JUN JUMPSTYLE UNITED NATIONS

OFFICIAL JUN LEAGUE STANDARDS

Competition architecture, technical judging and shared standards for the global Jumpstyle community.

PROPOSED FRAMEWORK / EDITORIAL DRAFT

01 / ORGANIZATIONAL ARCHITECTURE

A shared competitive language rather than a centralized authority: JUN develops common frameworks while communities retain autonomy over their events.



RESPONSIBILITIES AT A GLANCE

JUN: shared practices. Administration: event rules. Organizers: registration, schedule and brackets. Judges: scoring and feedback. Moderators: disputes. Jumpers: performance and submissions.

The four judging pillars

Technical merit is the common foundation. Additional criteria may be adopted by individual competitions, provided their role is clearly defined.

Power

Intensity & energy

Strength, explosiveness, amplitude and sustained energy throughout the performance.

ILLUSTRATIVE SUBCRITERIA

- Explosiveness
- Intensity
- Endurance
- Amplitude
- Consistency

Onbeat

Musical synchronization

Timing and precision of movements against the beat, tempo and rhythm of the music.

ILLUSTRATIVE SUBCRITERIA

- Rhythmic accuracy
- Consistency
- Musicality
- BPM control
- Synchronization

Technique

Execution & control

Clean movements, posture, balance, fluidity and overall body control.

ILLUSTRATIVE SUBCRITERIA

- Balance
- Centering
- Posture
- Handmoves
- Fluidity

Variety

Repertoire & creativity

Diversity of tricks, combos, bases, transitions and creative choreography.

ILLUSTRATIVE SUBCRITERIA

- Trickset
- Combos
- Originality
- Creativity
- Complexity

Evidence distinction: the four core pillars are documented in the Jumpstyle Brasil manifesto and FAQ. The subcriteria above are a suggested technical decomposition, not a verified JUN-mandated scoring taxonomy.

Competitive structure

A flexible tournament model accommodating skill divisions, performance formats and different participant counts.

SKILL DIVISIONS

Beginners	Intermediate	Advanced
Fundamentals	Control & repertoire	Complexity & identity

PERFORMANCE FORMATS



Solo
1 jumper



Duo
2 jumpers



Trio
3 jumpers



Group / Multi
4+ jumpers

EXAMPLE TOURNAMENT PROGRESSION

01 **Registration**
Participant sign-up

02 **Qualification**
Initial assessment and selection

03 **Group Stage**
Optional, when applicable

04 **Round of 16**
First knockout round, if applicable

05 **Quarterfinals**
Eight remaining competitors

06 **Semifinals**
Four remaining competitors

07 **Grand Final**
Final head-to-head

LEAGUE CHAMPION — Final technical result

The league organizer may adapt stage count, categories and group format to the event size.

Scoring & assessment

An example equal-weight system for consistent and transparent evaluation. These weights and scales are proposed, not confirmed JUN requirements.

ILLUSTRATIVE WEIGHT DISTRIBUTION

Power	25%
Onbeat	25%
Technique	25%
Variety	25%
TOTAL	100%

WORKED SCORING EXAMPLE

Power	8.0 / 10
Onbeat	9.0 / 10
Technique	7.5 / 10
Variety	8.5 / 10

FINAL SCORE

8.25 / 10

OVERALL PERFORMANCE

82.5%

CALCULATION

Final score = (Power + Onbeat + Technique + Variety) / 4

Example: (8.0 + 9.0 + 7.5 + 8.5) / 4 = 8.25. For multiple judges, the organizer should define the aggregation and tie-breaking method in the published rules.

Judging integrity & references

A competition should reward the quality of the performance rather than personal preference, nationality or popularity.

JUDGING PRINCIPLES

- **Impartiality**
  No preference based on nationality, friendship or personal taste.
- **Technical merit**
  Assess the performance against the published criteria.
- **Qualified judges**
  Select judges with relevant technical expertise.
- **Transparency**
  Publish criteria and communicate how results are determined.
- **Constructive feedback**
  Explain strengths and areas for technical improvement.
- **Review & appeals**
  Define a process for resolving disputes and reviewing decisions.
- **Consistency**
  Apply the same rules to all competitors in a category.

SOURCE DOCUMENTATION

01 **JUN Frameworks** — OPEN SOURCE
Open competition frameworks, technical assessment and feedback.

02 **JUN historical organizational model** — OPEN SOURCE
Legacy README: decentralized assembly and shared standards.

03 **Jumpstyle Brasil** — OPEN SOURCE
Community manifesto and FAQ: four fundamental criteria and technical league evaluation.

04 **Original JUN framework documents** — OPEN SOURCE
English, Portuguese and Spanish PDF editions in the repository.

STATUS & SCOPE

The title is intended for the proposed standards document. The original JUN PDF files could not be inspected in the source review. The governance diagram, competitive formats, subcriteria, scoring model and expanded procedures are implementation proposals and should be reviewed before formal adoption. No ratification is claimed.