

## **AGENDA ITEM 10.3**

### **REPORT OF THE CHIEF JUDGE**

#### **World Glider Aerobatic Championships & World Advanced Glider Aerobatic Championships**

**Toruń, Poland**  
**July 26 - August 6, 2011**

**Philippe Kuchler (pik)**



#### **Overview**

The 2011 edition of the glider events happened again as a combined event for Advanced and Unlimited classes. Because of the decision taken in plenum at last year's CIVA meeting at Oberhausen both classes were flying for the titles of world champions. In WAGAC competed 36 pilots from 10 countries and in WGAC competed 23 pilots from 7 countries. Aircrafts that could be seen flying included the Pilatus B4/PC11, Swift S-1, MDM-1 Fox, MDM-1 Solo Fox, SZD 59 Acro but also the MU 28 and the SZD 54-2. In addition a Lo 100 found its way back into the Unlimited competition.

Website: [www.wagac.com](http://www.wagac.com)

The city of Toruń is located about 180 km to the west north-west of the capital Warsaw.

The final board of judges consisted of:

- COURTOIS, Bernard      FRA
- BAJZIK, Stanislav      CZE
- DUGAS, Alain      FRA
- GAWECKI, Jan      POL
- HAU, Stephan      GER
- KAFTAN, David      CZE
- LAMBERT, Peter      AUT
- MAXEN, Jan      DEN

Chris Rudd, USA and Gabor Talabos Jr., HUN cancelled their participation.

Scoring Office:

- SZCZEPANOWSKI, Paweł POL

### **Judges selection**

The process went more or less smooth this year. However, it has clearly to be stated, that CIVA is getting more and more short on judges for glider competitions. This can be confirmed by going through the official list of judges and applying the rules regarding being current or not. Without support from power judges, this year's board would have been too small to meet the requirement of 7 official CIVA judges. I want to send a big thank you to Bernard Courtois, David Kaftan and Jan Maxen who decided to support the line at Toruń. I really look forward to see all of them on future glider aerobatics judging lines. Thanks guys!

The situation shows clearly, that CIVA needs fresh blood. And I also want to encourage judges to make themselves available for glider competitions. I personally assure my full support for any project that helps to resolve the situation.

### **Judges Preparation**

On all three CIVA continental and/or worlds competitions this year the same principle of a judges preparation day was held. It consisted of a theoretical part and practical flights. The seminar was held on the arrival day before the official start of the competitions. In addition way before the contest itself, a written judge's test was sent out by the JSC to be completed by the selected judges on all competitions. The test contained questions tailored for power and for glider in one single questionnaire.

In the theoretical part, during the morning, the same presentation was used as in power, with only minor changes according to the glider rules. In any case I always tried to explain the rules for power and glider. In addition I added as many remarks regarding differences between Part 1 and Part 2 of the book as possible in the limited time of the seminar. In addition the above mentioned test was discussed with the judges and it showed clearly that such a pre-contest preparation is very useful and helps to raise the level of judging.

Of course the assistants attended as well and quite a number of team managers, which I personally really appreciated.

The afternoon of the preparation day was spent by looking at prepared demonstration flights held by selected pilots. A big thank you goes out to the 2 pilots Manfred Echter and Remy Louvel for flying for the judges. Remy was so kind to jump into the position of Sandor Katona who felt ill and had to decline to fly. The 5 programs, drawn by myself, contained intentional errors and for the first time that I know of it was intentional that the pilots had another program than the judges! As a bottom line of the practical part, this project showed nicely that its not only a challenge to fly programs correctly but even more to fly a Known

program with intentional errors, as programs 4 and 5 where the Known sequences of both classes with some changes done by me for the purpose of judges training.

The glider people know, that I did this kind of refresher already in the last few years before the competition. I therefore have to say that it was nothing new for me and I think it is a must to do a proper preparation before the competition starts. However, such a seminar is not targeted at getting new blood because it is held for judges who have already been selected and therefore only a closed circle of people can attend it. I am therefore convinced that this needs to be done outside competitions, before judge selection and accessible for everyone interested in becoming a judge. As a result of this, CIVA should rethink the way of investing into future judges with money and time by creating a syllabus and training sessions for recruiting new staff independent from competitions.

### **Contest Flights**

After the judges preparation day on Tuesday, Wednesday was supposed to be the first competition day. But due to the weather not acting as intended by everybody no competition flights could take place for 5 days. Or in other words, no competition programs could be flown in the first week.

During the remaining 6 days, both classes flew 4 programs consisting of Known, Unknown 1, Free and Unknown 2. A total of 92 flights in Unlimited and 144 flights in Advanced took place.

The board of judges had the choice of 3 positions and the box could be used in all 4 directions depending on wind and sun.

