



FEPA Jury Seminar 2014

Berlin

10th to 12th October

Estrel Hotel

Partnering with



Training Overview

Location	Hotel Meeting Room + Lobby (exhibit display)
Date	11th October 2014, approx. 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.
Exhibit Classes	Postal History and Thematic Philately
Keynote Speakers	Dr. Wolf Heß (Postal History) Vojtech Jankovic (Thematic Philately)
Lead topics	
Postal History:	Treatment and Importance – Are there correlating factors with other judging criteria?
Thematic Philately:	How to judge innovation – “Why is this item in this exhibit?”
Schedule	9 a.m. kick-off, introduction to training 9.15 a.m. keynote presentations 10.30 a.m. start of group phase, exhibits presentations 11.30 a.m. judging of exhibits in teams 2 p.m. wrap-up of judging, group discussion, ppt summary 4 p.m. end of group phase 4.30 p.m. summary presentations of groups, general discussion 5.30 p.m. wrap-up of training, assessment of group leaders, conclusions 6 p.m. end of training
Lunch	approx. 1 p.m., snacks and drinks (Hotel Lobby)
Coffee	approx. 4 p.m., (Hotel Lobby)
Dinner	approx. 7 p.m.

Nr.	Title	Frames / Sheets	Exhibitor / Presenter
1	Postgeschichte HAMBURG - Die Entwicklung der Stadtpost bis 1867	7 / 84	Thomas Hoepfner
2	Freistempel der Schweiz	8 / 128	Per Friis Mortensen
3	Bulgaria - Post Offices of Royal Palaces & Royal Mail 1886 - 1946	5 / 80	Boncho Bonev
4	Cuba - "The Triangular Trade" - 1764 to 1877	8 / 120	Dr. Wolf Heß
5	Large Hermes Heads of Greece 1861–1867 and Combination Frankings	8 / 128	Wolfgang Bauer
6	Prussia as the main link of the Russian-polish mail with the west	8 / 120	Karlfried Krauß

Exhibit 3 was not available

Judging Results Postal History

FEPA Jury Seminar 2014
Berlin

HAMBURG	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Cons.
Treatment	18	18	17	18
Importance	9	8	8	8
Knowledge	31	32	30	31
Cond+Rarity	27	27	27	27
Presentation	5	5	4	5
Total	90	90	86	89

Schweiz	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Cons.
Treatment	18	17	14	14
Importance	7	7	7	7
Knowledge	30	32	29	29
Cond+Rarity	25	25	22	22
Presentation	5	4	3	3
Total	85	85	75	75

Bulgaria	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Cons.
Treatment				
Importance				
Knowledge				
Cond+Rarity				
Presentation				
Total				

Cuba	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Cons.
Treatment	19	18	17	18
Importance	9	8	9	9
Knowledge	32	33	34	33
Cond+Rarity	27	27	27	27
Presentation	4	4	4	4
Total	91	90	91	91

Judging Results Postal History

FEPA Jury Seminar 2014
Berlin

Greece	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Cons.
Treatment	19	18	18	17
Importance	9	9	10	9
Knowledge	34	34	32	32
Cond+Rarity	28	29	30	29
Presentation	3	3	4	3
Total	93	93	94	90

Prussia	Team 1	Team 2	Team 3	Cons.
Treatment	18	17	19	18
Importance	9	8	9	9
Knowledge	34	33	35	33
Cond+Rarity	27	26	28	27
Presentation	4	4	4	4
Total	92	88	95	91

Training Results Postal History

Lead topic

Treatment and Importance – Are there correlating factors with other judging criteria?

