

Report by the Jury President to the President of the Air Sport Commission (IGC)

Event Details

Title: Gliding Event of the Second World Air Games: 3rd World Gliding Championship of the World Class, 1st World Gliding Championship of the 18m Class.

Date: 24–30 June, 2001. **Place:** Lillo, Spain

Organising NAC: Real Federación Aeronáutica Española

Number of Flights: 415, **Number of Tasks:** 14, **Number of Competitors:** 62.

Event Personnel

Event Director: Ángel García García

Deputy Event Directors: Juan Manuel Valle Torralbo, Víctor Gastón Sierra.

Stewards: Brian Spreckley, Jaroslav Vach, Henrique Fernandes Pinto.

FAI Jury:

President: Peter Ryder, **Members:** Piero Morelli, Niels Visser.

Complaints and Protests

Number of Complaints: 6, **Number of Protests admitted:** 2, **Number withdrawn:** 0, **Number upheld:** 0, **Number rejected:** 2.

Amount of protest fees retained: €500.

Bremen, June 10th 2001

Peter Ryder, Jury President.

Enclosures:

- Jury Proceedings concerning the protest of 26.06.01
- Jury Proceedings concerning the protest of 28.06.01
- General comments and recommendations
- Final Results of the World Class
- Final Results of the 18m Class

Jury Report on the Treatment of the Protest of the Spanish Team Captain, Dated 26.6.01

Text of the Protest:

The undersigned Jesús Broto, Spanish Team Captain, hereby submits to the International Jury the following protest with respect to a decision of the Championship Director on the second contest day.

With reference to art. 20.3.7 General Control Procedures, Official Rules, which literally states that “*Motor gliders must land prior to taking another launch for a start, otherwise they will be scored to the position where they started their MoP*”, the competitor Alvaro de Orleans-Borbon, upon landing after having started his MoP, requested another launch, but it was denied by the acting Championship Director, Mr. Ángel Casado.

The acting Championship Director also advised the competitor that the decision to deny another launch had been taken after having sought the relevant advice by the Stewards.

The denial of another launch deprived the competitor of any possibility to complete the task.

It is to be noted that an identical procedure, as duly recorded in his flight recorder, had already been followed by the same competitor on the first competition day, and that the second start, accomplished after starting his MoP and landing at the field, has been accordingly scored as per official scoring lists published today.

An appropriate remedy is sought, including, but not necessarily limited to, one or more of the following actions:

- cancellation of the contest day
- a statement concerning the competitor’s denied launch in the final results.

The protest was handed to the Competition Director at 9.12 p.m. on Tuesday, June 26, 2001. Copies were given to the Jury and Stewards shortly after 9 a.m. on Wednesday, June 27. A meeting of the International Jury was convened at 10 a.m. on June 27 at the silo. The following persons attended the meeting:

Peter Ryder, President of the International Jury,
Piero Morelli, Jury member,
Niels Visser, Jury member,
Ángel García, Championship Director,
Ángel Casado, Organization,
Brian Spreckley, Steward,
Jaroslav Vach, Steward,
Jesús Broto, Spanish Team Captain,
Álvaro de Orleans-Borbon, pilot of motor glider AJ.

After opening the meeting, the Jury President declared, as confirmed by the Competition Director, that the protest had been handed in within the specified time (see paragraph 14.3.2.2 of the Competition Rules), and that the protest fee (see paragraph 14.3.2.4) had been paid. After considering

the arguments of both sides and the evidence collected by the Stewards, the Jury decided un-
animously not to uphold the protest. The decision of the Competition Director not to allow AJ a
second launch on the second competition day was in the opinion of the Jury correct according to
the Competition Rules. The protest fee is forfeited.

Reasons for the rejection:

As evidenced by the GNSS flight record, the competitor Alvaro de Orleans-Borbon (AJ) took
off at 14:41 on the second competition day, crossed the start line at 15:52, restarted his engine
at 16:10, 54.329 km from the airfield and flew back to Lillo. According to paragraph 20.6.1.1.3
of the competition rules, *“the starting of a motor glider’s MoP is regarded as an outlanding”*.
Paragraph 20.3.7 states further that *“motor gliders, including gliders with sustainer engines, shall
comply with all requirements for gliders”*. The competitor AJ must therefore be treated in the
same way as a competitor with a non-motorized glider who landed out 54 km from the airfield.
This case is covered by paragraph 20.2.7, which says: *“A competitor landing outside the contest
site boundaries after a regular launch shall not have any further competition launch on that day”*.

