

## Report of the President of the International Jury

2<sup>nd</sup> World Intermediate Aerobatic Championship  
7.7.2019 – 13.7.2019  
Břeclav, Czech Republic



Philippe Kuchler, pik

### Introduction and Overview

The 2<sup>nd</sup> FAI European Intermediate Aerobatic Championship (WIAC) was held at the Airfield of Břeclav (LKBA), Czech Republic on 7<sup>th</sup> July - 13<sup>th</sup> July 2019. Contest Director was Vladimír Machula (CZE) and Chief Judge was John Gaillard (RSA).

The scoring office was run by Katharina Machula (CZE).

There were a total of 26 competitors (30 in 2014) from 8 countries (12 in 2014). Detailed results are available from [www.civa-results.com](http://www.civa-results.com).

Jury members were Elena Klimovich (RUS) and Tamás Ábrányi (HUN). A big thank you to you guys for the work done and the many happy hours we had together.

Website: [www.wiac2019.cz](http://www.wiac2019.cz)

### Overall Winner

#### Individual:



Igor CHERNOV  
Extra 330LX  
Ukraine

**Team:**

Igor CHERNOV, Timur FATKULIN and Dmitry POGREBYTSKY  
UKRAINE

Congratulations to Igor and the Ukranian team!

**Facilities and Contest Organization**

The airfield has numerous hangars where competition aircrafts could be stored. In addition there was an additional hangar tent used. The contest offices and the info-point was situated in additional containers next to the main building. Sadly there was no separate jury office.

The Info-Point was driven, conducted and managed by the proven Lenka Durasova in a “one lady show”. A big and heartfelt thank you to Lenka! As always, it was a big pleasure to work with you.

The catering was done by the hotel where all the competitors and officials were accomodated.

The airfield itself is located about 3 km outside of the town of Břeclav. The runway has grass surface and the whole airfield is big enough for such an event.

The box was marked very well. Even on aerial photos all markers where very well aligned and the their visibility was outstanding. Great job done by the organizer!

There where 2 judge positions used during the whole competition. One right next to the airport buildings beside the runway and the other one on the west edge of the box. Transportation to the second one was done by mini vans.

The weather data was supplied by several Czech services. The data was then presented very professionally by the CD. Wind measurement was done by means of drone flights. In addition the measurements where presented online on a dedicated web tool ([meteo.wiac2019.cz](http://meteo.wiac2019.cz)).

Density Altitude of 3000 ft has never been exceeded during competition days.

The scoring office was run in a “one lady show”, again. Katharina Machula did a very good job, despite some issues regarding initial configuration of the ACRO system. I (still) think the scorer should always have a full time assistant who helps to verify and recheck the tasks and paperwork sent to the judging line. Thank you Katharina for investing so much time into this! I appreciate your important work.

Messaging was done by sending Whatsapp messages which some of the officials sadly where unable to receive.

## **Contest summary**

4 programmes were flown by 26 competitors and 1 H/C pilot. 2 warm-up pilots, including Jaromir Cihak and the CD Vladimir Machula, were flying for the judges.

Please note that of the original field of 29 competitors, one didn't show up at all. 2 more were removed by the IJ due to violating rule 1.2.4.1 (Competitors Eligibility Restrictions). Of these 2 one was used to be the warmup pilot and the other one decided to fly as H/C.

No incidents nor any accidents took place. Thank you to the pilots for safe flying!

## **Complaints**

No complaint was handed in to the IJ.

## **Protests**

No protest was handed in to the IJ.

## **Other businesses of the IJ**

### **Technical Defect on HA-XEG**

During the very last flight of programme 1 on Monday the 8<sup>th</sup> of July a mechanical defect occurred on the aircraft used, the Genpro HA-XEG. The technical commission decided that the aircraft needs a thorough repair before the next flight because the tail wheel assembly was damaged. The aircraft was grounded and the repair was initiated. This aircraft was used by 4 pilots which therefore were unable to fly programme 2 on Tuesday the 9<sup>th</sup> of July. This concerns the whole Polish team and one pilot from Great Britain.

The IJ decided to let the 4 pilots fly programme 2 on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> of July interleaved in the morning in programme 3 in case the aircraft is fixed and ready to fly. The same 4 pilots would then fly programme 3 on the same day in the afternoon again interleaved. As a result para 2.5.1.1 would need to be waived. But para 2.5.1.2 would be kept in force regarding 6 hours separation.

Para 2.5.1.2 basically give the IJ the right to waive 2.5.1.1 but only in case the successful completion of the contest would be at risk. This is not the case. There are still enough teams to have a team competition. This is important because the Polish team would fall out of the comp if the Genpro wouldn't fly anymore. Because of this fact the IJ has called a team managers meeting to get a 2/3 majority to waive para 2.5.1.1. (according to para 1.3.1.6). The concerned pilots were of course willing to fly 2 programmes on the same day.

