

# Profi competition

## Aircraft categories

MODEL NUMBER: .....  
 MODEL NAME: .....  
 TOTAL SCORE: .....

JUDGES:  
 Judge 1 .....  
 Judge 2 .....  
 Judge 3 .....



POINTS ARE AWARDED IN A GIVEN CATEGORY ON THE BASIS OF COMPARING THE SELECTED FEATURE/SUBCATEGORY FOR ALL MODELS ENTERED IN A GIVEN COMPETITION CLASS. JUDGES MAY NOT REFER TO AN "UBER-MODEL" THAT IS NOT ON THE TABLE.

PAR.	CATEGORY	TOTAL POINTS	POINTS AWARDED	COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS
1.	<b>DOCUMENTATION</b>	6		<b>THIS IS THE BASIS FOR THE WORK OF THE JURY. IN THE ABSENCE OF DOCUMENTATION, THE MODEL IS AUTOMATICALLY DISQUALIFIED. Documentation should be prepared only in paper version, and should include the following:</b>
1.1	Abbreviated description of presented model	1		Abbreviated description of presented model – scope of works, changes beyond the box, paint scheme, list of aftermarket items used. Up to one A4-size page written with eg. 10pt Arial font including references to graphics in further sections of documentation.
1.2	Kit instructions + aftermarket instructions + photos of scratch-built items.	1		The modeller is to clearly indicate which parts of the basic kit were used/updated/replaced, e.g. marked-up portion of cockpit with note „resin set used for tub and seat replacement“.
1.3	Set of plans to be used as geometry reference (not detailing).	1		Allowing ascertaining proper geometry of the model – in case of doubts about e.g. symmetry irregularities.
1.4	Photos and drawings documenting key and unusual details	1		This should guide judges through key points of the model – it is up to the modeller how to present his/hers work so the judges look and appreciate the proper facet of the effort
1.5	Photos of exact article represented by the model	1		This is to assess compliance of paint scheme and weathering (broadly speaking) with the original subject. If there are points common throughout the type – modeller to pick several photos confirming the occurrence + provide written (short) reasoning.
1.6	Compliance of documentation with above criteria – care for quality of judges work	1		Documentation should be brief and to the point, devoided of any extras. This means excerpts from books – not whole book with bookmarks. Clear links within documentation, brief and clear descriptions. If the documentation is too large, judges – within limited time frame available – may not be able to find relevant information that influence scoring. It is the modelers' business to prepare documentation in such way that judges are able to honestly judge the model. Ok, c'mon – you spend weeks and months building a award-winning model – you easily can spend few hours more getting the documentation right.
2.	<b>DIFFICULTY POSED BY PRESENTED SUBJECT</b>	10		In this section, the judges will get acquainted with the modeler's intentions, so that in the subsequent sections, he can assess the effect of his work, or how difficult a task the modeler set for himself. We will evaluate it in the next paragraph, now the complexity of models on the table during the competition is determined. <b>THIS IS NOT AN EVALUATION OF MODEL COMPLEXITY OR TECHNOLOGIES USED DURING THE BUILD – IN THE SENSE OF QUANTITY OF USED AFTERMARKETS OR THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MODEL BEING BUILT AS READY TO FLY AND THE ONE DURING MAINTENANCE WORK.</b> The influence of the complexity of the original structure on the modeler's workload and implementation difficulties during model construction is assessed.
2.1	Inherent complication of subject	3		The complexity of the airframe geometry, i.e. the number of wings or rotors, tail booms – things that make it difficult to maintain the correct geometry of the model
2.2	Wealth of external features/equipment	3		Number and complexity of engines, additional equipment – suspended and fixed, antennas and other add-ons, etc. E.g. DH Comet's four jet engines buried within the wing are a tad different as one piston Mercedes protruding with all the guts at the tip of some Albatross.
2.3	Number and exposure of crew stations, glazing	2		Again – B-52 can have 10 crew members, but when compared to TB-3 ...
2.4	Fragility / openwork	2		E.g. advanced control surfaces – multi-section flaps, open framework of fuselage, complicated undercarriage, spiders-web of wires etc.
3.	<b>CLEANLINESS OF ASSEMBLY AND GEOMETRY PRESERVATION</b>	13		This point is about the „modeller abc“ – in other words, a correctly built model from a box. Any major modifications will be assessed in paragraph 4.
3.1	Geometry	4		Assessed according to plans supplied by modeller (symmetry, straightness...)
3.2	Overall neatness and tidyness	5		E.g. no glue stains, filing marks, fingerprints, the more invisible puttywork the better
3.3	Recreation of lost panel lines	1		Coherence with panel lines existing already on the kit, tidyness of work.
3.4	Transparencies	2		Assessed opacity and cleanliness of assembly.
3.5	Repair marks kept invisible	1		Last minute damage reported to judges will be omitted in scoring.
3.6	Dust	-1		Undusted model loses a single point