The Jury agrees that the last sentence of paragraph 20.3.7 (*“Motor gliders must land prior to taking
another launch for a start, otherwise they will be scored to the position at which they started their
MoP.”*) is not very clear and could be interpreted to be in conflict with 20.6.1.1.3. However, such
an interpretation would give such an unfair advantage to motor gliders in an integrated class, that
it cannot be accepted on grounds of fairness and was obviously not intended. Furthermore, it is
incorrect to consider paragraph 20.3.7 alone. This paragraph is closely bound up with paragraphs
20.6.1.1.3 and 20.2.7, which are very clear and give no room for interpretation.

Examination of the GNSS traces and take-off times of AJ on the first competition day gave the
following result: AJ took off at 14:27, landed back after returning with motor assistance at 16:25,
took off again at 16:41 and landed at 19:54. Comparison with the published score sheets shows
clearly that the second flight was used. This confirms the statement made in the protest concerning
the first competition day. However, as explained above, the decision to score the second flight
on the first competition day is in conflict with the rules. Only the first flight should have been
taken into account in the scoring. This mistake of the Competition Organizers cannot be corrected,
because there was no protest, and the scores of the first contest day are meanwhile final. The fact
that the Competition Director made a wrong decision on the first competition day is no reason for
upholding a protest against a correct decision on the second day.

Lillo, June 27, 2001

(signed)
Peter Ryder
Jury President

Piero Morelli
Jury member

Niels Visser
Jury member

Jury Report on the Treatment of the Protest of the Swiss Team Captain, Dated 28.6.01

Text of the protest:

On behalf of the Swiss pilot Werner Danz, who participates in the WAG at Lillo, we wish to file a

Protest

against the decision of the contest director pertaining to the airspace incursions of June 26th 2001 (TMA Madrid).

We can accept the fact that the pilots who were responsible for these incursions do not have to scrap the entire day. However, we **cannot accept** the extremely small penalty of a mere 100 points. It is our opinion that the “offence” is in no relation to the penalty, and we propose to raise the penalty to at least 300 points. Please consider the addition fact that pilots inside the TMA were able to reach a higher starting altitude (wave condition) than those pilots who flew conform with the rules.

Furthermore, we want all pilots (18) that were caught flying inside the TMA Madrid penalized, as it is our belief that . . . “either you are inside the TMA or you are not inside”. There is no such thing as “a little bit” inside.

We regret that we feel this protest to be necessary.

The protest was handed to the Competition Director at 9 p.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2001. It was received by the Jury President at 9:35 a.m. on June 29. A meeting of the International Jury was convened at 11 a.m. on June 27 at the silo. The following persons attended the meeting:

Peter Ryder, President of the International Jury,
Piero Morelli, Jury member,
Niels Visser, Jury member,
Ángel García, Championship Director,
Ángel Casado, Organization,
Brian Spreckley, Steward,
Jaroslav Vach, Steward,
Henrique Fernandes Pinto, Steward
John Zeitner, Swiss Team Captain.

After opening the meeting, the Jury President declared, as confirmed by the Competition Director, that the protest had been handed in within the specified time (see paragraph 14.3.2.2 of the Competition Rules), and that the protest fee (see paragraph 14.3.2.4) had been paid. In the course of the meeting, the Swiss Team Captain made 2 changes to his protest:

1. The phrase “at least 300 points” was changed to “about 300 points”.
2. The paragraph beginning “Furthermore...” was withdrawn.

After considering the arguments of both sides and the evidence collected by the Stewards, the Jury decided unanimously not to uphold the protest. The protest fee is forfeited.

Reasons for the rejection:

According to paragraph 5.2.1 of the General Section of the FAI Sporting Code and paragraph 14.1.1 of the Competition Rules for this event, the Championship Director has a wide discretion with regard to penalties: *“14.1.1 The Championship Director may impose penalties for infringement of the rules. The severity of the penalties ranges from a minimum of a warning to disqualification as appropriate to the offence.”* The use of the word “may” instead of “must” or “shall” clearly indicates that the Championship Director has in all cases the option to impose no penalty at all. If he does decide to impose a penalty, there is nothing in the rules which determines exactly which penalty must be applied to the offence concerned. The “List of Standard Penalties” is clearly intended as a guide, as for example the penalties mentioned in paragraph 5.2 of the General Section of the Sporting Code. Otherwise the title “List of Penalties” or even “List of Compulsory Penalties” should have been used.

