



Fachbereich
Völkerrecht
Europarecht
Grundlagen des Rechts

Ao. Univ.-Prof. i.R.
Dr. Michael Geistlinger

Churfürststraße 1
5010 Salzburg
Austria - Europe

Tel.: +43 / (0) 676 5352622
Fax.: +43 / (0) 6457 300713
Michael.geistlinger@plus.ac.at
www.uni-salzburg.at

Private: A-5542 Flachau, Wastlgasse 252

Salzburg/Flachau, 15 December 2025

Independent Report on the 2025 iF3 Masters World Championships in Brisbane, Australia, November 21st – 23rd, 2025

1. Introductory Remarks:

The International Functional Fitness Federation (“iF3”) has assigned the 2025 iF3 Masters World Championships (“the Event”) to its Australian Member, the Australian Functional Fitness Federation (“AFFF”). The AFFF’s president, Ms Mele Robinson, has been Vice President of the iF3 at the time of assignment of the Event, in the preparatory phase of the Event and all the time through when she has been the president of the Local Organizing Committee („LOC”) until closure of the Event. Ms Robinson resigned from her positions as iF3 Vice President and AFFF president as did the AFFF’s Secretary General, Mr Anthony Rogers, from his function, both after the closure of the Event.

The fact that Ms Robinson has been Vice President of the iF3 explains why the iF3 President, Ms Gretchen Kittelberger, the iF3 General Secretary, Mr Laurent Selleslaghs, the iF3 Treasurer, Mr Brenton Stone and the Executive Board Member, HRH Prince Khaled bin Alwaleed bin Talal Al Saud, could trust that the Event would be prepared according to the requirements and standards for such event set up by the iF3. These requirements and standards are laid down in the 2025 International Functional Fitness Masters World Championships Hosting Agreement (“the Hosting Agreement”), which has been submitted to Ms Robinson for signature on April 18th, 2025. Ms Robinson submitted a Final Report as per para 13 of the Hosting Agreement.

2. Date, Place, Time of the Event, Program and Participation

This report follows, as far as reasonable and feasible, the order of the Hosting Agreement.

There were obviously no issues concerning the date, time and place of the Event. The Event took place in Brisbane on the scheduled dates (November 21st – 23rd, 2025). It was structured as required by the General Competition Rulebook and Standards for Internationally Sanctioned Competitions in

Functional Fitness with the aim to find the most well rounded athlete. Athletes were intended to complete in 6 different events, called tests, and to be ranked against each other based on finishing order. Individual athletes were set to be tested in the categories of Endurance, Strength, Bodyweight, Skill, Mixed, and Power. The highest performer cumulatively, across all tests, should have been declared the overall winner.

There have been issues, however, with regard to the Pre-Event-Planning Period, the Programming, the Equipment and Venue Set-up, the Technical Officials and Judging, the Service Provider Circle21 and the Score cards. Scheduling inefficiencies caused extended athlete wait times.

2.1 Pre-Event Planning Period

The Pre-Event Planning process did not conform to the iF3's typically planning process. Instead of monthly planning calls all year leading up to the event, with calls every 1-2 weeks in the final month, due to other urgent obligations of the iF3 and non-availability of Ms Robinson, only informal planning conversation occurred via Facebook Messenger from around May 2025 through the Event between the iF3 Executive Board Members. The LOC did not request any meetings with the iF3 prior to the iF3 beginning to request meetings. Ms Robinson having canceled several set meetings leading up to the Event due to other commitments and conflicts with other events she was running, let only one formal Masters Worlds Planning Call occur on October 28th, 2025. Ms Robinson was the only member of the LOC to attend the call. The Head Technical Official did not attend any planning meetings nor did any other members of the planning team.

Recommendation: Within 30 days after signing the Host Agreement the LOC should be obliged by inclusion of a respective provision into the standard iF3 Hosting Agreement to present itself and the roles fulfilled by its individual members, the site, programme, equipment, floor plan, staffing and logistics at a virtual site visit using live cameras and going over several hours. The site visit should be recorded and followed-up by an iF3 Executive Board member specifically put in charge for that task. Considering that there are five iF3 Executive Board members and on average 5 events to be run by the iF3 per year, each of the Executive Board members could take the responsibility for monitoring one event. The virtual site visit could also serve to ensure the LOC is actually robust enough to handle organization and management of the Event and sufficient budget and staffing provided.

