

Report to FAI from the Jury President of the European Microlight Championships (Classic classes), Nagykanizsa, Hungary, 16 – 21 July 2002

Jury:

Richard Meredith-Hardy (GBR, President)
Tomas Backmann (SWE)
Carlos Trigo (PRT)

Protests:

Seven in all:

Task 1: 4 successful protests from Czech, Germany and Poland (x2).

Task 3: 2 failed protests from Hungary.

Final team scores: 1 successful protest from the Czech team.

The Jury has collected USD 50 and Euro 50 in protest fees for CIMA.

This unusually small number of protests (at least for a classic classes championship) was as a result of some intensive informal negotiations as the championship progressed between Jury members and various teams or the organizer. I found it most important to not just sit back and wait for protests; to maintain a happy championships the Jury has to be much more proactive. One persuasive argument often used was “well it isn’t very good, but then if Marton hadn’t volunteered to do it, then there wouldn’t have been a championship at all”.

The root cause of all but the last protest were either caused by the weather, pilot stupidity or circumstance, all usually combined with poor briefing. As usual for a championship directed by Marton Ordody, there was a lack of good (or sometimes any) briefing sheet and the briefings were extremely chaotic; not enough control and many invitations for unnecessary debate.

The last protest was a pure issue of Section 10 interpretation: How are the team scores to be calculated? Marton thought one way, the Czech team thought another. Our interpretation looked at exactly what S10 says which brought the argument to an extremely logical conclusion in support of the Czechs but S10 definitely needs revision in this area (again!). It would be a good idea if two unequivocal options were offered as a separate agenda item to the next CIMA meeting so this long-running argument can be decided once and for all.

Final Scores

AL1 class - TOTAL

				Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	TOTAL
1	57	Jan Lukes	CZE	899	200	1000	486	1000	968	25	592	5170
2	61	Antonio Marchesi	ESP	885	250	862	756	890	941	50	324	4958

3	63	Wolfram Walter	GER	0	150	373	1000	880	925	250	1000	4578
4	69	Tamas Fehervari	HUN	1000	0	0	659	974	907	150	843	4533
5	56	Petr Bezdek	CZE	993	0	796	486	0	1000	50	264	3589
6	62	Francisco Diaz	ESP	156	200	193	662	673	670	150	227	2931

AL2 class - TOTAL

				Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	TOTAL
1	59	Yuriy Yakovlyev / Igor Pugach	UKR	766	250	938	878	959	958	250	1000	5999
2	55	Paul Dewhurst / Dawn Dewhurst	GBR	1000	100	1000	1000	1000	941	0	527	5568
3	54	Pavel Kapusnik / Petr Kapusnik	CZE	834	200	813	961	967	943	250	564	5532
4	53	Pedro Nogueroles / Manuel Perez	ESP	853	150	936	877	998	1000	150	527	5491
5	52	Heinz Korella / Dirk Kusch	GER	872	200	681	987	952	901	150	392	5135
6	51	Korc Dusan / Marian Hladen	SLO	838	0	518	0	424	922	0	0	2702

WL1 class - TOTAL

				Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	TOTAL
1	1	Gabor Rabnecz	HUN	965	250	926	892	1000	1000	250	990	6273
2	13	Endre Thuróczy	HUN	923	250	923	879	995	932	250	960	6112
3	34	Richard Rawes	GBR	963	250	867	879	917	968	250	981	6075
4	10	Pavel Cerny	CZE	885	250	1000	827	966	977	250	894	6049
5	40	Alojzy Dernbach	POL	1000	250	937	691	950	939	250	1000	6017
6	15	Manuel Rey	ESP	960	0	980	1000	967	919	250	819	5895
7	14	Antonio Calatrava	ESP	855	250	838	798	976	924	250	669	5560
8	16	Adam Zbynek	CZE	824	250	883	827	925	896	200	727	5532
9	31	Gordon Yule	GBR	821	250	895	874	862	836	0	960	5498
10	32	Patrick Nicholls	GBR	843	250	931	795	986	803	200	482	5290
11	3	Jozsef Toth	HUN	710	250	840	725	936	840	250	451	5002
12	45	Lukas Hynek	CZE	920	250	648	650	999	854	250	367	4938
13	12	Istvan Horvath	HUN	796	250	777	685	767	890	200	309	4674
14	5	Laurent Le Bihan	FRA	768	200	913	600	823	845	0	417	4566
15	8	Viktor Wyklicky	GER	868	0	932	335	973	942	0	471	4521
16	11	Istvan Takacs	HUN	852	250	859	235	789	792	250	491	4518
17	48	Endre Martinecz	HUN	600	250	812	425	758	909	200	424	4378
18	50	Jan Hanus	CZE	888	0	603	520	952	812	0	268	4043
19	17	Stanislovas Petruskevicius	LIT	652	250	694	235	567	902	250	290	3840
20	4	Alain Saly	FRA	567	250	484	456	917	763	50	322	3809
21	33	David Hadley	GBR	829	0	0	741	624	663	250	406	3513
22	6	Emmanuel Eggermont	BEL	821	200	788	0	0	0	0	0	1809
23	2	Branko Jurkovic	SLO	375	200	204	0	0	0	0	0	779