Concerning the airspace infringements on the third competition day, the Competition Director first announced at Briefing on the following day that the competitors concerned would be given a warning. This minimum penalty was later changed to the “standard penalty”, i.e. disqualification for the day, and these penalties were included in the unofficial scores for the day. Following a complaint by the Italian Team Captain, the penalty was reduced to 100 points. In all these actions the Competition Director was within the Competition Rules. It therefore only remains to be decided whether a penalty of 100 points or “about 300 points” is more appropriate for the offence concerned. In deciding in favour of the Competition Director, the Jury took into account the following facts:

1. The Stewards gave evidence at the meeting that the flight records of the competitors from the third competition day did not substantiate the claim made in the protest that those who had been inside the TMA were able to reach a higher starting altitude.
2. Airspace infringements on the first and second competition days, which did not become known to the Jury and Stewards until the scores for these two days had become final, were not penalised.
3. Airspace infringements were not penalised during the practice period (see paragraph 14.1.2.1 of the Competition Rules).

Lillo, June 29, 2001

(signed)

Peter Ryder
Jury President

Piero Morelli
Jury member

Niels Visser
Jury member

General Comments

Information for competitors

The information given to the pilots prior to the start of the contest was well below the standard appropriate to an event at world championships level. The maps provided carried no airspace information. Details about the airspace boundaries and the types of restriction (copied from the AIP) were provided only after repeated insistence by the Stewards, and then very late (during the contest). This resulted in there being no penalisation of airspace infringements during the training period and on the first two contest days. When penalties were eventually applied, complaints and protests were inevitable (see above).

The turn point data bases contained many mistakes, which were fortunately ironed out by experts amongst the teams during the practice period. A number of turn points situated inside TMA Madrid were deleted.

Briefing

The briefing room was part of a hangar, separated from the rest — a workshop — by a dirty parachute canopy. At the beginning there were only chairs, no tables for anyone and no marked places for the participants and team captains. After repeated complaints and advice from the Stewards, the Organisers eventually provided tables and reserved seats for the teams, the Jury and the Stewards (though the Stewards had to do without tables throughout the contest). There was no podium and no tables for the Director and the meteorologists. No seats were provided for visitors (VIPs, press etc.). Information was displayed with a “beamer”, which worked quite well.

During the first days of the training period, communication at briefing was hampered by the lack of a person in the Organisers’ team with a good command of English. This situation improved somewhat with the arrival of the IGC delegate Ángel Casado, and still further when the Organisers were finally persuaded to give all important information in writing.

Ground and flight operations

Gridding and launching operations seemed to work quite smoothly and generally safely, although one or two towplanes more would have reduced the launching time. There were no injuries, but two gliders in the 18m class were damaged so badly that they could not continue, one in an outlanding, the other in a launching accident.

Luis Fernández Alonso did an excellent job checking the glider configurations in the training week. Unfortunately he was not present during the competition week.

The weather was excellent, though mostly blue, and allowed flying on all 7 possible days. (Two Team Captains voted against using Saturday, June 23rd, as an additional competition day). The competition was close and exciting throughout. The only women competitor, Sarah Steinberg of Great Britain, won three days and was leading after day 6, but made a tactical error on the last day, falling to 5th place. Bernd Gauger of Germany suffered a similar fate in the 18m class, coming in

after the closing of the finish line on the last day and thus dropping from first to 11th place overall. With regard to the World Champions — Steve Jones of Great Britain and Olivier Darroze of France — there is no doubt that the competition gave a representative result in both classes.

Facilities for Jury and Stewards

Accommodation and meals The accommodation provided for the Jury in a new hotel, a converted monastery, in Lillo was of an excellent standard and only about 1.6 km from the airfield. A common room in the hotel was also used twice for meetings of the Jury and Stewards with the Organisers.

Meals were provided at the hotel and in the airfield restaurant.