2.2 Budget and Staffing

The AFFF was financially responsible for the execution of the Event. According to para 10 of the Hosting Agreement, the AFFF had to submit a proposed budget for the Event to the iF3 within 60 days of signing this agreement. The purpose of this obligation has been to assist the iF3 and the AFFF in establishing the expected quality standards for the Event. As can be seen from the „Lessons Learned“, prepared by the AFFF Secretary General after the conclusion of the Event, there was no budget established at all. This fact led to unexpected expenses, the need for individuals to step in with self-funding and severe understaffing.

Had the fact that only 8 Technical Officials (“TO’s”) would be on site, many of whom were also covering other roles or were inexperienced, been known to the iF3 in advance as required by para 7 of the Hosting Agreement, it would have been clear that the Event would not be run properly. Typically an event of this size would require 20-30 TO’s. No scoring team was in place and as a result the LOC president and the iF3 president had to perform scoring duties all weekend.

The iF3 did not have experience with the Head Technical Official assigned to this event. Typically the iF3 selects the Head Technical Official for its competitions, the travel expenses to be covered by the LOC. However, in this case the LOC did not have the funds to cover the travel expenses for the Head TO

the iF3 wanted to select and selected a local Head TO instead. This Head TO had never been involved in an iF3 event, was not knowledgeable of the iF3 Movement Standards, had not reviewed the iF3 Test Announcement documents thoroughly and had to confer with the iF3 President several times to discuss the appropriate Movement Standards. The score cards prepared by the Head TO were inadequate to track athlete scores effectively and accurately.

Even if it may well be that there were Head Judges from the Oceania Judges Syndicate, highly trained and consistent professionals, the MC one of the best MCs in the industry, the DJs very efficient and a paid paramedic and additional trained first-aid personnel on site as well as sufficient food and hydration supply for day 1 and day 2 provided, the staff was not sufficient for two simultaneous floors as admitted by the AFFF Secretary General. A "paramedical" certainly is not a "medical" as required by para 7 u) of the Hosting Agreement, even luckily there were only two injuries throughout the Event. The AFFF Secretary General reported that, whereas two medical staff per floor should have been assigned, only one medical was there, which was insufficient to cover concurrent floors and led to delayed response capability and elevated safety risks.

Other staff pulled out before the Event began including the Live Stream provider. This left the LOC without a broadcast team. The LOC purchased two phones, tripods, and a gimbal to set up basic static coverage using the platform they had been preparing. However, on-floor problems that arose made it impossible for media or technical teams to establish, test, or stabilise the backup stream and the LOC to set up even a minimal, reliable broadcast. As a consequence people were left with only the German broadcast which the LOC shared and tried to make work for everyone the best they could.

Recommendation:

The Hosting Agreement should be amended so that the budget shall be submitted by the Host of an event to the iF3 prior to the virtual site visit. In addition, at the same time, the Head TO shall be determined by the iF3 and the coverage of his/her travel expenses shown in the LOC's budget. The Head TO shall be part of the virtual site visit. At the same time as the budget, the number and quality of staff shall be specified and the staff presented at the virtual site visit. For the details, the Hosting Agreement should refer to a competition playbook, which obviously is in the process of being finalized by the iF3. This competition playbook should, inter alia, delineate what roles and staff positions need to be filled at an event, but also advise LOCs to conclude firm contracts with service providers (live stream, broadcast, supply of equipment, etc), which avoid the president of an LOC to drive a truck herself instead of a broken truck and accept an email of withdrawal of a live stream provider two weeks before the Event without obligation of substitution or at least contract penalty.

2.3 Programming

The AFFF had agreed with the iF3, that the AFFF would prepare the first draft of the test programming with review by the iF3 Programming Committee. However, despite several requests to receive the programming, which should have been given to the iF3 at least 3 months in advance, the iF3 did not receive the programming draft until October 22nd, 2025. This did not leave any time for the Programming Committee to see or review the programming. The draft required revisions as several of the tests did not conform with iF3 standards or had elements that would not have worked for various reasons. As a result, the iF3 President, Gretchen Kittelberger, had to step in and try to get the test announcement documents prepared properly and at last minute. The "safety-first approach for programming" applied by the LOC according to the Final Report might have been an ideology, which turned out successful, but cannot substitute lack of timely action.