4.	<b>IMPROVEMENTS OF BASIC KIT</b>	21		The improvements need to be coherent with supplied documentation. It is a strip-down for training – <b>great</b> . If this is strip-down for daily maintenance – <b>great</b> . If this is strip-down for repair or build – <b>great</b> . If this is strip-down for a reason never substantiated by real life – <b>no good</b> (unless you can show appropriate photos to back this up). The improvements should be judicious and justifiable – no use replacing good plastic part with resin just for the sake of replacing.
4.1	Surface detail quality	3		Justified re-scribing, added riveting, represented deformations
4.2	Fragility of details (to-scale factor)	2		Appropriately thin and to-scale probes, antennas, links, gear struts, oleos made of steel and not painted etc.
4.3	Making model 'alive' a mechanical sense (achieved in a different way than by painting)	4		E.g. thinning the trailing edges of wings/fins, edges of engine nozzles or other openings, hollowing air intakes, deflection of control surfaces, shutters, etc.
4.4	Opened inspection/service hatches	2		Regular service hatches only. This does not apply to stripped skin.
4.5	Enhancement level of basic kit	4		Estimate of updates, upgrades and enhancements. For scratch-built parts 100% of points available, for aftermarket upgrades – 75% points available. See also notes for par. 4.6
4.6	Scope and sensibility of contribution and complication: added step ladder vs full cabling and cradle to the engine vs conversion to different version of airplane.	6		Recap on 4.1-4.6. Judges asses workmanship required and scope of improvements made. E.g. representing surface panel deformations is more complex and time consuming than inserting brass aftermarket pilots. Replacement of good kit cockpit with marginally better resin – <b>no good</b> . Artificial strip-down of parts that would have never been stripped under normal (documented) situation – <b>no good</b> . Adding new elements that disturb the logic of presentation for the sake of adding more new elements – <b>no good</b> . Inconsistent detailing across the model – <b>no good</b> .
5.	<b>PAINTING: SURFACE QUALITY</b>	10		
5.1	Quality of the painted surface	6		Smudging, uneven density, roughness, orange peel, overflow etc. – no visible defects of painted surfaces should be awarded. The method of preparing the base for metallics and achieved realistic "metal made" effect. Getting a realistic and smooth glossy surface – level of sheen should be appropriate to the scale.
5.2	Application of decals or painted markings	4		Decals without silvering or creases, blended with surrounding surface etc.
6.	<b>PAINTING: COMPLIANCE WITH THE DOCUMENTATION</b>	26		
6.1	Difficulty of selected paint work	9		Standard kit instructed uniform multi-color cammo vs single base color enhanced by researched touch-ups, panel variation, glossiness variation, material variation. Creating illusion of scaled down real object is at premium, so is staying away from doctrines/fashions/trends. Judges should be sensitive to "way of doing things" attitude seen in the model instead of real attempt to represent effects depicted in documentation.
6.2	Compliance of geometry and colors	3		See paragraphs e) and f).
6.3	Diversification of sheen and opaqueness of the whole structure and its individual elements	3		Irregularity of surface structure and diversity of materials (the sheen looks different on canvas than on metal). Deviations from currently applicable laws of physics (e.g. high-gloss, pink tires) must be documented.
6.4	Conformity of the user-specific markings	1		See paragraphs e) and f).
6.5	Conformity of stenciling	2		See paragraphs e) and f).
6.6	Traces of exploitation such as dirt or signs of wear	8		Smoke stains, scratches, discoloration, streaks, mud stains, etc.; see also notes to paragraph 6.1. The following aspects are assessed: compliance with the laws of physics; technical quality of performance and the realism of the presentation. Deviations from the laws of physics (e.g. "upward" streaks on structural elements) must be documented.
7.	<b>BASE</b>	3		
7.1	Aesthetics	1		In other words: if there is a base other than a mirror, a piece of plexiglass, chopping board or picture frame – one that had to be made, arranged – then a point is scored.
7.2	Value added to overall presentation	2		Full points if no major issues. If evident non-sense is represented (e.g. pilot in full flight harness in cockpit and wing skin removed for presentation purposes) – points can be subtracted.
8.	<b>COHERENCE AND ILLUSION OF REALITY</b>	11		
8.1	Composition of presentation	3		Clever, resourcefull, uncliched, good looking, well composed presentation earns points. Additionally enhanced by fabular imprints. The rules of aesthetics apply, it is also permissible to break them in a <b>conscious</b> way.
8.2	Not-a-plastic-kit-toy	4		The more the model convinces to be scaled down real thing the better.
8.3	Unconventional approach to the subject	4		The recipient's interest in the subject of the work is rewarded – even the quite common Bf 109 can be presented in an unusual and interesting way.