Office and meeting rooms Upon arrival at the airfield we found a door labelled “International Jury” leading to a windowless room of about 6 m² in size which was obviously serving as a storeroom and a repository for the mops and buckets of the cleaning brigade. Towards the end of the training period, the room was cleared out and furnished with a table and three chairs, but of course there was no telephone (see remarks on communications below) and not even a minimum of office material. Everything had to be provided by the Jury members themselves or begged from the busy girls in the main competition office. Such working conditions are of course totally unacceptable for an International Jury. We were nevertheless better off than the Stewards, who had no office at all and used ours to deposit their equipment.

There was no room at the airfield suitable for meetings of the International Jury or informal discussions with the Stewards and the Organisers. Fortunately, however, there was a silo nearby with an attached agricultural college, where we found a room which could be used for Jury meetings, and also the above-mentioned room in the hotel.

Transport No cars were provided for the Jury or Stewards. Most had their own cars. I was provided with a bicycle, which was sufficient for the purpose.

Communication

External Communicating with the rest of the world was one of the biggest problems in Lillo. There was only one telephone line at the airfield, which was used for telephone and fax in the main competition office. Further lines were available at the silo, about 600 m from the airfield building. One was used for a telephone and fax, another for a pay phone available to the teams. In addition there were three computers with E-mail and Internet connections at the silo. One was used mainly by the meteorologists, another exclusively by a person sending scores to the Aero Club of Toledo web site, and the third was available to the teams on a payment basis. Obviously this capacity was in no way sufficient, so that most teams had to fall back on their own mobile phones.

Internal Due to their lack of experience with international competitions at world championships level, the Organisers had not foreseen the need for rapid communication between competition officials, Stewards, Jury and Team Captains. There were no telephones anywhere except in the competition office and no public address system. People had to use their own mobile phones or hire them from the Organisers at rather high costs. I had no mobile phone, and it took a long time to persuade the Organisers that I needed one, but they eventually gave me a rented phone at no charge. Despite repeated requests from the Stewards and myself, we never received a list of the phone numbers of the competition officials and Team Captains.

Distribution of papers (met sheets, task sheets, scores etc.) was sluggish and incomplete at first, one reason being that only one copying machine was present at the site (which fortunately did not break down). The need for pigeon holes or mail boxes for the teams, Stewards and Jury was simply not understood by the Organisers, and it again took a lot of persuading from the Stewards to get them eventually.

As far as scores were concerned, I soon got into the habit of popping into the scoring office and asking Víctor, who was always helpful, to copy the latest version onto a diskette.

The Organisers provided no Daily Bulletin, which is a usual means of Communication between organisation and teams at World Championships, with official information, results, stories and photos.

Public relations

Considering the growing awareness of the importance of publicity for our sport and especially the declared intention of the World Air Games to improve the image and acceptance of all air sports, it is difficult to understand why the Organisers of the gliding event in Lillo had made absolutely no provisions for press and public relations work whatsoever. There was no person responsible for PR and no facilities or procedures for receiving and informing visiting journalists.

Results, many nice pictures and short reports in Spanish, some of which were later translated into poor English, were published on the web site of the Real Aero Club de Toledo. At the time of writing (July 5th) this site still only carries the *unofficial* results.

At the request of the FAI office, I sent short daily reports and results, as soon as could get them, by E-mail to Lausanne, where they were published on a special WAG page of the FAI site. This work was hampered by my duties as Jury President and also by the above mentioned communication problems. Eventually the IGC delegate Ángel Casado allowed me to use his private E-mail account from a computer used also by the meteorologists, who of course had priority in the mornings.

Scoring

The scorer Víctor Gracia Lozano did good work checking the flight records and producing the scores. He responded generally quickly to suggestions from the Stewards, and some mistakes in the scoring program were corrected before the start of the contest. Some blunders such as the erasing of some of the flight records or the failure to check airspace infringements were not his fault, but due to wrong or inadequate instructions from the competition director.

The preliminary results were quickly displayed on monitors in front of the contest office and in the restaurant, but somehow the unofficial results never got out until 9 a.m. on the following day. In view of the long protest time (14 hours), this meant that the final results for the day were always very late.

Opening and closing ceremonies

The opening ceremony in the evening of Saturday, June 23rd, was obviously meant mainly for the local dignitaries. All speeches (except mine) were only in Spanish, so that most pilots wondered why they were there.