Recommendation: It is advised that the iF3 Programming Committee shall take over programming for iF3 events and write the tests themselves using LOC input during the virtual site visit.

2.4 Equipment and Venue Set-Up

Complaints of the athletes about the venue obviously had no substance. To have moved the entire set-up to the lower pavilion of the venue which was flatter would have been advisable from the beginning as it would have been advisable to provide for better signature. Complaints of the athletes about the use of poles as wall ball targets were not legitimate, because the poles functioned equally as well as rig targets for the movement and because there is no iF3 rule requiring wall ball targets to be used. The only requirement in the iF3 rules is a height requirement, but whether a wall, pole, or other target is used is up to the discretion of the organizers.

Despite claims to the contrary, warm-up equipment was sufficient and personally brought by truck by the LOC President. This equipment included an additional full rig, full matting, six full sets of plates and barbells, extra dumbbells, extra wall balls, one additional BikeErg and two additional rowers, all beyond the equipment already hired.

Some equipment never arrived on site due to a broken down delivery truck. The LOC team drove to the warehouse in the moving truck they had on hand and personally collected 8 rowers and 8 BikeErgs. SkiErgs could not be collected due to no functioning truck, no backup transport, no available supplier and no remaining pickup window. This forced modifications to the test programmed for Friday. The additional attempt of the LOC to borrow SkiErgs at a local gym (Torian) failed because there were not have enough units available to meet the Event's requirements.

The official athlete shirts were delayed in transit. At additional cost to the LOC, they arranged for urgent air freight to ensure volunteers, staff, and Australian athletes had access to them during the event. No athlete T-shirts were ready to be able to sell at the Event as planned. The athlete name plaques arrived containing errors. The LOC was confident that the supplier that earlier had always delivered excellent results for major events would act properly and did not double-check the plaques prior to distribution. The President of the LOC took responsibility for the issues with the name plaques and declared regretting the issue.

Recommendation:

The competition playbook mentioned above under 2.2. should advise LOCs to conclude firm contracts with equipment providers, which, unless cases of force majeure are given, prevent the LOC from substitute actions and additional costs. Back-up solutions should be thought of well ahead of the Event.

2.5 Registration and Participation

Obviously the expectations of Circle21's role at the Event were different. Both, the iF3 and the AFFF expected a representative of Circle21 to come assist with livestreaming and live scoring of the Event. The AFFF, in addition, expected from the personal presence Server-to-Athlete screens, onsite hardware and real-time troubleshooting. The AFFF's final report made the lack of personal presence of Circle21 responsible for major operational gaps, in particular, no onsite scoring technician, slower processing of scores, increased manual data handling, a significantly heavier workload for staff and no contingency plan for heat lists disappearing from Circle21 when heats ran late.

The iF3 President reported that the lack of personal presence, indeed, made using the platform more difficult for the LOC, however, that it was never intended for the Circle21 representative to be the person inputting scores all weekend. The Circle21 representative also reported to the IF3 that he provided several instructional videos to the LOC on how to use the platform and that the LOC did not take him up on his offer to have a call to learn how to use the platform effectively.

Given the importance Circle21 has due to its monopoly service for the iF3 and its events it does not appear professional and up to business-standard that Circle21 cancels personal representation at the Event at such short notice without personal back-up solution.

Recommendation:

Given the ever growing inclusion of Circle21 into the iF3's organisation and events and mutual dependence it is highly advisable to conclude a formal contract with Circle21 specifying the mutual rights and obligations and including provisions for the consequences of non-fulfilment of duties and dispute settlement.