WL2 class - TOTAL

				Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	TOTAL
1	23	Samir Elari / Cathy Amaric	FRA	945	250	986	862	1000	1000	250	1000	6293
2	43	Artur Siwinski / Henryk Orwat	POL	984	250	796	1000	999	968	250	928	6175
3	44	Tomas Krolkowski / Joanna Krolkowska	POL	875	200	992	1000	997	962	250	803	6079
4	21	Tomas Gajser / Jose Gajser	SLO	963	250	997	830	992	959	200	880	6071
5	20	Gabor Guti / Pal Matuska	HUN	928	250	972	921	986	906	200	828	5991

6	18	Vince Ferinc / Zoltan Varga	HUN	1000	250	776	741	979	966	250	807	5769
7	35	Simon Baker / Anita Holmes	GBR	984	200	1000	782	993	974	250	529	5712
8	46	Petr Chvojka / Petr Gronat	CZE	900	250	929	873	988	967	150	596	5653
9	39	Robert Grimwood / Chris Saysell	GBR	951	200	982	793	934	920	200	508	5488
10	36	Keith Ingham / Steve Rosser	GBR	881	250	778	886	983	945	250	484	5457
11	26	Antoine Demellier / Eric Currell	FRA	886	250	929	747	957	846	250	464	5329
12	47	Karol Kubit / Janusz Szyszka	POL	766	0	745	797	987	931	250	498	4974
13	19	Algirdas Sirvydas / Darius Jakubauskas	LIT	942	200	875	670	902	715	250	274	4828
14	7	Aurel Kovacs / Tamas Meszaros	HUN	829	250	997	602	785	833	200	282	4778
15	25	Pierre Emmanuelle Leclere / Charles Durand	FRA	819	250	923	484	873	764	250	315	4678
16	37	Matt Robbins / Gwynn Carwardine	GBR	702	0	933	484	911	862	200	513	4605
17	38	James Robin Pearce / Andy Malham	GBR	558	200	831	683	709	836	200	420	4437
18	24	Eric Groby / Laurent Rapiteau	FRA	828	200	613	670	689	809	200	370	4379
19	30	Jiri Zitka / Ales Bradac	CZE	838	200	977	555	694	841	0	252	4357
20	29	Ota Hynek / Jiri Hynek	CZE	663	250	811	554	636	733	0	680	4327
21	42	Jan Sinogl / Pavel Sinogl	CZE	766	150	877	0	898	746	200	609	4246
22	22	Mirko Lebar / Niko Kapun	SLO	615	250	63	366	789	593	200	195	3071
23	28	Robert Mair / Dietmar Spekking	GER	0	0	534	587	682	832	0	331	2966
24	27	Klaus Wehrmann / Daniel Lothar	GER	478	0	472	366	508	485	250	243	2802

Team - TOTAL

1	Czech Republic	45647
2	Great Britain	39506
3	Hungary	38728
4	Spain	26936
5	France	24821
6	Poland	23245
7	Germany	18149
8	Slovenia	12623
9	Lithuania	8668
10	Ukraine	5999
11	Belgium	1809

Briefings

International championships are by definition almost entirely conducted in a foreign language either to the organizer or the teams, usually both. Yet again it was well demonstrated how confused people can get if there is no briefing sheet, or one which does not contain all vital information.

Good briefing sheets are essential, preferably distributed well before the briefing. Written amendments to any alterations made at the briefing must be distributed. The Director must stick to his plan!

