

The international Jury report from the 9:th European Microlight Championship Classic Classes, held at Nördlingen, Germany 29:th of July to 5:th of August 2006.

Jury

Tomas Backman (SWE, President)

Martin Marecek (CZ)

Jan van der Heijden (NL)

Site

The airfield of Nördlingen is about 10 minutes car drive from the town. The airfield has an asphalt runway and parallel to that a grass strip. Adjacent and parallel to the runway there is a taxi way leading up to the apron and the hangars. The surroundings are fairly flat and well suited for microlight competitions. In contact with the taxi way there are grass areas that were used for parking the microlights. Between the runway and the taxi way there was a grass area used as the quarantine. There are no control zones in the vicinity and the ceiling up to the TMA was high enough, not causing any restrictions for the competition. There was also a control tower, though not used during the competition and a main office building.

Facilities

The camping site for the competitors was close to the airfield buildings and near the aeroplane parking place, across a small stream with two bridges leading over it. The briefing was in one of the hangars and the restaurant in the other one. The briefing hangar was big enough to provide room for everybody, but a bit short of chairs. In the briefing hangar there were pigeon holes for every team as well as for the jury and the stewards. The acoustics was poor and made it difficult to hear what was said. To fix that a microphone and loudspeaker was used. In the briefing hangar there were plenty of boards for score sheets and other messages to be put up. In the restaurant hangar three meals were served a day at a reasonable pricing and the food was very good. Close to the restaurant was the office of the scoring/computer personnel and the Jury room. The championship director had his office in the main building, where there also was an internet café. Power supply was sufficient and in order. Toilets and showers were in sufficient numbers, clean and well functioning. There was also washing facilities for the competitors laundry and there was even a Lost and Found shop.

For those who made their own meals it was close to shops to buy food and other supplies.

Administration

The administrative staff was in sufficient number and had sufficient equipment. The distribution of task sheets and its posting was done at approximately one hour before briefing and in sufficient numbers, as was the distribution of the score sheets. The score sheets were not up to full standard at the beginning, they lacked important information like date and time of posting, was sometimes not signed by the competition director etc. All this was corrected when addressed and after a few days it ran as it should.

Briefings

The briefings were generally well laid out, but the task sheets were sometimes tricky and ambiguous and had to be explained and clarified during the briefing. This was improved later on with the help of one of the stewards. As an aid there was an over head projector. As said before, the acoustics were not so good, despite the loud speaker and especially for all those who not had English as their vernacular it was difficult to understand what was said. This is to be thought of in the future and perhaps the task sheets should be distributed several hours in advance for the team leaders to study under relative calm conditions .

Tasks

The number of tasks flown was 10. This was more than the number needed to make it a Championship. The tasks presented where generally very good, imaginative and fun. The competitors seemed to like them.

Running the tasks

This championship had a staff of many marshals. They were well trained in their duties and could make decisions of their own. The Chief marshal had a good hand with his “troops” and i.e changes of landing directions during precision landings was done in almost no time. Language was a minor problem as most of the marshals spoke at least a little English. The weather caused no big problem during the Championship. There were thunderstorms and heavy downfalls, but luckily it all happened when there was no task running and there was no day without flying

Complaints and protests

The system with complaints and protests and when and where to address one’s lamentation, seemed to function fairly well. But even so, there where a few competitors that had to be guided. The Jury received 8 Protests where of one was upheld and seven were denied. CIMA is to receive 350€.

Price giving ceremony

The price giving ceremony took place at the exact time. This is the first time in the history of CIMA competitions that this happens. The reason for this was the quick handling of complaints and the equally quick posting of the score sheets. Therefore the Jury received most of the protests in good time and could finish its work without any delay. The prize giving ceremony was held in a relaxed and joyful atmosphere and the evening was finished with dinner, dancing, singing and a spirit of good fellowship.

Conclusions

Nördlingen is an excellent place for a microlight World- or European championship, provided not both Classic Classes and the New Classes are run at the same time, as the space available on ground is thought to be too small for that. If the Deutsche Aero Club could manage to assemble the same staff again in Nördlingen, or an equal staff, the opinion is that they would very well qualify for another European or World Championship.

Tomas Backman
President of the International Jury