2.6 Score Cards

It is the role of the LOC under the lead of the Head TO to prepare the score cards for the Event. The Score Cards for 4 of the 6 tests at the Event were inadequately or inaccurately prepared. Each athlete should have their own score card for each test. This did not happen for the Endurance Test. The Score Cards for the Endurance test were done so poorly that the athlete times could not be matched to the athlete completing the test. This caused the iF3 and LOC to have to cancel the results of that test. Additionally, the number of repetitions used to calculate the scores on the Skill test was incorrect, the number of repetitions listed on the Power test scorecard was incorrect, half of the Mixed Test score cards contained empty boxes with no repetition numbers at all, and the Bodyweight Test Score Card also did not contain the total number of repetitions in the test. Athletes often were given score cards that were not designed for their specific age group, and TO's were filling out score cards but failing to accurately record the athlete's name, heat number, and age division.

The AFFF's Final Report admitted that the Endurance test led to significant scoring issues, inter alia, due to last minute handwritten score cards, manual corrections, and slow data processing. The AFFF President took responsibility for score cards not being audited sooner.

Recommendation:

The Hosting Agreement should be amended in order to include a more specified Host obligation than the current para 7 k) obliging the Host to have preprinted score cards with athlete's names and other necessary data for the respective test delivered to the participants prior to the start of each test.

3. Tests

3.1 Endurance Test

The Endurance Test had to be changed to something different at the last minute, because the equipment required for this test did not arrive due to a broken down truck. The change was agreed upon by the LOC President and the iF3 General Secretary while the iF3 President was on travel to the Event.

The Endurance Test was run in waves every 10 minutes on a continuously running clock rather than in heats with distinct starting and stopping times, which is the typical format. As such the Head TO attempted to track athlete scores on a single piece of paper by recording lane end times only and then subtracting time based on what heat the athlete was in. Athletes did not have individual score cards for this test. Names were crossed out and other names were written in place all over the sheet of paper. It became impossible to track which time belonged to which athlete and the wrong times were credited to around 30% of the athletes and several athletes had no times at all.

All these facts were not communicated by the LOC President to the iF3 President at the proper time, but came to be known to the iF3 President over night from Friday to Saturday in pieces and finally,

when already close to 30 % of all participants had submitted appeals by Saturday morning stating scores put in the leaderboard for the Endurance Test were inaccurate.

No consensual mode of how to solve the situation could be found. Various emails were sent in the context of an effort for redoing the test. Athletes and other persons were yelling at staff as well as other athletes. Obviously, direct access by athletes to iF3 staff was overwhelming and inappropriate at the Event. The staff running the redo were not willing to continue to run the test. An email was sent canceling all redos for the remainder of the day and delineating how scoring would work moving forward. There were some additional athlete complaints after this decision, which continued also at the After Party, but most stopped at this point.

The final solution was that the Endurance Test would not count for the final standings. The latter would be and, in fact, have been determined from the five completed tests.

Recommendation:

The iF3 rulebook shall be amended so to include a provision for what happens in the case that scores are lost or messed up to the extent that they cannot be retrieved or accurately recorded. Athletes and coaches should have limited access to directly approach iF3 staff at the events, and it is up to the LOC to create this barrier.

3.2 Skill Test

The LOC provided for 8 competition lanes for this test and attempted to split the competition lanes in half to accommodate 2 athletes per lane. When athletes saw the potential set-up they immediately began complaining about the safety of the set-up. After many athlete complaints were received, the LOC reverted to an 8 lane format and redid the heats. However, the LOC President felt uncomfortable using the iF3's required scoring and heat assignment software, Circle21, and was unable to create the heats in a timely manner using this software. In order to keep the competition from falling too far behind, she moved everything over to a different platform, Competition Corner. This caused confusion with the athletes. However, at the time there was no other option to keep the competition moving forward as no one on site was well versed enough with the Circle21 platform to be able to use it effectively.

Additionally, the Skill Test required getting to a pull-up bar. The pull-up bar was very tall and most athletes could not reach it and required assistance to reach the bar. The LOC bought risers for this purpose but they were unstable and not tall enough. Instead 20 to 24 inch plyo boxes needed to be used. This crowded the space under the rig and created not only an unsafe environment for athletes but also an aesthetically displeasing one. The LOC should have had a better plan in place to get athletes up to pull-up bars.

Finally, the scores for the Skill Test were added incorrectly and had to be redone by the iF3 President and the LOC President during very late Friday night.

