

IGC STEWARD REPORT

8th FAI Junior World Gliding Championship 28th July – 10th August 2013

**Central Gliding School (Leszno)
Poland**

Contest Director: Wojciech Ścigala

Overview: The competition attracted 84 entries from 23 countries, 48 in the club class and 36 in the Standard class. 6 countries fielded a full team of 3 pilots in each class. That there are this number of young competition pilots from so many countries is very encouraging for the future of gliding.

Where there is criticism in this report, it is intended to be constructive and in no way devalues the tremendous amount of good work that has been done by the contest organisers and the many other volunteers involved with the preparation for and the running of this competition, which by any standards was a great success. The IGC is most grateful for all their energy and enthusiasm.

1. ORGANISATION

1.1 Overall organisation

The overall organisation was effective and friendly

1.2 Quantity of Officials

Sufficient for the task

1.3 Experience of Officials

The CD and the Deputy CD (Task Setter) are experienced in running and competing in Championships. The Contest Director had served as a Steward at the Musbach Junior Worlds and was well prepared for the competition. The Task setter has Task set on a number of occasions. They were assisted by highly experienced Central School officials.

1.4 Suitability of Meetings and Briefings

The main briefings were held in the main hangar. Tables were provided for the pilots and managers and there was ample seating for crews and other spectators. The Beamer display was visible and while the acoustics in the hangar were not good pilots were able to hear the briefings. Briefings were concise and well managed.

An initial Team Captain's meeting was held followed by daily meetings before the competition daily briefing. At the first one, the standard procedures were explained and the local procedures were clarified. Subsequent meetings were held in order to explain corrections and changes made to task sheets. These meetings were held at the airfield in a smaller airconditioned briefing room in the Airport Hotel.

1.5 Suitability of weather information

The forecasts were made by professional meteorologists based on the information gathered from several sources. This information was presented in briefing by one of the Meteorologist's to the pilots in a clear and understandable way.

1.6 Suitability of facilities

The briefings were held in a hangar. An audio system was used to ensure that everyone could hear the information. A Beamer was used to project visual information.

The competition office (also known as the info office) was located in the Airport Hotel (Also part of the Central School). Scoring occurred in the Contest Director's office by the CD

Catering was organized in the main building and the hangar, although mainly in the Airport Hotel restaurant..

The camping area was located to the North of the Hotel. Showers and Toilets were located in a Shower block along with a washing machine.

An area for team gazebos was reserved in front of the camping area to ensure a good view of the airfield action.

A 'wifi' network covered the Hotel and Camping area. Internet connection worked sporadically usually because of insufficient bandwidth. We think good Internet coverage with good bandwidth should be a requirement for all gliding competitions in this era of wireless communication.

1.7 Transportation

The Jury provided their own cars. The Stewards borrowed bicycles. Transportation was organised to and from Poznan (Airport and Railway Stn).

1.8 Information dissemination (Pronouncements, schedules and decisions)

All the official information was displayed on an official notice board located in the Airport Hotel lobby. A set of Pigeon holes for dissemination of info by paper to the Team Captains was positioned in the Hotel lobby. Internet was used to display results. Wireless and SMS was also used to inform the Team captains, Jury and Stewards of daily timings. At launch time messages were also broadcast on the launch frequency.

The internet was the main source of information for Preliminary and Unofficial results. All Unofficial and Official results were posted in the Airport Hotel Lobby.

1.9 Pilot assistance

Pilots and crews could always find adequate assistance from the organizers at the competition office

1.10 Retrieval

In general, there were no problems with glider retrievals.

1.11 Launch control for fair access and efficiency

The launches were usually efficient. 13 tugs were used. Launching took an average 55 minutes to 1 hour for both classes. The Start Gate was opened 20 minutes after the last official launch of each class. Three tugs were kept on standby at the launch point to re-launch any gliders that needed a second launch.

The launches were fair. The correct order was maintained throughout.

1.12 Opening and closing ceremonies including presentation of Jury and Stewards

The Opening Ceremony was well organised and the suitably presented the gravity of the event. The Brass Band and their Majorettes were very good. There were short speeches from local civic dignitaries, the Aero Club of Poland and the Polish CAA. The International Teams were presented to a small crowd of spectators and the International Jury and Stewards were correctly acknowledged. The ceremony was followed by a short airshow. Two of the display items exhibited some *seriously dangerous display manoeuvres*.

1.13 Other Social Events, International Evening

The Mayor invited all Contest Officials and Team Captains to a dinner in the town on the 6th. It was a most convivial evening, demonstrating how important the Competition is to the town of Leszno and the surrounding district. Quite a lot of networking took place.

A very successful International evening was held in the hangar on the evening of the 1st August. It was the usual lively affair but started a little late due to a long day of flying and crewing. On Thursday the 8th the Polish Team invited all the other Competitors to a 'Polish' evening providing traditional Wild Boar, Lard, Bread and Gherkins, Beer and Vodka. Polish gliding films were shown. The party on the last night was great fun and the CD '*presented*' an unofficial, fun, Awards Ceremony Using data gathered from the Flight Record files.

1.14 Total number of Scheduled days and number of Contest days

The competition started on the 28th July and ended on the 10th. Poor weather prevented tasking on the first two days. A Rest day was declared on the 4th of August. Poor weather prevented flying on several other days altogether there were 8 Competition Task days. Two of those days only allowed 1 class to compete.

1.15 Media Liaison

Media liaison was carried out by a full time official of the Central School.

