

STEWARD REPORT

on

12 th WMC

Jihlava (Czech Rep.)

15.-22.August 2009

A. Facts

1. Only thanks to the initiative of the Czech Delegation to CIMA this years' championships took eventually place, and the microlight community should be grateful for this. Venue and date were decided only 6 months before, which left not only a much reduced time for preparation, but also made it impossible to find sponsors, as their annual budget was already allocated at the time of decision. The late publication of venue and date as some dissatisfaction about the few tasks flown at last two years' championships may have influenced the even lower number of participants (98).

The number also was affected by the childish decision of the French federation to boycott the WMC (as well as the WPC).

2. There were 12 national teams - only from Europe – present with competitors on

	<u>EMC 2008</u>	<u>WMC 2007</u>
7 RAL1 from 5 nations	3 from 3	7 from 5
19 RAL2 from 11 “	16 “ 8	20 “ 11
9 RWL1 from 5 “	14 “ 6	20 “ 8
22 RWL2 from 9 “	22 “ 10	28 “ 11

who flew on 6 days

4 navigation tasks	3	4
2 fuel economy tasks	1	1
8 precision landing tasks (RWL flew 10)	8	6

3. The teams from Russia and Norway were larger than ever (50% resp.100% increase). South-Africa and USA did not send teams as they did before. Thus no Non-European team was present.
4. RAL1 pilots from CZ, SV and GB were urged personally to participate in order to get sufficient competitors to make the championships valid in this class. One competitor flew (as in the past year) an old tube-and-tissue two-seater FK 9 solo.
5. All AC were weighed during the training days (before the competition started). In critical cases some equipment had to be removed for reducing the weight, and the max. admissible fuel was noted for each AC.
6. The organisers had divided their tasks amongst them as follows:
 - the COMPETITION DIRECTOR (GA and military pilot) briefed and conducted the tasks, dealt with the complaints and – in case –was the official representative of the WMC
 - the EVENT DIRECTOR (microlight pilot), a very nervous person, basically headed the marshals and the scoring team, was responsible for issuing information sheets and maps to the pilots and publishing the scoring sheets.

--- the DEPUTY DIRECTOR (microlight pilot and experienced team leader in former FAI events) assisted and replaced at times both and handled all other matters as they arose.

Communication between the FAI officials and the first two persons was sometimes difficult. Advice was accepted reluctantly. Despite repetitive request, copies of supplementary information sheets given to the pilots to perform the navigation and the fuel economy tasks, were not supplied to the Jury.

There was a second steward (from Slovakia) nominated for this championship. But as he could not speak or understand a word of English – the official language of FAI events – no communication was possible with him.

7. The championships fortunately took place during an extended period of good weather conditions, most of the days were without any rain or strong winds.
Tasks were flown every day from the Opening Ceremony to the day before the Closing Ceremony – as it was planned. In the morning of the 18. Aug. a navigation task with a subsequent precision landing had to be cancelled. And the second fuel economy task was postponed to the afternoon of 19. Aug because of military AC activities in the morning. The time was used for weighing fuel for the economy task.
Tasks 12 and 13 were complementary to each other, both were flown on 18. Aug each by one half of the competitors.
8. No tasks were flown on Fri 21. Aug. (the day before the Closing Ceremony) in order not to compromise this event by late scoring and availability of the complete results. However, as for this last navigation task with declared speed the pilots were not given the usual sheet informing them about the correct length of each of the 5 legs, they had themselves to measure them on the (not to scale) copies of the competition map, resulting in errors. Thus there was a successful protest and all scores had to be recalculated in the last hour.
9. The huge grassy airfield of Jihlava, situated on a plateau about 5km off the town, offered the possibility to install 2 runways in parallel, very comfortably for tasks, where take-off and landings had to proceed simultaneously.
The campsite was very suitable and the parking area for AC spacious.
Gasoline was readily available from the aeroclub's own station at the same price as in town.
10. Catering was according to budget constraints standard Czech fare at reasonable low prices.
11. Scoring was very quick. The first provisional results were published within few hours only after the tasks ended. However, sheets with the overall results were issued first only after 10 tasks were flown.
12. On the website of the WMC every day the scores of the first 3 pilots in each class and a series of photos were published. Good service for those, who could not assist personally.
13. The Opening Ceremony had been restricted – in regard of the limited budget – to the marching-in of the nations on the apron in front of the main hangar, several welcome speeches and the declaration of the championships being opened by the Jury president as the highest FAI official present.
14. The Closing Ceremony started also with the marching-in of the nations into the main hangar followed immediately by the prize giving, essentially by the Jury members.

B. Suggestions for amendment of S10

Already in the reports on WMC 2007 and EMC 2008 some mayor suggestions were made. It appears useless to repeat them.

But the most annoying fact for FAI officials and participants is the inconsistent use of titles for the organisers. They should correspond to the practise in other FAI disciplines and be fixed accordingly in the Section 10 and not result from the imagination of their holders. Essentially they should reflect the effective tasks attributed to the persons.

Therefore :

1. Annex 5 should be harmonised with Annex 2 to S10 as far as the titles of the organisers are concerned
 - Championship Director
 - Deputy Director
 - Chief Marshaland their respective duties clearly defined also in Annex 5 to S10 (as it is the case for the Jury members and the stewards) - or reference be made to the §§ in Annex 2.