Recommendation:

The details for the Skill Test, as for all other tests, including the event floor plans, must be presented and finalised by the virtual site visit. This moment is the last one, when the Event could be reasonably canceled in case of unsatisfactory preparation and then be assigned to another Host.

3.3 Bodyweight Test; Mixed Test; Power Test

All three tests suffered from incorrect score cards. The score cards for the Bodyweight Test did not contain the number of repetitions in the buy-in phase of the test, making scoring the test laborious for

the scoring team, which fact ended up with the two presidents to do the job. The score cards for the Mixed Test often contained only blank boxes. The score cards for the Power Test contained an incorrect number of repetitions.

Complaints about the wall ball set up for the Mixed Test did not carry any substance.

Recommendation:

The Recommendation under para 2.6 above applies: The Hosting Agreement should be amended in order to include a more specified Host obligation than the current para 7 k) obliging the Host to have preprinted score cards with athlete's names and further test-specific data delivered to the participants prior to the start of the respective test.

3.4 Strength Test

As a result of complaints that the floor was slanted and unsafe for the test were resolved by the LOC by moving the entire floor to the lower pavilion and conducting the Event there. This should have happened from the beginning.

Recommendation:

The venue set-up and all its details, including the floor plan, are an issue for the pre-planning period and a virtual site visit as recommended above under para 2.1.

4. Awards Ceremony and Prizes

The LOC complained that during the Event prize boxes were opened and items removed which included volunteer and staff shirts.

Recommendation:

By slight amendment of para 4 m) of the Host Agreement, an obligation for the Host could be introduced, to secure the Hosts Prize bags need effectively. Athletes should be reminded to adhere to the iF3 Code of Ethics and act appropriately.

5. General Recommendations

- a) To include a provision into the standard iF3 Hosting Agreement that within 30 days after signing the Host Agreement the LOC shall present itself and the roles fulfilled by its individual members, the site, programme, equipment, floor plan, staffing and logistics at a virtual site visit using live cameras and going over several hours. The site visit should be recorded and followed-up by an iF3 Executive Board member specifically put in charge for that task. Considering that there are five iF3 Executive Board members and on average 5 events to be run by the iF3 per year, each of the Executive Board members could take the responsibility for monitoring one event;
- b) to amend the Hosting Agreement so that the budget for the Event shall be submitted by the Host of the Event to the iF3 prior to the virtual site visit. In addition, at the same time, the Head TO shall be determined by the iF3 and the coverage of his/her travel expenses shown in the LOC's budget. The Head TO shall be part of the virtual

- site visit. At the same time as the budget, the number and quality of staff shall be specified and the staff presented at the virtual site visit. For the details, the Hosting Agreement should refer to a competition playbook, which obviously is in the process of being finalized by the iF3. This competition playbook should, inter alia, delineate what roles and staff positions need to be filled at an event, but also advise LOCs to conclude firm contracts with service providers (live stream, broadcast, supply of equipment, etc);
- c) the iF3 Programming Committee shall take over programming for iF3 events and write the tests themselves using LOC input during the virtual site visit;
 - d) the iF3 to conclude a formal contract with Circle21 specifying the mutual rights and obligations and including provisions for the consequences of non-fulfilment of duties and dispute settlement;
 - e) to amend the Hosting Agreement in order to include a more specified Host obligation than the current para 7 k) obliging the Host to have preprinted score cards with athlete's names and other necessary data for the respective test delivered to the participants prior to the start of the each test;
 - f) to amend the iF3 rulebook so to include a provision for what happens in the case that scores are lost or messed up to the extent that they cannot be retrieved or accurately recorded. Athletes and coaches should have limited access to directly approach iF3 staff at the events, and it is up to the LOC to create this barrier
 - g) to provide by the iF3 rulebook that athletes and coaches should have limited access to directly approach iF3 staff at the events, and that it is up to the LOC to create this barrier;
 - h) to amend para 4 m) of the Host Agreement and include an obligation for the Host to secure the Hosts Prize;
 - i) to remind Athletes to adhere to the iF3 Code of Ethics and act appropriately.

 , 15/10/25