814

Rules of Procedure for Officials Assessment Commission – Evaluation of Judging – Assessments for the Figure Skating Branch

This Communication replaces ISU Communication No. 2734 with immediate effect

(Changes compared to the previous version of ISU Communication No. 2734 are underlined)

1. Appointment of the Officials Assessment Commission (OAC)

- 1.1. For each season, i.e. for the period from July 1 to the following June 30, an OAC Pool shall be appointed by the Council upon recommendation of the Vice President Figure Skating after consultation with the Head of Officials Figure Skating. The appointments shall specify members to serve in the sub-group on National Bias.
- 1.2. In order to be included in the OAC Pool, an Official must fulfil the following criteria:
 - a) be or have been on the ISU Officials list of ISU Referees, ISU Technical Controllers, ISU Technical Specialists or ISU Judges for Single & Pair Skating, Ice Dance or Synchronized Skating. Members of the OAC shall not be members of a Technical Committee at the same time;
 - b) have the following skills:
 - ability to analyze competition data;
 - ability to work quickly and in an organized manner;
 - good written English;
 - familiarity with report writing;
 - basic computer skills (in particular ability to work with Word and Excel files);
 - ability to remain objective in all officiating evaluation matters.
 - c) not have an Assessment according to Rules 440 and 838 for service in the three full years prior to their appointment. Members of the OAC Pool receiving an Assessment, independent in which discipline and capacity, shall be deleted from the OAC Pool with immediate effect. After the expiry of the period of validity of the Assessment the Council shall decide on

- reinstatement into the OAC Pool by the recommendation by the Vice President Figure Skating;
- d) be available to attend educational seminars.

2. Assignment of OAC members for specific ISU Events

- 2.1. For the Single & Pair Skating, Ice Dance and Synchronized Skating ISU Events, the Vice President Figure Skating shall assign at least two OAC Pool members for Single and Pair Skating, two OAC Pool members for Ice Dance and two OAC Pool members for Synchronized Skating. Each member can be assigned to more than one discipline of the same event. The assignment of the OAC Pool members shall be kept strictly confidential and can be communicated to third parties only with the written approval and/or decision of the ISU.
- 2.2. If possible, at least one of the assigned OAC members for Single & Pair Skating, one of the OAC members for Ice Dance and one of the OAC members for Synchronized Skating should have acted as an OAC member before.
- 2.3. The ISU Office will administratively assist the OAC as required.

3. OAC members rules of conduct / Reimbursement

- 3.1. For the season 2026/27, the designated OAC members will perform their duty from their home for the Junior Grand Prix and Grand Prix, for the Grand Prix Final and ISU Championships the OAC members will perform their duty on-site.
- 3.2. The OAC members must keep all data made available to them **strictly confidential** and may not make any comments or give any information related to their work at any time, except when specifically, and formally requested by the respective Technical Committee, the Head of Officials Figure Skating, the Vice President Figure Skating or the Director General.
- 3.3. OAC Pool members must not act in any other capacity at the events for which they have been assigned to act as an OAC member.
- 3.4. OAC Pool members may not accept any appointment to act as OAC member in any ISU Event in which a family member is officiating as an Official and in which any Skater with whom or with whose Coach the OAC Pool member has a family relationship or is working with might participate.
- 3.5. Remuneration for OAC will be set out in a separate Communication.

4. Evaluation Procedure and Report

4.1. As soon as possible after the conclusion of the respective ISU Event the assigned OAC members will receive the following evaluation materials:

- Electronic documents including the Grades of Execution (GOEs) of every element and the Program Component scores of all Judges.
- Electronic documents highlighting the cases of evaluation based on the criteria outlined in the supplementary materials below and under paragraph F) below;
- Excel sheets indicating cases of evaluation;
- Electronic documents of statistical grids highlighting cases of possible (national) bias which are based on a mathematical calculation of the percentage difference between / each Judge's total score for one Competitor (Single Skater, Pair, Ice Dance Couple, Synchronized Skating Team) and his total scores for the two Competitors who, in the official result of the respective segment, are placed immediately above and for the two Competitors placed immediately below that Competitor.
- Video recording of the competition;
- Other supplementary materials, as decided by the respective Technical Committee. These materials are not limited to the following but will include highlights for Grade of Execution and Program Component Scores that are not according to the rules. The OAC members will receive in addition statistical tools on Program Component Scores showing the range of scores used by each judge in each component and the variance between the Program Component Scores of all the 3 component scores of each skater.
- In addition, materials from the Maelstrom Analytics Judging Evaluation Platform will be provided.

4.2. The OAC members must review the evaluation materials, consult each other and prepare a joint report within 21 days after receipt of the evaluation materials.

4.3. The OAC members must review all scores identified as cases of evaluation as described in paragraph 6. below and/or as cases of possible (national) bias and/or undue favoritism. The OAC members shall also evaluate and indicate errors, scores not highlighted on the electronic documents as per paragraph 6. which they consider as unjustifiable based on their own judgement and/or supplementary materials, statistical tools and Maelstrom Analytics judging reports provided to the OAC.