The closing ceremony consisted of a pleasant open-air dinner at Lillo's new hotel, followed by the prizegiving. The latter came so late because it was a competition day, and it was nearly 11 p.m. before the concluding Jury meeting could be held.

The invitation to join the official opening and closing ceremonies at Seville and Jerez, respectively, received hardly any response due to the time-consuming bus trip and did not contribute to a feeling of being part of WAG.

Rules

Two problems with the rules (Annex A) cropped up in connection with the protests reported above.

1. The sentence "*Motor gliders must land prior to taking another launch, otherwise they will be scored to the position at which they started their MoP*" in paragraph 20.3.7 of the competition rules, which is included in a slightly different form in paragraph 20.2.10 of the new Annex A: "*If they require a second launch for a start, they must land prior to taking the new launch, otherwise they will be scored to the position at which they started their MoP,*" raises a number of questions. Firstly, how is it possible to "take another launch" *without* landing first? Secondly, under what circumstances could a motor glider be allowed to start the engine *without* being treated as outlanded? Does this rule effectively mean that the MoP must not be re-started under any circumstances without landing first, if a new start is to be valid?

The pilot of AJ interpreted this rule to mean that a motor glider, after having made a valid start, could use the engine to return to the field, land and make another start, but this is clearly in conflict with the rules which state that the starting of the MoP shall be regarded as an outlanding (20.6.1.1.3 of the Lillo rules and the new Annex A) and that a competitor landing outside the contest site boundaries shall not have any further competition launch that day (20.2.7).

2. In the old rules, the function of the list of "standard penalties" is not quite clear, because no reference is made to this list under 14.1.1. Now a new sentence has been added: "*Offences not covered by this list may be penalized at the Championships Director's discretion.*" Does this mean that the Championship Director has *no* discretion with regard to the listed offences?

Summary

In summary it must be stated that this was a poorly prepared and organised championship. The Organisers themselves admitted this; indeed they could hardly deny it in the face of massive criticism from the teams, Stewards, and Jury. They excused the deficiencies with limited financial resources and manpower. The question must be asked, however, whether it was really necessary to build a new airfield for the event. Only 30 km away there is an airfield at Ocaña, where the facilities are reported to be excellent. One could suspect that the World Air Games were a means to an end: to provide the Real Aéro Club de Toledo with a new home after the closure of Mora.

Under such conditions it is almost a miracle that the event was, in the end, a sporting success. Apart from the superb weather, there were two main reasons for this: the dedication and hard work of many people in the Organisers team and the patience, perseverance and positive attitude of the Stewards. It must be mentioned, however, that the work of the Stewards rested on the shoulders of two of them, since the gentleman from Portugal, who appointed against the advice of the IGC Bureau, proved to have no experience or knowledge of international gliding competitions.

As far as the Jury is concerned, Piero Morelli and Niels Visser proved, not for the first time, to be excellently qualified for the job. It was a pleasure to work with them.

Recommendations

1. In future WAG events, a contract should be signed between the IGC and the Organisers of the gliding event (via FAI and the organising NAC if necessary), specifying in detail the required facilities. A date should be fixed, well before the event, when the preparations should be virtually completed, failing which the event is to be cancelled. The contract must also regulate the liabilities for a cancellation.
2. At the WAG there must be a person carrying the overall responsibility for PR work, and of course one PR person at each event. The central PR manager must coordinate the work of the event PR people and ensure that they have the facilities to do their work.
3. The rules mentioned above should be looked at by the rules subcommittee.



