

Jury Report from 8th Paramotor & 14th Microlight FAI World Championships Matkopuszta, Hungary 9th – 16th Aug 2014

This is the report of the FAI Jury.

1. Venue

The venue for the event was a provincial airfield situated on the outskirts of the small village of Matkopuszta, approximately 95 KM to the South West of Budapest. The airfield has one runway (13/31). The airfield is situated in a very flat and expansive area with very few local land marks or obstacles. The surface of the runways, associated taxiways and quarantine/parking areas was short stubbly grass with a relatively hard packed base although recent rains had soften this somewhat.

Within the boundary of the airfield the space available for accommodating facilities for both the Paramotor & Microlight championships with space for the decks, quarantine, parking and camping areas was quite tight.

The road access to the airfield is via a single track part paved/part dirt track road which during the week of the championship was undergoing repairs and repaving which resulted in many inconvenient diversions and delays and caused issues with basic deliveries to the airfield. After the end of the competition participants have to drive a detour via an very rough track, because the main access road where still under construction and blocked.

2. Weather

During the practise and competition weeks the weather was hot (plus 30° C); predominately dry during the day with a number of storms practically in the evenings (practise week). On the whole the weather conditions stayed stable throughout the competition with winds being light and variable although on day two there was a brief series of rain showers that temporarily disrupted both the WPC & WMC competitions and on the 5th predicted strong winds grounded the WPC in the afternoon. On the 6th day of competition an approaching cold front grounded the WPC competitors and disrupted WMC task 11

3. Facilities

The main facilities situated at the airfield available for use by the competitors & organisers consisted of:

- A large main hanger and associated offices which housed the main organisers and competition directors' rooms. Adjoined to the hanger was a restaurant/bar complex that also housed the main WPC/WMC briefing rooms, scorer's office, main competition notice boards etc. The WPC briefing room also doubled as the Jury's

office! The main communal areas and campsite were equipped with a number of separate Wi-Fi networks that performed with various degrees of success throughout the event.

On the whole the Wi-Fi net was not of an adequate size or robustness for an event of this size. As these competitions increasingly rely on the internet as it's primarily source of communication it is recommended that there is a separate Wi-Fi network for the sole use of the competition organisers, stewards, jury members etc.

- The jury/stewards had to share an office which also doubled up as the WPC briefing room, a situation which the Jury and Stewards accepted but was far from ideal.
- Breakfast, lunch and dinner was prepared and served in a marquee that was adjacent to the bar/restaurant area.
- The bar was open from early morning till 22:00 (no extension even on "corn" party night)!
- There were shower and toilet blocks scattered throughout the airfield including in the permanent bar/restaurant briefing room area and within the camping sites. Although of enough numbers and quality there were numerous problems with the showers/toilets in the campsite area due mainly to interruptions in the power supply which affected the water supply. Cleaning took place irregularly and there appeared to be a lack of toilet paper etc.
- The camp site was situated towards the North Western end of the airfield adjacent to the main access road to the airfield. The campsite was equipped with its own Wi-Fi and electricity/water supply (both regularly intermittent).
- Reasonable waste management was maintain at all times
- No fuel facilities were available on the airfield. Competitors were responsible for arranging their own fuel supplies from local gas stations (10km). This situation had been well advertised in advance so didn't come as a surprise to any of the teams.
- A permanent first aider/paramedic was on site during all hours of the competition and was sited in front of the main hanger or bar restaurant area
- On the morning of the 9th August there were a number of security concerns raised following a number of thefts (2?) in the campsite area. The event organisers didn't appear to take any action with regards to increasing security etc although fortunately there were no further incidents

4. Administration

There are separate competition directors for each competition although a number of the support services are shared.

There are a number of offices spread across the operational/administrative buildings being used by both competition teams and the support services. This set up is not ideal and did slow down/confuse communications.

One of the scoring rooms was also the main competition/information point which meant that the scorers were constantly being interrupted.

Both marshalling teams was headed by competent English speakers and a support interpreters who assisted both the organisers and the competitors as required. The WPC chief marshal had to be drafted in at the last minute as the original one had pulled out for personal reasons. There were just sufficient numbers of marshals and assistant marshals for the tasks required although initially the marshals seemed unsure of their role and required additional training and support on occasions especially with regards to the precision/timed based tasks.

