

## Report of the Contest Director/Jury Member



The World Games 2017

5.8.2017 – 13.8.2017

Wroclaw, Szymanów Airport, Poland



Philippe Kuchler, pik

### Introduction and Overview

The glider aerobatics part of this years World Games took part at Szymanów Airport, located about 12 km north of the city center of Wroclaw, Poland. The other FAI sports competing at the same location where Paramotoring and Canopy Piloting.

The event was by invitation-only and classified as a Special Event. Glider aerobatics had 12 spots to fill. After the short term cancellation of 2 selected Czech pilots there were finally 11 pilots from 8 NAC's competing.

Pilots list:

BERTOSSIO	Luca	ITA
HOLL	Eberhard	GER
ILINSKY	Vladimir	RUS
KAMINSKIY	Georgy	RUS
LENTZ-GAUTHIER	Eric	USA
MAKULA	Jerzy	POL
MAYR	Siegfried	AUT
SCHAAL	Eugen	GER
SERRES	Daniel	FRA
SZILÁGYI	János	HUN
TOTH	Ferenc	HUN

All pilots where competing on Swift S-1.

Results are available on: [www.civa-results.com](http://www.civa-results.com).

## Overall Winner



Ferenc TOTH  
Swift S-1  
Hungary

### Congratulations to Ferenc as the Winner!

There was no team competition taking place as the event was laid-out as an individual competition only.

Jury:

The jury for all 3 sports was put together by each involved commissions contest director or liaison officer. The president was supplied by CASI. The members where the following:

Mike CLOSE, AUS, Jury President	CASI
Elisabet MIKAELSSON, SWE	IPC
Wolfgang LINTL, AUT	CIMA
Philippe "pik" KÜCHLER, SUI	CIVA

The board of judges consisted of:

[ COURTOIS, Bernard	Chief Judge, scoring	FRA
[ DOVGALENKO, Tamara		UKR
[ FRAIZE, Thierry		FRA
[ HAU, Stef		GER
[ PAKAI, Csaba		RUM

Scoring Office:

[ KUECHLER, Philippe "pik"	SUI
----------------------------	-----

No warm-up pilot was used.

## **Preface**

The FAI has applied to the IWGA (International World Games Association) to be part of the 2017 edition of the World Games and has suggested the 3 mentioned sports for participation. However, the Local Organizing Committee (LOC) also has a word regarding the final selection of sports. Canopy Piloting (IPC) was set as this sports commission has generally big success on their events. Poland has a leading role in Paramotoring (CIMA), probably the main reason for including them in the event. For Glider Aerobatics the popularity of gliding in general in Poland but for sure the personal popularity of Jurek Makula where the factors to include us (CIVA) in the Games.

For every World Games the participating sports are selected from scratch. So there is no guarantee that one of the three is in again on the next edition.

I was put in charge for this event mainly on request of FAI and with the support of the GAC. As I was already the Liaison Officer during preparations, I was put into the position of the CD.

The pilots where selected based on their performance in the last 2 years on WGAC (2015 and 2016). Sadly not all pilots eligible could participate. Not because of disinterest but because of other personal/family obligations or due to last minute troubles avoiding participation. All NAC's where informed before informing the pilots themselves. Sadly, most of the NAC's didn't even reply to the mails sent out.

## **Facilities and Contest Organization**

In July 2016 the chairman of the GAC, Manfred Echter, and myself attended the first organizational meeting at Wroclaw. We also visited the venue at Szymanów. The whole organization of the airport disciplines was headed by Markus Haggene, Sports Director FAI.

The airfield is run by the Wroclaw Aeroclub under the lead of Marek Józwicki and consists of a big hangar, several accompanying buildings and a huge open space with a grass runway. Marek was the service provider for all 3 competitions.

The organization and communication with FAI as the head of the flying part, especially Markus, was very close and productive. Luckily Markus was the one fighting with the LOC for all details outside the airfield. Marek in turn was responsible for everything on the airfield (or to be precise within the fenced part of the airfield, the play grounds).