4.4. The OAC members shall also review the individual Judges' scores and identify irregularities which reveal possible violations of the ISU Code of Ethics, in particular any bias, but also any type of undue favouritism.

- 4.5. The evaluation of the OAC shall be based exclusively on the evaluation materials as per paragraph 4.1 and its own observations. The OAC may not use any other data sources or take into account any other information and input of third parties unless specifically approved by the ISU Council for their work.
- 4.6. The report of the OAC shall include:
- a) The opinion of the OAC members on whether the scores in identified cases of evaluation as per paragraph 6. are correct or at least acceptable. OAC will include their score on such cases in the report.
 - b) GOE or Program Component scores which the OAC considers to be errors despite not being identified as cases of evaluation according to paragraph 6.
 - c) The opinion of the OAC members on whether highlighted cases of possible (national) bias actually do reflect (national) bias.
 - d) Observations of irregularities in the scores of individual Judges which the OAC members consider indicating violations of the ISU Code of Ethics, in particular bias, lack of impartiality, neutrality and honesty, manipulation of the competition by using unfair strategies or undue favouritism.
 - e) The report may contain additional comments on other subjects, such as rule violations, misbehaviour of the Referee etc.

5. Processing of OAC reports

- 5.1. OAC reports including the evaluation material shall be made available by the appointed OAC members to the respective Technical Committee through the ISU Office without delay, but latest 21 days after the end of the concerned competition.
- 5.2. The respective Technical Committee shall evaluate the OAC reports as soon as possible. Between their meetings, the Technical Committees shall communicate through e-mail, conference calls or video conferences. In case of disagreement between the OAC and the respective Technical Committee on the determination of certain errors, the matter shall be conveyed to the Vice President Figure Skating who takes the final decision.
- 5.3. If the respective Technical Committee identifies anomalies in Judges' scores which the OAC members have not evaluated, it shall inform the ISU Vice President Figure Skating who shall decide whether these anomalies are to be considered as errors and/or (national) bias.
- 5.4. After the evaluation process of the OAC and the review by the Technical Committee, the errors exceeding in number the maximum of acceptable errors, will be registered by the respective Technical Committee in a dedicated database under the responsibility of and managed by the Head of Officials Figure Skating at the ISU Office.

5.5. The number of acceptable errors per segment is based on the number of Competitors (Single Skaters, Pairs, Ice Dance Couples, Synchronized Skating Teams) per segment, as follows:

Up to 10 Competitors:	1 error
From 11 to 20 Competitors:	2 errors
From 21 to 30 Competitors:	3 errors
From 31 to 40 Competitors:	4 errors
More than 40 Competitors	5 errors

5.6. When a Judge has accumulated 4 or more registered errors but less than 20 during the season, will result in a review by the Technical Committee with the involvement of the Head of Officials Figure Skating for whether a Letter of Advice, Letter of Warning or Assessment shall be issued or not. During this review, the following non-exhaustive list of circumstances shall be taken into consideration:

- The number of segments in which the errors were accumulated
- The number of errors accumulated in each segment
- The severity of the errors.

If the number of registered errors is 20 or more, an Assessment will be issued automatically without delay.

5.7. If after having received an Assessment, the same Judge accumulates 20 or more additional errors during the term of validity of the respective Assessment, the Technical Committee with the involvement of and the Head of Officials Figure Skating will review for a possible additional Assessment. The additional errors will be evaluated in the same manner as stated in paragraph 4.

5.8. In cases of especially grave error(s), the Technical Committee with the involvement of the Head of Officials Figure Skating may decide on an Assessment regardless of the total number of registered error(s).

5.9. All Letters of Advice, Letters of Warning and Assessment are subject to a review and approval of the ISU Vice President Figure Skating. All such letters shall be sent to the concerned official with a copy to his/her ISU Member as well as the ISU Vice President Figure Skating and the Head of Officials Figure Skating.

5.10. Cases identified as (national) bias or indication of (national) bias shall be handled in accordance with Rule 440 paragraph 1 of the Sport Rules for Single & Pair Skating and Ice Dance and respectively Rule 838, paragraph 1 of the Sport Rules Synchronized Skating.

5.11. Decisions on possible Letter of Advice, Letter of Warning or Assessment, shall be taken continuously as warranted during the season and sent out from the ISU Office without delay.

5.12. The Technical Committees shall by May 25 of each year prepare and submit to the Vice President Figure Skating, with a copy to the Head of Officials Figure Skating, a report with a summary of all Letters of Advice, Letters of Warning and Assessments that have been issued during the season.

6. Criteria for the identification of cases of evaluation in the Judges' GOEs and Program Components scores

6.1. Method of Calculating the Range of Grade of Execution (GOE)

- a) For each element performed the computer calculates the average GOE of all the Judges. The GOEs awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- b) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and each Judge's GOEs which results in so called "Deviation Points".
- c) If the Deviation Points of an element for a Judge is more than 2.0 points, the GOEs of that Judge for that element will constitute a case of evaluation.