The scoring teams for both comps were adequate in numbers but lacking in experience/training and in some cases dedication!

5. Running of the event

All navigation and economy task was controlled by electronic devices and FR's.

Precision landings & precision tasks were videoed and also checked by a sufficient number of marshals (would recommend that 2nd video camera be used in all circumstances in case of problems).

The quarantine areas was well marked and marshalled with numbered signs (WMC) for everyone to find their place.

For the weighing of fuel for fuel limited tasks the organisers had five sets of scales each controlled by a trained marshal.

WMC - Refuelling and the checking of the refuelling was carried out by the competitor in conjunction with a dedicated team of marshals.

WPC - Refuelling and the checking of the refuelling was carried out by competitors from different teams/countries working together checking each other's machines.

Both systems worked fine.

The scoring system and the manner in which it was managed was overall not satisfactory. The organising team did not use the well tried and tested FRDL or Microflap systems for the downloading and analysing of tracks etc. The system that was used was meant to be managed totally on line but due to problems with the internet connection this proved not to be possible. The downloading and scoring was very slow, inaccurate and confusing.

Information was not posted on line in a timely manner if at all. It was felt that the way the individual scoring sheets were presented could be improved had they followed the detailed procedures as laid down in Section 10 and Annex's.

Due to the issues with the internet the main form of communication between the organisers and the competitors and officials was by use of the official notice board and team/officials pigeon holes. But this was dissatisfactory.

The way in which complaints were dealt with by both CD's was unsatisfactory. Some complaints were given to the organizer in writing (WMC) and most of the complaints for WPC via the web portal. The response time in both cases was excessively long. Not every complaint and response seems to be have been published according to Sec. 10 – 4.35

Overall communication between the organisers and the competitors and officials was less than satisfactory. The jury had to continually remind the organisers of their responsibilities with regards to posting all communications, scoring and notices/task sheets etc, etc on the notice board and web site and that these should all be marked with the date and time of issue.

The overall handling of the tasks by the marshals was good. There were mistakes but when these occurred and were noticed or pointed out corrections were made as soon as possible.

There was an incident before the start of the competition when strong winds tipped over a trike and the wing batons pieced a navigator's leg. An ambulance had to be called and attended promptly, hospitalization was required.

A short time before the competition the organizer was informed, that the designated steward Marta Denis was not able to attend for medical reasons. The competition organizer spoke to the CIMA bureau about this issue who confirmed that they agreed that the event could proceed with one steward covering both competitions.

Jury member Rene Verschueren when he heard of this problem expressed his concern with this decision via an email addressed to the jury president.

Meanwhile the jury president asked Natalia Paska (POL) if she is willing to attend the event as the second steward, when she will arrive on Sunday at Matkopuszta and she agreed. This decision was backed up by the CIMA bureau.

At the beginning of the first WPC team leaders briefing and without any prior notice being given to CIMA or championships officials Rene stood up in the meeting and expressed his concerns about the lack of a second steward, his unhappiness with the lack of a second deck for paramotors and handed over his competition accreditation document and his jury Hi-Vis jacket to the jury president as an act of resignation from the competition jury.

After further time for reflection and a conversation with the remaining jury members and a strong demand to rethink about his decision, he asked for his resignation to be ignored and for his reinstatement on the jury which was immediately agreed.

6. Briefings

The WMC briefings took place in a small room adjacent to the restaurant and bar complex. The briefings were voice recorded but not minuted or videoed by the organisers as far as could be seen.

The WPC briefings took place in a small room shared with the Jury and Stewards adjacent to the restaurant and bar complex. The briefings were most of the time attended by the officials although not minuted or videoed by the organisers as far as could be seen although

a number of the competitors appeared to be recording some of the briefings for their own records.

The briefings were not announced everytime on the web but via the official notice board. Although overall the system worked it was far from satisfactory.

The tasks & task sheets were handed out at the briefings but were not on the whole posted on the web or official board which was not ideal. The tasks were presented by each competition director both of whom did not appear to have thought though the details of their tasks and there implications in as much detail as required. The Q&A's at the end of each briefing were regularly longer than the briefings themselves!

7. Tasks

WMC - The number of tasks flown was 13, which is sufficient to validate the championships. The tasks presented were generally very good, imaginative and challenging and the competitors seemed to appreciate the variety of them.