WAG 2001 - Spain

World

Final results

P.	N.	C.	Surname	Name	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	TOTAL
1	EY	FRA	Darroze	Olivier	899 (5)	548 (9)	994 (2)	466 (12)	997 (2)	986 (1)	634 (10)	5524
2	EZ	FRA	Dubreuil	Sebastian	932 (2)	545 (10)	1000 (1)	461 (14)	992 (3)	974 (2)	596 (16)	5500
3	F1	POL	Kawa	Sebastian	776 (18)	604 (2)	970 (5)	666 (1)	935 (4)	791 (9)	726 (1)	5468
4	LOT	POL	Nieradka	Zbigniew	810 (14)	597 (3)	969 (6)	664 (2)	931 (5)	789 (10)	695 (4)	5455
5	HZB	GBR	Steinberg	Sarah	1000 (1)	610 (1)	981 (3)	436 (18)	1000 (1)	822 (3)	557 (22)	5406
6	CB	BRA	Duarte	Claudio Blois	901 (4)	552 (6)	967 (8)	487 (10)	733 (19)	783 (12)	719 (2)	5142
7	I	DEU	Reich	Axel	835 (13)	551 (7)	939 (11)	565 (3)	865 (9)	802 (5)	583 (18)	5140
8	YY	DEU	Wartha	Thomas	713 (22)	550 (8)	940 (10)	552 (4)	864 (11)	804 (4)	664 (9)	5087
9	V	RUS	Silvanovitch	Alexandre	855 (10)	488 (18)	981 (3)	504 (8)	914 (6)	795 (7)	536 (26)	5073
10	1	USA	Tuckey	Patrick	867 (9)	594 (4)	937 (12)	439 (16)	727 (21)	781 (13)	688 (5)	5033
11	CU	NLD	Smit	Martin	843 (11)	531 (12)	968 (7)	463 (13)	743 (16)	797 (6)	682 (6)	5027
12	BR	BRA	Improta	Luis Fernando	923 (3)	563 (5)	646 (19)	539 (6)	864 (11)	795 (7)	632 (11)	4962
13	TS	USA	Pin	François	876 (7)	533 (11)	933 (13)	435 (19)	866 (8)	610 (27)	705 (3)	4958
14	S	DNK	Arndt	Ole	781 (17)	508 (16)	949 (9)	437 (17)	720 (22)	730 (18)	574 (20)	4699
15	C6	PRT	Hermann	Jörg	883 (6)	362 (26)	830 (14)	496 (9)	781 (14)	650 (25)	666 (8)	4668
16	01	NLD	Wijsman	Paul	758 (21)	529 (14)	635 (20)	506 (7)	865 (9)	770 (14)	603 (15)	4666
17	W9	DNK	Hald	Jan	776 (18)	520 (15)	650 (16)	548 (5)	713 (24)	725 (19)	549 (24)	4481

<i>P.</i>	<i>N.</i>	<i>C.</i>	<i>Surname</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Day 1</i>	<i>Day 2</i>	<i>Day 3</i>	<i>Day 4</i>	<i>Day 5</i>	<i>Day 6</i>	<i>Day 7</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
18	PA	HUN	Varga	Tibor	770 (20)	530 (13)	634 (21)	384 (24)	737 (18)	743 (15)	541 (25)	4339
19	ZX	NZL	Bartley	Bruce	837 (12)	431 (24)	599 (22)	355 (26)	804 (13)	667 (21)	577 (19)	4270
20	LB	ITA	Perotti	Giovanni	874 (8)	435 (23)	433 (25)	377 (25)	772 (15)	602 (28)	612 (13)	4105
21	PE	ESP	Toquero	Pedro	263 (27)	475 (21)	649 (17)	435 (19)	869 (7)	652 (23)	682 (6)	4025
22	LU	SWE	Göök	Bengt	498 (23)	478 (20)	651 (15)	470 (11)	739 (17)	652 (23)	466 (27)	3954
23	UA	LTU	Kukcikaiitis	Viktoras	327 (25)	486 (19)	585 (23)	449 (15)	710 (25)	738 (17)	462 (28)	3757
24	AO	ESP	Broto	Jesus	260 (28)	471 (22)	648 (18)	385 (23)	608 (28)	663 (22)	631 (12)	3666
25	1C	BEL	Van de Steene	Michel	335 (24)	395 (25)	495 (24)	388 (22)	729 (20)	707 (20)	554 (23)	3603
26	G8	AUT	Wagner	Herwig	804 (16)	217 (30)	0 (30)	251 (29)	717 (23)	785 (11)	567 (21)	3341
27	LE	NZL	Reid	David	810 (14)	361 (27)	197 (28)	0 (30)	681 (26)	638 (26)	586 (17)	3273
28	LT	LTU	Motuza	Vladas	1 (30)	490 (17)	90 (29)	423 (21)	649 (27)	740 (16)	457 (29)	2850
29	C5	PRT	Sá e Melo	Pedro	227 (29)	266 (29)	385 (27)	285 (27)	563 (29)	589 (29)	0 (30)	2315
30	W1	ITA	Volpi	Diego	285 (26)	349 (28)	413 (26)	253 (28)	354 (30)	0 (30)	608 (14)	2262



WAG 2001 - Spain

18 m.

