

Report of the Chief Judge

European Intermediate Aerobatic Championships (EIAC) Deva Airfield, Romania



Judges

As the Coronavirus pandemic remained a key factor for many judges in their ability to obtain international travel documents, the CIVA Judging Committee carried out a fresh survey of available judges and assistants. This resulted in a slightly reduced panel of just six judges, and following approval from the bureau of CIVA the championship was able to proceed on this basis.

The judging panel at Deva was thus -

- Galyna Suprunenko (UKR) with Liliya Avramenko
- Algis Orlickas (LTU) with Eugenijus Raubickas
- Bela Guraly (HUN) with István Szilbek
- Alexandr Miakishev (RUS) with Vladimir Razhin
- Csaba Pakai (ROM) with Cristian Vraciu
- Elady Lozano (ESP) with Guy Auger
- Nick Buckenham (GBR, CJ) with Hanna Räihä

Judging currency test

On arrival each judge and assistant pair was handed a short test with a number of graphically based questions, and requested to review each situation presented and enter the final mark



that they considered appropriate for each of the figures illustrated. This style of test has been shown to overcome many of the problems that can arise from text-based questions when given to judges and assistants whose first language is not English. Their conclusions and the logic behind the downgrades that led to their final marks were reviewed through a final discussion session, during which various complex points were assessed and their correct interpretation in the CIVA Section-6 part-1 rules clarified.



Judging location and operations

With a predominantly north-west wind parallel to the major range of hills to the north, just one judging location was established. With the official wind coming from either the north-west or the south-east each day this position was used throughout the event.



The organiser provided an excellent range of temporary sun-shade covers with comfortable sets of chairs for each judging team, and a good set of tables and chairs under a larger open-sided tent was provided for the CJ position. A separate tent with a fridge for soft drinks was close by.

Two separate video recordings were made using fairly basic cameras, and a good sized monitor was available in a dark tent to review flights when required. When used to check particular figure elements the video output quality was adequate, though the picture was often unstable and this led sometimes to difficulty establishing the correct result.

The judges used the Left-Right style of judging forms throughout, and the scoring office provided good sets of paperwork in lever-arch folders for each judge. A very helpful team of organising assistants was always available to assist with local requirements, paperwork collections and returns to the scoring office.

Championship progress

With just 20 competitors from 7 countries it was possible to complete a full programme of flights each day. The weather was excellent throughout, with only temporary non-flying periods in the morning while the visibility cleared. The four programmes were thus easily completed during a five-day period, with a single rest day to separate programmes 2 and 3 – Free Unknown sequences 1 and 2. The organisers were thus able to set the closing ceremony one day earlier than had been expected, allowing departures to begin on the Friday.

Judging Output

Very few problems arose from the paperwork submitted by the judges, only a few sheets being returned for correction of minor details. Throughout the championship all judges maintained a good standard of output, and the overall Ranking Index data was well within normal limits.



Judges statistics

A selection of elements from the scoring system assessment of judges during the championship is presented below for reference:

Analysis of Judges Combined Anomalies

Sequences: Seq01 Programme 1: Free Known, Seq02 Programme 2: Free Unknown #1 (INP), Seq03 Programme 3: Free Unknown #2 (INP), Seq04 Programme 4: Free Unknown #3

| The 1st European+Ir Deva, România 04.0910.09.2021 | ntermediate | | LTU Algis Orlickas RI 7.40 [4] | UKR Galyna Suprunenko RI 10.47 [4] | ESP Elady Lozano RI 10.84 [4] | HUN Bela Guraly RI 11.30 [4] | RUS Alexandr Miakishev RI 11.78 [4] | ROM Csaba Pakai RI 13.83 [4] |
|---|------------------------|--------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Style Comparison Average and Style of Judges Raw Marks compared to normalised all-Judges average Style $\heartsuit 2 x Raw SD$ | Average: Style: | 1.91 0.29 | 2.00 0.18 | 1.93 0.27 | 1.92 0.32 | 1.90 0.36 | 1.90 0.25 | 1.83 0.37 |
| Vertical axis scale: 1 mark = 130mm | | | | | | • | | I |
| Raw Marks Factors: | Average %: Style %: | 100 100 | + 4.32 - 37.71 | + 1.02 - 7.11 | + 0.29 + 8.71 | - 0.69 + 23.58 | - 0.59 - 14.68 | - 4.35 + 27.21 |
| Review of Percep | tion Zeros | | | | | | | |
| PZ's accepted = 2 | | | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| PZ's rejected = 32 | | | 1 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 12 | - |

10

1

Cumulative RI contributions per Team

| Algis Orlickas (LTU) | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--|--|
| Judge: max.co Panel: | untry bias | = 1.06 = 4.81 | min = -1.63 min = -4.03 | | |
| Most favoured | Least favoured | | | | |

Judge: max country bias = 2.12 min = -3.04

Least

GER O GER O CER O CER O CROM

favoured

= 4.81 min = -4.03



Bela Guraly (HUN)

Panel:

Most

favoured

Totals per Judge

| Galyna Suprunenko (UKK) | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Judge: max o Panel: | country bias | = 2.35 = 4.81 | min = -3.10 min = -4.03 | |
| Most favoured | Least favoured | | | |

Caluna Sunrunanka (UKD)

10



Alexandr Miakishev (RUS)

| | max country bias | . , | min = -4.03 min = -4.03 |
|---------------|-----------------------|-----|----------------------------|
| Most favou | Least red favoured | | |



Elady Lozano (ESP)

0

12

1

| Judge: max co | ountry bias | = 1.81 | min = -3.72 |
|------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------|
| Panel: | | = 4.81 | min = -4.03 |
| Most favoured | Least favoured | | |



Csaba Pakai (ROM)





In conclusion

Despite some difficult situations due to restrictions caused by the Coronavirus pandemic the event was run to a high standard, and in my opinion the judging panel provided an accurate and fair view of the programmes flown. Few 'Low' penalties were recorded, and generally the quality of the flying was excellent.



Many of the pilots at this championship should undoubtedly commit to the Advanced category at the next opportunity, where their skills and technical ability will be tested in a more appropriate environment.

Nick Buckenham Chief Judge, EIAC 2021