In contradiction to Sec. 10 Annex 6, 6.3.1 the director did not choose the turn points, gates and marker position from GNSS signals, taken at or above the point. He overflew them several times to check them against the map and has taken the coordinates from the map with reference to his photos. The jury randomly checked a number of these points and as far as it was possible to walk close to them they were within the allowed tolerance. In a team leaders briefing all team leaders where informed of the situation and agreed, that they would not file a complaint or protest in regard to any scoring issue arising out of this particular situation.

WMC - The % break down of the tasks was:

- Navigation: 53%
- Economy 27%
- Precision 20%

WPC - The number of tasks flown was 7, which is sufficient to validate the championships. The tasks presented were generally very good, imaginative and challenging and the competitors seemed to appreciate the variety of them. A number of competitors voiced their concern that there should have been more tasks flown and there was general disappointment that they had to fly a Japanese slalom around kicking sticks rather than the now more common pylon slalom.

Due to an error on the part of the WPC organising team, the times for Task 2 - Japanese Slalom in WPC were recorded to the whole second and not, as stated in Sec. 10 to 1/10th of a second. The team leaders were asked whether they would prefer to:

- a. accept the task as valid in its present format
- b. cancel the task

Prior to a vote being taken the team leaders were informed that for the scores to be accepted in this format the vote for option “a” would need to be unanimous. By secret ballot the team leaders voted 10 to 6 in favour of option “a” but as this was not unanimous this task was cancelled.

WPC - The % break down of the tasks was:

- Navigation: 41%
- Economy 28%
- Precision 31%

The jury was comfortable that the % breakdown of tasks for both competitions met the Section 10 requirements.

Complaints & Protests

Number of complaints:

WMC = 83
WPC = 197

Number of protests

WMC = 2
WPC = 3

Complaints were numerous with many emulating from misunderstandings and were sorted out fairly easily. Due to the majority of the protests being submitted on paper rather than via the web system it was at times difficult to assess how the complaints were being handled by the two competition directors. The slowness in the publication of the complaints and responses and the fact that on the whole the responses were not posted on the notice board or web created a fair degree of uncertainty and dissatisfaction amongst the team managers and competitors

All complaints and protests and Jury decisions will eventually be published on the official championship web site: <http://wmc-wpc2014.hu/>

8. Conclusions

Overall the Jury felt that Matkopuszta Airfield provided a good location for the championships and that the organisational team performed adequately under the circumstances.

Due to the lack of experienced scorers and the constant delays in answering of complaints and the publishing of results the awards ceremonies had to be run separately were not able to be held on the Saturday until much later than anticipated. The WMC awards were presented around 1800 while the WPC event was not held until around 2300. As part of the process of speeding up the production of the results for the WPC event the time for protests for the last few tasks was cut from 2hrs to 1hr after consultation with the WPC team

managers who were still on site at that time. This unusual action was taken to avoid the WPC awards ceremony having to be held in the early hours of Sunday morning.

Unfortunately even after the awards ceremony's had been held the competition directors for both events were not able to produce a satisfactory set of results for either the competitors or jury members. The results were finally posted on the competition web site at 23:30 on Thursday 21st Aug.

It was felt that although there was an opening ceremony which was well organised (although very short at approximately 9 mins) and attended due to issues with the scoring there was no combined closing ceremony and in particular the WPC event was not well attended due to it being held at 2300 on the Saturday.

There appeared to be no coverage of the event by local media (TV/Radio/Print) and there appeared to be little advertisement of it in the locality which resulted in hardly any local residents visiting the event other than at one of the WMC out landing fields on the 2nd day of the competition.

It was felt that overall the competition was held in good spirit although the previously mentioned issues surrounding the scoring and access to the internet/competition web page etc did sour relationships between the competitors and the organising committees for both events towards the end.

A clash of personality issue did occur in the WPC competition involving the comps Director and one of the team managers which although unsavoury at times was managed by all involved.

The organisation worked extremely hard to make the championship a success and the holding of both events simultaneously greatly added to everyone's workloads and stress levels. Although in the end both events were completed this was only achieved by the extremely hard work of a small band of volunteers and the understanding and assistance of the majority of competitors.

(Wolfgang Lintl)

Jury President