It could be wise to use the same words and definitions as in other FAI events and no other titles should be used (for example: Event Director) – or otherwise be defined and used correspondingly in both relevant Annexes 2 and 5 to S10.

2. Replace also in S10 Chapter 4 – 4.29.11 ; 4.30.1 and 2 as well as in Annex 3 Part 1 – 1.3 the terms Director or Competition Director by “Championship Director” – or harmonise otherwise.
3. It would be helpful, if the organiser issues an organisation chart of his staff annexed to the Local Regulations.
4. Further changes in Annex 5 to S10 § 3. Stewards are proposed as follows :
 - § 3.1 first phrase
“Stewards are advisers to the Organisers (Championship Director etc.), the International Jury, team leaders and competitors” --- not: Event Director !!!
 - § 3.2 1)
Delete the second phrase, as it says the same as above in the proposed form
 - § 3.2 7)
Delete “How are the turn point photos.....through tofilms cannot be tampered with?” and “What systems aretime is always recorded?”
Insert instead: “Are the GNSS loggers used of the officially approved types?”
 - § 3.3 second paragraph
Delete here as it applies to the Jury
The then second paragraph should read “....propose to CIMA modifications”
5. As often several tasks are combined in one flight and in order not to delay the award giving ceremony the last phrase in S10 Chapter 4 - 4.29.1 §5 should read
“For tasks flown on the last competition day the time limit is 2 hours.....”
6. Similar in Annex 3 to S10 Part 1 - 1.9.7 §4 the end of the first phrase should read
“....., or two hours in the case of tasks flown on the last day of competition”

Further,

CIMA should definitely search for a way to rescue the RAL1 class. This year the problem was waived only by the urging of the pilots to participate and the fact, that those from Poland, Slovakia and Czech Rep. had only shorter distances to travel.

Therefore

– in line with the practice of weightshift microlights – it is suggested to add in S10 the § 1.5.4 “ A two-seater landplane may be flown solo in the RAL1 class, if its MTOW is in line with § 1.3.1 assuming a weight of 75 kg for the missing second person”.

The results of the WMC 2009 show, that the traditional RAL1 flown were definitely less performing concerning speed and economy, than the up-to-date RAL2.

(Different from other classes the industry has not offered any new up-to-date RAL1 model over the past decade. Only recently appeared the slimmed down Czech ATEC 212 SOLO with Rotax 582 with an empty weight of 200 kg – at a price of 46.000 EURO plus VAT !).

Or decide:

The minimum number in RAL1 class be reduced to

- Two competitors from two nations.

C. Other Suggestions

1. A day before the championship will be opened, the Championship Director should call for a meeting of all his staff to present them and their respective tasks to the FAI Officials to know the people and make their responsibilities clear. A sketch organisation chart would be helpful for everybody (organisers, staff, officials – and participants)
2. CIMA should consider, better not to hold a (European) championship, if preparation starts late (less than a year before) – and thus stick to its own set rules.
3. The Preparation Monitor should include in his work the verification, that a sufficient number of tasks which have the qualification for a FAI class I event have been thoroughly elaborated and the task sheets (with maps etc.) have effectively been prepared for printing – as it was the case fortunately at this WMC. .
4. The Stewards have to check the texts of the task catalogue issued with the Local Regulations before the championships starts and point out ambiguities to the Director. This time the texts were corrected before issuing.
5. The individual teamleaders have to make all their complaints about the results of a specific task once only and all together and must not return with new complaints concerning the same task thereafter, thus causing the issue of even one more version of the provisional result sheet
6. Last, but at least all FAI Officials should bring a spare mobilphone with them, which can be loaded with a national SIM-card in order to avoid costly international roaming and facilitate in this way the immediate contact between themselves and the organisers and viceversa.

D. Summary

1. Problems that arose.

1.1 - The Jury members did not receive all information supplied to the pilots for the tasks. Thus they were unable to check, whether there were errors or omissions.

1.2 - For the last navigation task with declared speed the usual sheet indicating the official distances (used for scoring), was not given to the pilots. So they had to measure the length of the legs on the not to scale copies of the competition map, resulting in differences. This led to a protest requiring recalculation of all results in the very last hour before the Closing Ceremony.

2. Situations that could have developed.

2.1 - It is standard custom to hand-out “Emergency badges” to pilots providing important telephone numbers and a text in local language asking for help in case of outlandings. They were not supplied at the WMC 2009 – and fortunately there were no outlandings.

3. Successes.

3.1 - The Jihlava airfield is a perfect site for conducting aviation championships.

3.2 - A specific Task Catalogue was issued with the Local Regulations in the Internet for downloading, which contained a choice of

7 navigation tasks (out of 13 in S10)

2 economy tasks (out of 7 in S10)

7 precision tasks (out of 7 in S10)

plus the definition of deck take-off and landing, also the list of penalties to be applied, thus allowing the pilots a good preparation at home. Also the briefings could be made short, as it was sufficient, just to tell the title of the next task and no task sheets needed to be printed and distributed. In few cases minor changes or additions proved necessary, they were published on the information board.

5 th. November 2009

Gerhart F. Gerecht