The respective deviation points will be indicated on the Judges protocol sheets provided to the OAC for evaluation. In the example below, the GOE of Judge A for the element 7 has to be evaluated.

Example	Average GOE	GOEs of Judge A	Deviation Points
Element 1	1.8	1.0	0.8
Element 2	-2.1	-4.0	1.9
Element 3	0.0	-2.0	2.0
Element 4	0.8	1.0	0.2
Element 5	-1.0	0.0	1.0
Element 6	0.4	2.0	1.6
Element 7	2.2	0.0	2.2

- d) In addition, the out of consensus element marks and the element accuracy judging reports from the Maelstrom Analytics Judging Evaluation Platform might be used to help identify cases of evaluation.

6.2. Method of Calculating the Range of Program Components scores

- a) For each Program Component, the computer calculates the average scores of all the Judges. The Program Components scores awarded by the Referee are NOT used in this calculation.
- b) The computer then calculates the difference between the "calculated average" and the judges Program Components scores which results in "Deviation Points"

- c) The Total Deviation points for each Judge will be added to provide a Total Net Deviation Points (+ and - deviation points compensate each other) based on all Program Components totalled.
- d) Total Net Deviation Points must not exceed 4.5

The respective deviation points will be indicated on the Judges protocol sheets provided to the OAC for evaluation.

Example:

	Average Component Score	Component Scores of Judge A	Deviation Points in Minuses	Deviation Points in Pluses	Total Net Deviation Points
Composition	5.75	4.00	- 1.75		
Presentation	5.85	4.00	- 1.85		
Skating Skills	3.50	7.00		+3.50	
Deviation Points in Minuses			-3.60		
Deviation Points in Pluses				+ 3.50	
Total Net Deviation Points					0.10**

**No Need for Evaluation

- e) In addition, the out of consensus component marks and the components accuracy judging reports from the Maelstrom Analytics Judging Evaluation Platform might be used to help identify cases of evaluation.

7. National Bias

- 7.1. A separate sub-group of the OAC will evaluate possible national bias (sub-group on National Bias).
- 7.2. As the method for identifying possible national bias, the Maelstrom Analytics Judging Evaluation Platform will identify same-nation or other nation marks having a large positive or negative discrepancy. The threshold is set at 1%. The platform will identify judges with a statistically significant national bias, either over a single competition, or over multiple competitions taken together.
- 7.3. The sub-group on National Bias will review the cases of evaluation as identified by the Judging Evaluation Platform and will either confirm or reject the initial assessment. The sub-group of the OAC will send the report to the Head of Officials Figure Skating at the ISU Office, to be registered in the dedicated database. The ISU Vice President Figure Skating will approve a Letter of Advice, Letter of Warning or Assessment.

8. Cases of Evaluation of Judges Behavior

The respective Technical Committee shall further examine any reported critical observation of the Judges' behavior which indicates a disciplinary/ethical violation. The Vice President Figure Skating and the Head of Officials Figure Skating shall be informed of any such examination being undertaken by the respective Technical Committee. If the respective Technical Committee finds a reported critical behavior to constitute a serious disciplinary/ethical violation or in case of repeated disciplinary/ethical violations it shall submit the case to the ISU Integrity Unit. In case of a less serious disciplinary/ethical violation, the Vice President Figure Skating can issue a Letter of Warning according to Rule 440, paragraph 9, respectively Rule 838, paragraph 7.

9. Evaluation of judging at International Competitions not covered by the OAC

In International Competitions not covered by the OAC, no systematic evaluation of Judges GOEs and Program Components scores takes place. However, the Referee of such International Competitions shall include in the report, if in the Referee's opinion, a Judge has made serious errors in GOEs and/or Program Component scores. For the purpose of establishing what constitutes serious errors, the Referee shall use the criteria for the identification of cases of evaluation (para 6. above) as approximate guidelines. Respective reports must be based on the "Judges detail sheets", which are published at the end of each segment of a competition. The respective Technical Committee shall review reports on especially grave or multiple serious errors, and send a report to the Vice President Figure Skating, with a copy to the Head of Officials Figure Skating. The Vice President Figure Skating shall decide depending on the severity of the error whether a Letter of Advice or Letter of Warning shall be issued. All such letters shall be sent to the concerned official with a copy to his/her ISU Member as well as the ISU Vice President Figure Skating and the Head of Officials Figure Skating.

10. Evaluation of the decisions of the Technical Panel and of the decisions of/conduct of competition by the Referee at ISU Events

The evaluation of the above-mentioned decisions relating to the Technical Panel and the Referee are regulated in the Sport Rules, Rule 440, paragraph 3 and Sport Rules Synchronized Skating, Rule 868, paragraph 2.

August 3, 2026

Jae Youl Kim, President

Colin Smith, Director General