### Notes and tips regarding the judging process in the Profi scoring competition at the Wrocław Model Show:

- The work of the judges' committees starts with getting acquainted with the documentation provided with the submitted models – the one-page description of the model is the most important (see paragraph 1.1 above).
- Documentation for the model should be delivered only in paper form and prepared in such a way as to facilitate the work of the judges. A description of the content of the documentation can be found above (see paragraphs 1.1-1.6 above).
- The judges agree upon points awarded in the process of sharing a conversation with fellow judges.
- In case of a rather average level reported in a given class, there may be exceptions to the rule described above – to be agreed with the organizer.
- If the documentation provided is not complete or generates doubts, the judges may rely on their own knowledge or briefly check the issue on the Internet. The selection of proceedings remains the responsibility of the judges. We assume that there are no experts in any field and specialization among the judges. We also assume that the appointment to the judges' commission does not take place on the basis of judge's teeth check-up – the persons selected to perform this function have appropriate knowledge plus analysis and conversations skills that allow them to judiciously and culturally assess, discuss and balance the meaning of the components of the model. We assume that the modeller should take care of preparing the materials to allow the judges to work. If he does not do it, he can not claim a judgment against his expectations later.
- In the event that a particular construction or marking detail is not explicitly documented (a legible photo of the original or a legible photo / drawing of a construction detail is not available / unknown), an estimate of the characteristic (educated guess) is allowed, but only that which has been based on available materials concerning a given structure / user / period in time or general knowledge and are presented clearly and legibly in the documentation presented with the model.
- If during the work of the committee a significant dispute arises within the commission, the problem with interpretation of the regulations or after summarizing the initially granted points there will be evident doubts – the chairman of the commission is obliged to consult the Wrocław Model Show organizers.
- Each member of the jury will receive a referee card to use as draft. Each committee will also receive a scorecard for which it will make a final, agreed score. This card is archived and is presented next to the model on the second day of the event, so that everyone interested can see the detailed scoring.
- The sample scoring card containing all assessment categories together with the comments will be made public with the start of registration of the models for the competition.
- The sample documentation of the model submitted for the competition will be made public with the start of registration of the models for the competition (on the website www.wroclawmodelshow.pl).
- This list has been prepared to speed up and streamline the work of the jury and to increase awareness of modelers regarding the work of the judges' committees.