Scoring Phraseology

There was terrific confusion as to what “official” scores are, and indeed Marton issued Task 1 official scores which were different to the last set of provisional scores which led

to the possibility of protests without complaints (because there was no opportunity to complain). The word “Official” was not understood by the Director or competitors to actually mean “Director’s Final” which is what they are. “Official” is simply not a strong enough word.

The sequence “Provisional – Official – Final” assumes that the director is always wrong with his final scores - the terminology is far from clear.

We should return to the old system which assumes the Director is usually right, where you have “Provisional” and “Final” only. This is the Director’s scores, his provisional ones and his final ones after all complaints have been dealt with.

Final scores should always be the same as the last set of provisionals so everybody has a chance to complain about alterations.

If there is then a successful protest about the Final scores then you still have Final scores, but “Edition x, as revised by protest”. There is, of course a limited time-frame within which this can happen.

Sportsmanship

Having not been directly involved in classic classes championships for a while I was slightly surprised that there still is quite a considerable “sporting” esprit amongst pilots, for example, in the muddle of the task 1 “official” scores (more below) it became important to try to persuade two pilots to have their 20% penalties back a day after they had been erroneously removed between the last provisional and the first official. The situation was rather more complicated than a simple “technical correction” but they agreed without fuss.

There is no doubt that if the Jury’s position on tactical protests is well known (and it was) then teams and pilots are quite fearful of being labelled unsportsmanlike. People who complained about other pilots were very careful to have very good evidence.

Marton did not do any compulsory weighing but it has been proven for two years now that if the weighing policy of an organization is clearly stated before a championships, and it is well known what the Jury thinks of it (ie no compromises, no “2% error factor” Etc.) then problems are much reduced or, as in the case this year, completely eliminated. People simply did not come to the championships with overweight aircraft, there was not one single complaint about weight once the championships had started.

To encourage people to be weighed voluntarily the Jury issued a notice a day or two before the opening entitled “Free Insurance” suggesting that anybody who thought their machine was near the limit should have their machine weighed and if an unsuccessful protest about weight was brought against anyone who had been tested then the Jury would take this protest as likely to have been a tactical one.

From time to time the almost inevitable rumours start about someone's performance. I found it to be very important to try at all times to get to the root of these rumours and then quietly try to correct it. A fine example was when a lot of pilots saw something in the distance which appeared to be the organization unfairly assisting a Hungarian competitor; in no time at all there were a host of unpleasant stories going around. In fact the whole thing was quite innocent and once the true explanation became known the whole fuss evaporated.

Site, area and organization.

Nagykanisza airport is a huge grass airfield with excellent infrastructure, fine ablutions, bar and restaurant Etc.

The area is a little more hilly than most of Hungary and really quite scenic. Most pilots seemed to enjoy flying in the area except for an extremely argumentative Belgian who blew his top in the second day's briefing, claiming that all the forest he was made to fly over was exceptionally dangerous. After his 10 minute speech, all Marton could say was how safe a "tree landing" could be (!) which started the Belgian off for another 10 minutes. After trying unsuccessfully to lobby other teams to his support throughout the day he went away the next morning. Nobody seemed particularly sad.

The marshals were generally very good, and there were plenty of them. The scoring was a nightmare mainly because they often changed as a result of the dozens of complaints. I think Task 3, which was complicated by a thunderstorm and misplaced markers went through 6 editions of provisional scores.

Fuel control & measurement

Marton chose to measure fuel by volume (in 2 litre plastic bottles) and have a "bilateral" system of teams controlling teams much as the PPG's have been doing for years. Marshals only had to resolve disputes and assist with tank sealing.

In principle it worked very well; fast and friendly much as the PPG people discovered years ago, but:

1 - Marton's 2 litre bottles were not all identical.... Jan Bem discovered that if someone chose all of one type of bottle they could have quite a different volume, by 20 or 30cc over 10 litres.... Fortunately this did not turn into a dispute, but it could have...

2 - There was considerable dispute at the second fuelling as to what constituted "empty". There was, of course no written instruction and Marton said at the briefing "empty tanks unless you can't see in them, in which case run engine until it stops". The French & UK teams who on that occasion were controlling each other, decided everyone should run to "engine stop", and then when they had finished, said it was unfair that other teams mostly had only "empty tanks". Result was other teams had to redo the whole thing again to "engine stop". Moral: In future the rule should be written on the briefing sheet as "Tanks should be empty and all engines run until they stop".