During the competitions there was every morning and after flying in the evening a meeting with the representative of the LOC, the overall Director (Markus), the 3 competition directors, the service provider (Marek) and the jury president. Communication was direct, open and straightforward. I really appreciated these meetings as problems where always solved unbureaucratic and with focus to solutions between us.

The opening briefings where all held at the contest hotel. Further briefings where held on the airfield at the trailer park.

## **Contest summary**

All competitors flew 4 programmes:

Free Programme

Unknown 1

Unknown 2

Freestyle, with smoke and music (manually transmitted by me to the cockpit via handheld radio...)

The 2 Unknowns were quite challenging and clearly tailored for the Swift S-1. They were created by myself in cooperation with my well known WGAC/WAGAC assistant Schorsch Dörder. A participation with a Fox (except maybe the Solo Fox) was not planned.

The Freestyle was aimed at the spectators on the grand stands. One of the points to be corrected for the next special event of this format is the distance from the box edge to the crowd line. It was way too far. See below.

The minimum for the 3 classic programmes was set to 200 m together with the pilots on the opening briefing. The minimum for the Freestyle was 100 m, again agreed by all competitors on the opening briefing. Allowed was a low pass down to 50 m after completion of the Freestyle, but none of the pilots did what we would call a low-pass for the audience. Reason see below.

Flight order for the first programme was by drawing of lots, for the following programmes it was the ranking in reverse order. This created a very good storyline in having the best flying last.

During the flights there was slightly improvised live comment for the spectators. The selected speaker did a good job in animating the audience present. However, his knowledge about Glider Aerobatics was rather limited and he was therefore supported by Nick Buckenham, who was in Wrocław for a presidents meeting, and myself. Thanks Nick for jumping in.

On the big screen we were able to present shortly after every flight the marks given by the judges and on a second page the standings after the flight. This was mainly possible because of the heavy support of Noosphere, an FAI partner company. A big thank you goes to the 2 brothers from the Ukraine who helped me a lot.

Despite having a big screen available, we were not allowed by the LOC to show aerobatic videos during the waiting times for the next flight. The reason given for this by the LOC was copyright issues. A big downdraft!

Scoring was done without Fair-play. Sadly the planned solution with tablets was not available. So scoring was done on conventional score sheets and the immediately typed into a Noosphere solution for display purposes. Due to the lack of a dedicated scoring officer, I had no other chance than to prepare all the paperwork by myself. In addition the whole calculation part was done based on Excel Sheets because there was no operator for ACRO available! After the competition I recreated the whole event in ACRO and luckily enough the Excel results corresponded with the ACRO ones. One exception, see below.

## **Complaints**

No complaint was handed in to the Jury.

## **Protests**

No protest was handed in to the Jury.

## **Judging Analysis and Fair-play**

As stated above, Fair-play was not used. So no judging analysis is available. This was intentional to make the whole scoring process as transparent as possible and to have understandable live results for the audience without the side effects of FPS.

Despite not using FPS I am convinced that the scoring and the final results are fair and plausible without any biasing induced by the judges.

## **Proposals to CIVA plenary or respective commissions – Things to learn for next time**

I don't see any necessity for immediate changes to Part 3 rules based on the experience at this event. The programmes for gliders work well with current settings, although challenging.

I list the following items for consideration for future special events in Glider Aerobatics:

- [ A scoring director is an absolute must. This can't be done by the CD in addition to all the other tasks during the comp. My days were very long: Getting up at 5 o'clock and going to bed after midnight. It was really a hard week for me. But hey, nobody said it would be a pony farm.
- [ The raw scoring used surfaced a problem in ACRO when I reconstructed the whole event for the CIVA results page. ACRO wouldn't let me enter any PZ given by the judges. After a quick chat with Nick we agreed that this needs to be possible even when not using FPS as we have judging rules that demand the judge to give a PZ. The handling of ACRO by that time produced a slight difference in score than what I had in the Excel tables. Luckily the ranking was not touched. The differences were absolutely minimal. As far as I know Nick has solved this problem already. Of course the issue was described to the pilots and they had no problem with the difference either.
- [ The solution with a scoring CJ was working well. To have a good assistant is mandatory. Why shouldn't this be an option for our classical events?
- [ None of the pilots did a low-pass because the dead-line was too far away from the crowd line. This clearly because of safety reasons requested by the LOC and agreed upon by FAI and myself as CD. For future events however, I strongly suggest to waive the deadline for the low-pass to give the pilots the possibility to present themselves. Of course with safety in mind. But hey, these pilots were the best of the best and very experienced demonstration pilots as well.

- [ CIVA should undertake a move to have an electronic replacement for the good old score sheets. This would facilitate the live scoring ground breaking need for special events. The solution on the software side of the scoring system (ACRO) was there. Many thanks to Nick for preparing this. I know he invested a lot of time and communication with Noosphere. But for some reasons this was dropped. Mainly time constraints. Also the necessary tablet hardware was not available.
- [ The set out minima in Section 6, Part 3 do not need to be changed. The solution to set the minima together with the pilots at the opening briefing worked very well. So the minima in the rules should be used as guidance, but not treated as mandatory. Just to clarify: the minima for the event where set higher than what is stated in the rules. I am very happy that the pilots unanimously agreed to the proposed limits by me. Thanks guys! I really appreciate that.
- [ The selection of the pilots was based on their performance during the past 2 WGAC (2015 and 2016). The LOC requested the sports commissions to state how the selection was made. For this reason I created a very basic ranking system for Unlimited. This was then accepted by the GAC. The used system was only taking WGAC's into consideration and was limited to 2 years back. However, CIVA should definitely make a move into having a ranking system looking also into other events (eg. nationals) and incorporating a delay of more than 2 years. The ranking should be publicly available on CIVA news. This would clearly make us ready for future special events.
- [ Finally, there is one thing that needs to be said: Finances. It was clear from the beginning that the number of officials available to all airports is very limited (hence no scoring director). Its a policy driven by the IWGA, but set by the LOC. I can accept it with some moaning. But what I can't accept is the whole fuzz around accompanying persons for pilots and the sudden reduction of funds available for competition purposes. The helpers received lodging from the service provider and not the LOC. It was planned that all airports people stay at the same hotel. Not even this was possible in the end. In addition it had to be subsidized by FAI. In top of that, some necessary equipment had to be paid by the sports commissions themselves. In our case the red van which was used for HMD and deadline monitoring. This is from my point of view a no-go. The LOC wants to have a comp, so they definitely need to take care of everything necessary to run the show safely and productive. Don't get me wrong: This critique is not aimed at CIVA, nor FAI, nor the service provider. Its clearly targeted at the LOC. And one more example: it was stated that all costs for flights are covered by the LOC through the service provider. However, I was quite surprised when I was approached that pilots need to pay for some training flights... This is clearly not a problem of the service provider. Marek had no choice than to ask the money for it. He has already covered a lot of costs from his pocket, which should clearly be covered by the LOC.

## **Final Words**

Luckily we had very good weather. Except for the last planned competition day (Sunday). Because of approaching thunderstorms we had to fly programme 4 on Saturday evening. But after all, this was a good decision and made it possible to fly all 4 programmes on an airfield with shared airspace during 3 days.

In addition the cooperation between the 3 sports commission was very good and oriented towards solutions. It showed to me that such events are possible if the right people are driving it. A big thank you to my CD colleagues! It was very nice working with you.

I also want to say thank you to Markus who kept the difficult part of talking to the LOC away from us. I enjoyed the cooperation. A heartfelt thank you Markus!

And finally, the biggest thanks, goes out to Marek. Lets bring it to the point: Without you this would never have happened! You made it possible, man.

Philippe K uchler, pik  
28.10.2017  
Zumholz, Switzerland