The picture to the right shows the “beach”, the southern judging position. As on a real beach the judges were able to enjoy a nice barbecue out there during one of the lunch breaks!

Line judges where used at the usual 2 front corners equipped with special aims.

Video was done with at least 2 cameras running at the same time. This provided good backup and was used in quite a number of video conferences either at the judges’ room or at the line. On both “cinemas” a big LCD screen was available to have a good view for the



board. The identification of flights was done as usual by taking a shot of the flight number followed by a non interleaved pan to the glider in the sky assuring the right flight is looked at.

During the warm-up flight for one of the Unknowns in Unlimited class I noted that the warm-up pilot took the wrong exit in the second last figure. By watching the first competitor doing the same thing I got worried about a possible cock-up of paper work. After having stopped the flights I had a chat with the President of the International Jury and it was confirmed that the paperwork held by the judges was different from the one given to the competitors. The jury then decided that the pilot can re-fly the sequence and that the case is treated like a technical defect. The source of the mix-up is not known to me. Needless to say that such things shouldn't happen...

### **Flight Safety**

I am happy to be able to report that flight safety was no issue on competition flights this year. The main reason for this is for sure that all pilots acted very responsible and respected the lower limits very well. Only relatively few LOW's and no LOW-LOW's at all had to be given by the board.

On the other hand, the newly introduced radio check on the safety frequency by the pilots when approaching the box, as done in power since many years, was a mixed adventure. I also had to coordinate the availability of the box to the approaching aircraft to avoid having more than one glider at altitude at the same time. This and the fact that in glider normally more than one aircraft is airborne (up to 3, depending on towing aircraft availability) in addition to the competitor flying the sequence in the box, created quite a lot of "noise" on the frequency and pilots raised their concerns about being able to concentrate on the sequence.

I don't have a ready-made solution for this problem at the moment, despite having tried to modify the radio procedure compared to the book, but I feel that the GASC has to rethink the procedure again.

### **PHMD**

As another key point under the aspect of flight safety I want to mention the new Polish Height Measuring Device (PHMD) developed by the Poznan University. It worked flawlessly and it not only increased flight safety but also competition fairness.

There were only 2 flights where the PHMD delivered questionable results in reporting the lower boundary limit to the CJ position. Both unexpected beeps occurred during the last figure in the same sequence. The figure was a shark tooth with a half aileron roll from positive to negative on the 45 up line. No beep was received between the end of the second last figure and the last figure. No beep was either received after the completion of the last figure before wing wag. However, on the 45 degree line about half way up in the half roll a beep was received.

The supporting team of the Poznan University investigated the 2 occurrences and stated that it must have something to do with a pressure difference generated by the roll movement of the aircraft through a possibly open vent window. The LOW's were not given on these 2 flights because of an obvious technical anomaly and not a situation where the pilot has touched the low line of the box.



The left picture above shows the CJ screen on the laptop displaying numerically and graphically the altitude of all transmitters. The right picture shows the onboard transmitting device. No electrical power from the onboard system of the aircraft is needed. The device is completely independent. Only a mounting bracket has to be prepared in the cockpit.

## Protests & Claims

There was a claim from an Advanced team, that the handling of the box out times is not according to the rules. I decided, due to language barriers, available staff and radio transmission problems not to transmit the box outs from the line judging positions directly to the CJ position by radio after every flight to avoid confusion and to have the line judges concentrate on their job. This in turn ended up in not having the total box-out seconds on the well known CJ summary sheets for the flights but only on the list done by the line judges from where they were transferred into the scoring system. As an immediate action an additional helper could be found that used a mobile phone connection from the CJ position to the line judges to get the seconds after every flight. The claiming team was satisfied with this solution.

In Advanced class a protest from a team was received regarding the possible mix up of a video being looked at by the board of judges to confirm a HZ. The particular video session was supervised by a member of the International Jury. The protest was denied by the International Jury.



## **Summary**

The whole event was organized in a professional and very favorable way. Only minor glitches surfaced during the competition and they were normally resolved within short time by the organizer. Accommodation for the judges was in one of the best hotels I have ever had the chance to stay at a competition and the transport for the board outside the airfield and on the airfield was excellent. In addition, the excursions organized for pilots and officials were well chosen and helped very much to bridge the bad weather in the first week. I want to say thank you to Poland and the organizing team for creating a memorable event in the well known heartwarming atmosphere of Polish people.

I also want to say thank you to my board of judges for the excellent cooperation and the many nice moments at the line and the discussions later at the hotel lobby. Thanks people, I will remember this. I felt like being the head of a good team.

And finally, a heartwarming thank you goes out again to Schorsch Dörder, my Assistant. And again I have to say that teamwork at the CJ position is the key for a successful work at the line!

Philippe Kuchler  
7.10.2011  
Payerne, Switzerland