3 - Marton didn't have a Parc Ferme. Fuelled and unfuelled aircraft were all mixed up in the fuelling area. Some people worried about this, but in my opinion (which may not be the opinion of other Jury members) there was little chance of cheating because of the "many eyes" of the controlling team. Because there was a real chance a big thermal or gust could come along and blow machines over, people really had to be near their machines at all times.

GNSS Flight recorders

We had a stunning success with our GNSS Flight Recorder (FR) trial, MUCH better than even I expected. The potential for making future championships fairer and much easier to manage without vast investment are at last here.

I took 3 GAC approved FR's to test which are expensive (800 - 1000 euros ea.) and which did have a few problems (batteries running out, disconnected antennas, failure of user to switch it on properly) but Joel Amiable (FRA) produced 7 small 'off the shelf' handheld GPS's with modified firmware so they cannot show any flight info @ 200 euros ea (150 if you buy 10+); they are extremely simple to use and highly reliable; not one fault in the 42 task flights we recorded in a variety of different aircraft at the championships.

I will be producing a report in the next few weeks on the features, problems Etc. of each individual type of FR we tried at EMC 2002 and some of the analysis software we used.

Hopefully Joel will come to the PPG/PPT/PHG event in two weeks time with more of them so every pilot can try one in more than one task - If we have no technical problems (which I expect) then I see no reason why they could not be used as primary evidence at the WMC in UK next year in accordance with the timetable agreed at the 2000 CIMA meeting.

Before this can happen there are things which need to be done.

First: CIMA needs a specification for FR's. To this end I have produced a draft Annex 6 to Section 10 which is intended to be a stand-alone document rather than a 20 page addition to the existing S10 document. It's a bit technical but I think it needs to be if we are not to make a mess of things like GAC has done.

You can get the latest version at <http://www.flymicro.com/fr>

Second: CIMA needs a method of approval of FR's. It is proposed that CIMA establish a Flight Recorder Approval Committee (FRAC). The duties, terms of reference etc. are all included in the draft annex 6 above.

As you can see in the name of the document, this is DRAFT2, and in fact there are a few things even I would like to alter before the document is put forward as a formal inclusion to the agenda for this year's CIMA meeting. I am releasing it now because it is a complex issue and everyone must have a good look at it before they can make sensible

comments. I believe this really will work, so it is important that we have something good enough to be accepted at the meeting or we will lose a whole year.

I will establish a website so all discussion is as transparent as possible. I expect there will be more drafts released before the agenda deadline in September.

Drag racing & other new tasks.

The Hungarian drag racing association organized a practice before the championship and a knockout competition after the end with a \$10 entry fee and a \$1000 winner's prize.

It was actually rather fun. Safe, spectacular and quick, and there appeared to be a lot more pilot skill involved than you would initially credit. All classes of aircraft could compete fairly against each other which was different. In particular it gave (for once) quite a fair competition between the lightweight two-strokes and the heavyweight (and expensive) four strokes.

The course was 201 metres (not sure why, 1/8 mile?) but this seemed to be about right – any longer and the trikes would not have been able to stay down, and the big 3 axis machines which have much greater top speeds would have had an overwhelming advantage. It seemed a good thing that the co-pilot did not need to be on board in the two seat classes.

Their decision to run it on a knockout “one on one” basis was correct as often the races were so close that nothing but a quite a sophisticated electronic timing system could have resolved times accurate enough, whereas it was easy to see the winner of a race even if it was very close. (It can also be easily checked by video).

I can see that this task would work very well as a “new WAG” task. It could even be incorporated into regular championships for a low score, 250 or 500 points maybe. A knockout event between 60 aircraft which resolved all places could take considerable time but there is no reason, for example, why it couldn't be an on-going event for an hour or so every evening of the championships. Apart from pylon racing it is the most interesting task for spectators I have yet seen and it could have been much enhanced with a PA system.

Other tasks

The Polish were to give a demonstration of some new tasks but in the end it didn't happen. They erected a large “box” made of plastic tape suspended from two poles which I think you were supposed to fly through. Interesting...