Final results

P.	N.	C.	Surname	Name	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	TOTAL
1	250	GBR	Jones	Steven	786 (15)	672 (10)	944 (1)	510 (10)	1000 (1)	938 (3)	981 (2)	5831
2	LEO	ITA	Brigliadori	Leonardo	859 (11)	798 (4)	874 (8)	495 (13)	863 (13)	890 (9)	791 (20)	5570
3	BT	CHE	Danz	Werner	770 (21)	700 (8)	875 (7)	471 (18)	954 (5)	826 (12)	826 (18)	5422
4	RCA	ITA	Stefano	Ghiorzo	735 (24)	794 (5)	880 (6)	445 (23)	860 (14)	890 (9)	790 (21)	5394
5	DG	DEU	Triebel	Claus	921 (8)	720 (6)	616 (18)	513 (9)	889 (8)	749 (22)	960 (3)	5368
6	XT	NLD	Termaat	Ronald	943 (6)	628 (13)	591 (23)	527 (4)	881 (9)	897 (8)	887 (10)	5354
7	DW	GBR	Watt	David	796 (12)	627 (14)	389 (27)	590 (1)	992 (2)	941 (2)	1000 (1)	5335
8	SV	LTU	Sabeckis	Vytautas	953 (2)	617 (17)	919 (3)	549 (2)	739 (20)	732 (23)	814 (19)	5323
9	HA	FIN	Lehtonen	Esko	953 (2)	597 (21)	900 (4)	358 (26)	950 (6)	907 (5)	608 (26)	5273
10	AB	POL	Wujczak	Stanislaw	773 (20)	811 (2)	614 (20)	495 (13)	961 (4)	763 (21)	848 (15)	5265
11	BG	DEU	Gauger	Bernd	1000 (1)	712 (7)	710 (15)	517 (8)	916 (7)	1000 (1)	402 (27)	5257
12	TI	FRA	De Péchy	Philippe	941 (7)	634 (12)	520 (25)	462 (20)	869 (12)	898 (7)	930 (4)	5254
13	CZ	CZE	Krejcirik	Petr	952 (4)	581 (23)	719 (14)	507 (11)	709 (23)	797 (16)	908 (7)	5173
14	KM	UKR	Mykola	Kovalchuk	725 (26)	692 (9)	893 (5)	495 (13)	744 (19)	730 (24)	829 (17)	5108
15	LF	CZE	Dedera	Milos	777 (17)	585 (22)	792 (11)	524 (5)	712 (22)	778 (18)	911 (6)	5079
16	L58	USA	Walters	Richard	775 (18)	834 (1)	631 (17)	532 (3)	972 (3)	929 (4)	402 (27)	5075
17	BP	SVN	Pristavec	Botsjan	698 (27)	618 (16)	751 (12)	468 (19)	881 (9)	718 (26)	878 (12)	5012

P.	N.	C.	Surname	Name	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3	Day 4	Day 5	Day 6	Day 7	TOTAL
18	LI	SLK	Kozar	Josef	951 (5)	580 (24)	603 (22)	446 (22)	703 (24)	807 (13)	890 (9)	4980
19	NH	POL	Centka	Janusz	786 (15)	808 (3)	616 (18)	476 (17)	655 (25)	777 (19)	848 (15)	4966
20	PI	SVN	Kolaric	Igor	698 (27)	609 (20)	748 (13)	443 (24)	829 (16)	713 (27)	880 (11)	4920
21	S9	NLD	Konings	Mischa	907 (9)	623 (15)	129 (29)	524 (5)	878 (11)	904 (6)	893 (8)	4858
22	XL	CHE	Mühlethaler	Dieter	769 (22)	664 (11)	824 (10)	256 (28)	736 (21)	726 (25)	783 (22)	4758
23	JH	BEL	Hanssens	Pascal	734 (25)	417 (25)	931 (2)	485 (16)	794 (17)	702 (28)	665 (24)	4728
24	PC	AUT	Rabeder	Karl	787 (13)	612 (19)	196 (28)	456 (21)	844 (15)	799 (14)	865 (13)	4559
25	C17	PRT	Rosado	Jose Paulo	787 (13)	373 (27)	577 (24)	518 (7)	421 (28)	786 (17)	924 (5)	4386
26	H1	AUT	Hartl	Wolfgang	755 (23)	613 (18)	516 (26)	177 (29)	588 (27)	798 (15)	865 (13)	4312
27	AJ	ESP	De Orleans-Borbon	Alvaro	384 (30)	40 (29)	860 (9)	496 (12)	783 (18)	866 (11)	782 (23)	4211
28	7	ESP	Soler	Marcel	899 (10)	413 (26)	611 (21)	356 (27)	629 (26)	630 (29)	623 (25)	4161
29	ZE	PRT	Ferrero Pires	Jose Augusto	568 (29)	316 (28)	653 (16)	393 (25)	370 (29)	775 (20)	402 (27)	3477
30	MZ	USA	Bartell	William	775 (18)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	775
31	FW	RUS	Vaskov	Leonid	0 (31)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0 (30)	0

