

# Jury report



## 13th FAI European Microlight Championships

Wloclawek, Poland

### **Event Details:**

Title: 13th FAI European Microlight Championships

Date: 15-23 August 2015

Location: Wloclawek, Poland

Organising NAC: Aeroklub Polski

Organiser: Aeroclub of Wloclawek

Number of flights: More than 500

Number of Tasks: 14

Number of competitors: 72 pilots and co-pilots

### **Event Personnel**

Event Director: Marek KOZINSKI

Competition Director: Anna TARTACZUK

Deputy Competition Director: Mariuz JARMUSZCZAK

Chief Scorer: Kriysztof OPECHOWSKI

Chief Marshal: Wojciech Mamona

Steward: None

Monitor: Tormod VEIBY (NOR)

### **FAI-Jury**

President: Wolfgang LINTL (GER)

Member: Tormod VEIBY (NOR)

Member : Rob HUGHES (GBR)

### **Complaints and Protests**

Number of Complaints: 30

Number of protests admitted: 5

Number withdrawn: 1

Number upheld: 2

Number rejected: 3

Amount of protest fees retained: 150 EUR

### **Aircraft and Competitors**

AL1 1 (class not valid)

AL2 14

WL1 6

WL2 14

GL2 5

Total 40 aircraft, 72 competitors (not including the invalid AL1 class)

### **Venue**

The competition site was Wloclawek Kruszin airfield, near Wloclawek. The airfield was large with plenty of room for camping, decks, runways and quarantine. It was near to a few houses but away from population centres. The airfield had several buildings including main administration centre including briefing room, toilets, showers, hangars, cafe and scoring portakabin. Access was controlled by identity badges.

### **Accommodation**

The campsite was on the airfield; a flat grass area with temporary toilets and showers. There were initially not enough facilities but this was improved during the week.

FAI officials stayed in a basic hotel 8 km from the airfield. They were provided with a rental car.

### **Services**

Catering was provided for local marshals and FAI officials. Competitors were able to buy meals. The food was mostly adequate.

The Jury were provided with a comfortable room with air conditioning, fridge with soft drinks.

Printing was done via email to the aeroclub administrative office.

A WiFi network was installed to provide connection for the whole area. At first this failed regularly but was upgraded on day 4 and presented few problems thereafter.

### **Competition staff**

The competition staff were all Polish. The Event Director was not obvious and did not make himself known. This caused a problem as the Competition Director effectively became responsible for every part of the event, including services and accommodation.

The Competition Director had previous experience of CIMA championships as a competitor but had not filled the role of Competition Director before. She spoke good English and had a good understanding of the rules with experience in rally flying championships. She struggled to understand the mentality of some pilots who sought to find holes in her task descriptions since her rally flying experience was more regimented.

Briefings were sometimes confusing with competitors asking a great number of questions; this was partly due to the lack of detail in early task descriptions as well as the CD's surprise at the inventive approach to finding ways around her tasks.

Generally the staff were friendly, professional, efficient and helpful.

### **Competition System**

There was an official [physical] board with paper notices which was supposedly

mirrored on a blog webpage but the two often did not match with the paper board being the point of reference. The webpage (emc2015.blogspot.com) was not very well structured.

The CD chose tasks from the Local task catalogue but often details were missed or changed, leading to unfamiliarity with the tasks by pilots and lack of clarity for penalties or standard procedures.

Weather information was generally readily available and provided at briefings.

### **Competition flying**

The competition was affected by poor weather for the first few days though opportunities to fly were missed.

The mix of tasks flown was good; there were several spot or precision landings in the first few days due to the weather conditions but later in the week navigation and economy tasks were flown.

Marshals were well briefed. Deck and airfield procedures were efficient. Quarantine, fuel weighing and other activities went smoothly.

There were three accidents during the championships; two resulted in no injuries and damage to aircraft (one being repaired and flew again the next day. The third followed an engine failure on take-off with the flexwing dropping to the ground from approx. 15m. Both crew suffered injuries including a broken leg and arm. The airfield response was immediate with the championship doctor on site within a minute. The crew was well cared for, hospitalised and returned home by medevac the next day.

### **Participants**

By the official registration deadline date, only one country (NOR) had registered any competitors. This created significant problems for the organisers; the CIMA Bureau also had to assist the organisers in contacting NACs to submit their entries. The organisers strongly considered cancelling the championship shortly before the event due to the lack of registered competitors.

40 aircraft

72 competitors

11 nations

4 valid classes (AL2, WL1, WL2, GL2)

1 invalid class (AL1 with 1 competitor)

### **Running the tasks**

The general briefing was performed on the Saturday after the event opening ceremony and held in the briefing room. The tasks were briefed daily on the airfield to team leaders.

Briefings were often confused; the briefing room's acoustics were poor, meaning questions could not be heard and silence was needed when the competition director spoke. Briefings could have been structured in a more ordered manner to reduce confusion. The task descriptions were not complete or accurate and led to

'negotiation' with competitors to arrive at satisfactory planning times or start procedures.

### **Scoring**

Scoring was the responsibility of Kriysztof OPECHOWSKI; he could call on help but largely worked on his own. Results were in the form of excel sheets and many results were created automatically by scoring software. The delivery of results was acceptable if a little slow.

Initially the score sheets did not include necessary information; version number, task name, time of publication, time for complaints etc. Using a template in future is recommended.

### **Publication of information on the Internet**

Competitor lists, tasks sheets and scores were not systematically uploaded to the official web page; this meant that neither the audience off-site nor the competitors on-site could clearly follow the championship. But this website in a structure, makes it difficult for non participants to follow.

### **Complaints and Protests**

There were ca. 30 complaints and 6 protests; three were rejected and two were upheld, one was withdrawn.

### **Anti-Doping**

None.

### **Media coverage**

None was obvious.

### **Ceremonies**

The opening ceremony was good and did not go on too long. The local aeroclub president and the vice-president of the Polish aeroclub gave speeches and the championship was formally declared open by the president of the jury.

There followed a fly-past by a Polish designed Fregata single seat motor glider and then an aerobatic display by an Extra 300.

During the closing ceremony FAI medals were awarded to the valid classes.

### **Recommendations**

Score sheets: CIMA should consider providing a model score sheet so that necessary information (version number, time and date of publication, task title etc.) are included on every score sheet.

Score sheets: Each class should be treated separately to avoid prolonging deadlines for complaints; e.g. classes AL2, GL2 and WL1 scores go official while WL2 score remain provisional due to complaints.

Task design: future Competition Directors should be strongly advised to use the model tasks in S10 Annex 3&4 and only deviate from them if local conditions make it

necessary to do so. This should avoid situations where elements of task descriptions are missed by Competition Directors.

Branding: there was very little evidence of identity or branding with task sheets, scores and other information missing the name of the championship, the connection with the FAI or other branding elements.

### **Conclusion**

Overall this was a successful and enjoyable championship. The weather (strong winds) threatened to disrupt the proceedings but fortunately this passed after a few days and many tasks were flown in the last 3 days.

This report was agreed by all jury members

Wloclawek, 23. August 2015

Wolfgang Lintl  
Jury President