- “right” balance between too much and too little content on exhibit pages is essential; guide through the exhibit by headers, have a brief intro on the top of each page or the start of a new chapter
- Avoid overcrowding of pages, reduce texts, leave out unnecessary (unimportant) details and illustrations of cover backsides (Prussia exhibit)
- Distinction between sub-class 2C and other sub-classes: Depending on the theme and treatment, including illustrations and non-philatelic material does not automatically make an exhibit class 2C (HAMBURG exhibit, this is not sub-class 2C)
- Sub-class 2C: Theme has to be suitable for this class; how much non-philatelic material? 50% rule (???) cannot be strictly applied, it needs to be properly incorporated and strictly connected to the theme
- Importance is decided first of all by the theme (subject, timeframe etc.); influencing the importance is best done by a clever, in-depth and innovative treatment and also showing brilliant knowledge; in certain cases it can also help to include material such as incoming mail (example: Heimatsammlung of a small town with letters from emigrants back to their hometown)
- our opinion is that additional points in rarity must not increase points in treatment

Exhibits Thematic Philately

FEPA Jury Seminar 2014
Berlin

Nr.	Title	Frames / Sheets	Exhibitor / Presenter
7	LUFT (U / unter) DRUCK	7 / 84	Dr. Wolf Heß
8	My Life as a Bicycle	8 / 128	Vojtech Jankovic
9	The Tiger To Pet - The House Cat Between Predator And Cuddly Animal	7 / 84	Angelika Dunda-Schubert
10	Kinder - Kinder... "Die ersten 10 Lebensjahre"	8 / 128	Albrecht Zimmermann
11	Women in Sports	5 / 80	Ivan Trancik / Vojtech Jankovic
12	Horse Racing and Riding Sport	5 / 80	Igor Banas / Vojtech Jankovic

Exhibits 10 + 11 were not available, instead the exhibit "Woman in Space" was displayed

Judging Results Thematic Philately

FEPA Jury Seminar 2014
Berlin

Luft ...	Team 4	Team 5	Cons.
Treatment	32	33	32
Knowledge	25	26	26
Cond+Rarity	24	24	24
Presentation	4	4	4
Total	85	87	86

Bicycle	Team 4	Team 5	Cons.
Treatment	32	31	31
Knowledge	27	27	27
Cond+Rarity	27	27	27
Presentation	4	4	4
Total	90	89	89

Tiger to Pet	Team 4	Team 5	Cons.
Treatment	27	27	27
Knowledge	25	25	25
Cond+Rarity	24	25	25
Presentation	4	4	4
Total	80	81	81

Horse Racing	Team 4	Team 5	Cons.
Treatment	24	22	23
Knowledge	22	22	22
Cond+Rarity	25	20	23
Presentation	4	4	4
Total	75	68	72

Judging Results Thematic Philately

FEPA Jury Seminar 2014
Berlin

Woman in Space	Team 4	Team 5	Cons.
Treatment	27	28	27
Knowledge	24	23	23
Cond+Rarity	24	22	23
Presentation	4	4	4
Total	78	77	77

	Team 4	Team 5	Cons.
Treatment			
Knowledge			
Cond+Rarity			
Presentation			
Total			

Training Results Thematic Philately

Lead topic

How to judge innovation – “Why is this item in this exhibit?”

- Innovation was treated with more accent mainly as an integral part of all treatment evaluation criteria.
- Title is the hardest part of the exhibit, should be re-thought carefully possibly as the last thing when everything else is almost done. Clear title helps much to both jurors and visitors. If unclear (or even tricky) title is proposed, jurors have problems to understand and often tend to deduct points for title and plan criterion.
- Subtitle is highly recommended, even for chapters and subchapters to explain clearly the contents and thus help jurors (and of course visitors) to better understand the exhibit as a whole (good example LUFT (U / unter) DRUCK).
- Several samples of “general” items not closely related to the page topic were found. Every single item in a thematic exhibit should be revised whether it is specific enough and fits to textual description on a page – important aspect thematic treatment where exhibitor may get/lose points.

Final remark: There are still some differences between jurors, so permanent training devoted to alignment in scoring consistency are still necessary. Not only theory, but praxis!