1.16 Public and Internet Display of real time airplane positions and information

15 Way-Aero trackers were rotated between classes on a daily basis. The display was available on the internet and there was a screen at the official notice board in the Gliding Hotel reception area and a Beamer in the briefing hangar

1.17 Other organisation Comments

2 RULES

2.1 Adequacy of Local Procedures

There was a misunderstanding with the approval of the LP's which were only approved by the IGC Bureau just before the start of the competition. At this time two late changes had been made to the original draft, the first reduced the height of the finish ring, the second concerned the use of ballast in the Club Class. Both were introduced based on experience at other competitions. While the finish ring limits worked very well, the decision to exclude all ballast except that used for achieving the correct C of G position using the manufacturers approved fittings proved impractical. The scrutineers documented gliders that admitted carrying fixed ballast but did not ask for its removal if the total mass was less than the IGC Reference Mass. The results of mass measurements will be documented in a separate report.

2.2 Addenda or Changes

Submission of Start times was a contentious issue among the Team Captains who were divided as to the necessity for them. The requirement to submit start times is part of the Annex A rules. The Bureau was consulted and unanimously rejected a change to LP's on this matter unless there was unanimity among the Team Captains.

2.3 Fair application of Rules and Local Procedures

All gliders were weighed on the way to the grid and the results were consistent with those achieved at scrutineering and varied very little from day to day. The scales were positioned so that the gliders were usually cross-wind when they were being weighed.

2.4 Possible improvements to Rules or Local Procedures

2.5 Task Setting and Operations

In our opinion the Task Setting was first class and utilised the weather to the available limit.

2.6 Scoring System, use and application

SeeYou scoring was utilised under the supervision of the Contest Director. Provisional scores appeared within minutes of Flight Records being received and were available on the internet and on the TV screen in the Gliding Hotel reception area. A very clever “Robot” was positioned by the screen that would harvest competitor’s flight records within seconds of an SD card or memory stick being put into the machine. No human intervention was required except to insert and remove the memory device.

2.7 Protest Handling and application

During the Practice period it was stated that Penalty points awarded for *Hazardous flying* would be carried over into the competition proper. At the first Team Captains meeting it was decided to penalise 2 Polish pilots in this way. They had been considered the worst offenders with regard to crossing the road at the threshold of runway 24 below 10 metres. This happened on Practice Day 3.

This resulted in a complaint to the CD from the Polish Team Captain(TC) filed on the 28th July. The CD replied upholding the Complaint and re-instating the points on the 29th. On the 30th the Jury accepted two Protests, one from the French TC and one from the German Team protesting the removal of the penalty points. The Jury considered the matter and gave their verdict to the CD on the 31st July. They upheld the Protests and re-instated the penalties points.

3 SAFETY

3.1 General safety of the event

3.1.1 There was a Safety Minute at every Briefing. IGC Safety Slides and Videos were used sometimes.

3.1.2 Near collision incidents were reported and investigated during the practice period. After analysis these were addressed with the pilots concerned. Such incidents during the contest were handled where appropriate by the Pilot Safety committee, the appropriate Team Captains and by mention during subsequent ‘Safety Minutes’.

3.2 Occurrence of Incidents/Accidents

3.2.1 During the scrutineering process all pilots completed a simulated cockpit evacuation and discussed the decision process to determine in the event of a collision whether to bale out or stay with the glider. Pilots reacted very positively to both these initiatives.

3.2.2 The Self Briefing for operational details, *an addendum to the LP’s*, made it very clear that crossing the public road that forms the threshold of runway 24, below 10m would be considered as dangerous flying and offending pilots would be given an instant penalty. With the exception of two competition pilots who ignored this rule on one of the practice days, the remaining competitors complied very well. However

during the practice period and the first few competition days the tug pilots and the sniffer pilot ignored this rule. Thereby setting a very bad example to the competition pilots as well as creating some very dangerous situations on the road. There were several incidents where tow ropes from low flying tugs just missed cars travelling on this road. A letter to the Contest Director eventually solved the problem.

3.2.3 The organisers positioned the grid in such a way that the Std Class was some two rows behind the Club Class and would then start launching both classes simultaneously. This was later changed after discussion with the Safety Officer, so that tugs were used to launch the first two rows of the Club Class before starting to launch the Std Class.

3.3 Availability of Medical personnel

First Aid was provided by a staff member and the proximity of two local hospitals was considered sufficient for the Contest.

3.4 Use of Safety Officers

A safety committee consisting of a Safety Steward and a safety pilot from each class was established before the first contest days as per Annex A. The Organisation had appointed a Senior member of the Central School staff as Competition Safety Officer.

3.5 Launch Safety

We considered that all launching was conducted fairly and safely.

3.6 Pilots Skill related to safety

There were a number of low hours Pilots in the competition, which showed in their conduct when thermalling and especially also in the gaggle flying on the 'blue' days.

3.7 Suggestions for Future Safety Enhancements

It is our opinion that all Competition flight recorders should be set to record every 1 second interval of all flights. This would give considerable enhancement to Safety by making each flight record a more useful tool in flight analysis especially on occasions requiring detailed examination of flight records. Having one recorder set at 10 second recording and the other at 4 makes it very difficult to follow up safety complaints with precision.

It has been suggested that the mandatory use of Flarm could mean that the recording software could be amended to mark an **event** on the flight record every time two gliders came within perhaps 5 or 10 metres of each other.

R Bradley

Chief Steward

R A Bickers

Steward