The team managers meeting was held on the 9<sup>th</sup> of July at 13:00 and the result of the voting was unanimously in favor of the waiver of 2.5.1.1.

### **Exclusion of a judge from the judge line**

On day 4 of the comp there was a request from the CJ to expel a judge from the judge line because

of repeatedly not fulfilling instructions given to him by the CJ. This judge returned sometimes score sheets with missing grades on it or in difficult situations has only put “A” as the grade.

The jury denied the request because it was in their point of view not in any way unsportive behaviour which would render Paragraph 6.2.2 from the Sporting Code General Section applicable.

The jury does see the below points as the source for the problem:

1. The judge had to work with an assistant from the organizer because his planned assistant did not get the necessary visa to arrive at the venue. The assistant used was not an aerobatic judge nor had any aerobatic experience. By the time of selecting a replacement assistant for the judge the person used was the best alternate in terms of availability and in terms of language proficiency.
2. Considerable language problems surfaced between the CJ and the judge concerned. A jury member was used to translate as much as possible to the judge concerned.
3. The CJ has requested the judges to observe every flight from entering to leaving the box and in addition to detect the start of the sequence on their own. No whistling signals were given. This together with the frequency the flights, led to the situation that the judges often didn't have enough time to thoroughly complete their score sheets.

## **Problems with ACRO**

During data entry into ACRO there have been several occasions where entered scores disappeared or have been replaced by other pilots scores or non valid codes. In addition several crashes happened in the software. Thanks to the thorough support by Nick Buckenham, the problems could be located and Nick even built a new version of ACRO during the competition.

Nick explained to the IJ that the problems are within the presentation part of the software (print and web) and not within the calculations.

With his explanations he was able to diffuse the doubts regarding the correctness of the results within the IJ.

## **Judging Analysis**

1	Johnie Smith	RSA	7.73
2	Steff Hau	GER	9.19
3	Galyna Suprunenko	UKR	11.14
4	Bela Guraly	HUN	13.01
5	Alexandr Miakishev	RUS	13.05
6	Zuzana DANIHELOVA	CZE	17.5
7	Nick Buckenham	GBR	20.96

## **Proposals to CIVA plenary or respective commissions**

As a result of the contest operations supervised by the IJ the following proposals are submitted to

plenum or the respective committees:

All paragraphs and page numbers refer to Section 6 Part 1, Version 2019-1, except where mentioned otherwise.

- ! Allowed figures for programmes 2,3 and 4: On page 19, paragraph 2.3.1.4 it is mentioned that 1 figure from family 7.8.1 to 7.8.8 is allowed for Yak 52 and Intermediate. In the list of allowed unknown figures on page 63 however none of the figures (cuban eights) is tagged for Yak 52/Intermediate.

Rationale: This must be clarified. Either remove the figure from the list of allowed figures in the table on page 19 or add the tags for Yak 52/Intermediate on page 63.

- ! Appendix A: List of figures for Programmes 2,3 and 4: The information on page 53 regarding limitations on figures should be visible next to the figures concerned in the catalog of unknown figures. Somebody trying to select a figure for an unknown (eg. During figure drawing) might easily miss the additional information available on page 39. Especially when there is already printed restrictions next to the figure concerned, she/he might assume that the restrictions are complete. A possible easy solution could be to add at least a references to page 39 in the notes within the unknown catalog.

Rationale: Avoid time consuming discussions regarding elements/figures being allowed or not.

- ! Paragraph 4.4.3.1 is the list of elements for a mark of Hard Zero. In letter b) it is still mentioned that rolling on axis of more than 90 degrees has to be marked as HZ. In 2019 a new rule for roll on exit heading was introduced. This rule, paragraph B.9.3.6 letter I) subletter ii) defines rolling on axis of more than 45 degrees as a Perception Zero. This is clearly contradictory. After a chat with the creator of the afterwards as rule adopted proposal (Nick Buckenham) one of the clear intentions was to remove the necessity of verifying this error on a video because it is in most cases impossible and leads only to long discussions. The IJ therefore concludes that para 4.4.3.1 was missed to be changed accordingly.

Rationale: Housekeeping

- ! Submission of figures by the International Jury in case of fewer than 10 NACs

Remove the sentence "These figures must be of the average difficulty of the figures submitted by the NACs and cover Families not represented by them." from para 2.3.1.3.

Rationale: This sentence is difficult to follow down to the letter and doesn't really make sense.

## **Final Words**

Thanks to good meteo conditions, the comp was completed on day 4 with Programme 4.

I especially want to mention the unanimous decision of the team managers regarding the waiving of para 2.5.1.1 in favor of the 4 Genpro pilots. This is very good sportsmanship!

A big thank you goes out to all the volunteers and the local organizing committee, headed by Libor Babak, Chairman of the Břeclav Aeroclub.

And last but not least a thank you to Vladimir and his proven team who again managed to create a professional environment for a good championship.

Philippe Kuchler, pik  
13.7.2019  
Zumholz, Switzerland