Stewards Report for WAG 18m WGC and World Class WGC

1. Quantity of Officials.

There were sufficient officials and helpers for the organization to conduct the competition. There were insufficient helpers for PR, media and web site dissemination of results.

2. Experience of officials.

The contest directors were lacking in the necessary experience of International competition procedures and rules. Considerable help and advice was necessary in these areas. Scrutineering and scoring personnel were extremely competent and performed their roles well.

3. Suitability of briefings

During the practice period there was confusion at the briefings due to the lack of written information for the competitors and their poor understanding of questions in English. This was improved at the beginning of the contest and was satisfactory during most of the competition.

4. Suitability of weather information.

The weather information was good and delivered to the competitors in writing at briefing. The organization did not verify the weather information was correct before launching the first class. This resulted in the task being unnecessarily long on two occasions and too short on one occasion.

5. Suitability of facilities

By the start of the competition the briefing room had adequate tables etc and by the second contest day a team room was established with mail boxes. The facilities for teams to use E mail or fax were wholly inadequate. There were no facilities for the stewards and a small unused closet was identified as the jury hole.

6. Transportation

Stewards and Jury used their own cars, however the Jury president was given a bicycle. He is now fitter.

7. Launching

The launching system was safe and suitable for the airfield. It's efficiency was reduced by changes to launch master and his lack of good English for instructions to tug pilots. During the finishing period the procedures were good and mostly the pilots followed the procedures, it was necessary for three pilots to be given an official warning for landing short following instructions to land long. The safety of competitors was compromised by the close proximity of parked gliders along one side of the runway.

8. The Stewards and Jury were not presented at the opening ceremony. However a speech was made on behalf of the IGC by the Jury president.

9. Social Events

There was a final dinner and closing ceremony, unfortunately it started too late for some pilots and crews to attend.

10. Number of days.

There were 7 scheduled days and seven contest days.

11. Rules

Several amendments had to be made to the local rules before the contest. The start procedure rules had to be clarified, and the rules concerning motor gliders and marking their FDR with a noise event. See attached papers for rule additions and changes.

There needs to be the several clarifications to the rules, these will be covered in more detail in the jury report.

Briefly, The rule regarding Motor gliders starting the mop before another launch needs to be made more specific to engine starting. 20.3.7

The rules regarding penalties need be made more specific if the intention is that the director should only use the standard list of penalties. (See 14.1.1 The director MAY impose penalties).

13. Suggestions for amendment to Annex A.

Local rules should contain a list of definitions applicable to the contest, the list should be included in Annex A as a reminder to competition organizers. It should include, Legal daylight end, Units used for time(local or UTC), distance (normally km), bearings (true or magnetic), Altitudes (feet or meters/QNH or QFE), Coordinates (decimal or secs) and any other variable not identified in the rules.

It was generally considered wrong for all airspace infringements to be automatic disqualification. It is strongly recommended that all airspace infringements should be penalized, the penalty should however reflect the nature of the infringement. A system of graduated penalty should be included in Annex A along the lines of those already in use in many countries. These should apply to controlled airspace and be mandatory penalties. For infringements of other airspace such as restricted or Danger areas, a penalty structure should be included in local rules. This gives the organizers an opportunity to decide on the importance of local sensitive areas etc.

14. For the most part the rules were applied fairly however there were occasions when the application of the rules had to pointed out to the organizers.

The contest started with a grossly overset and optimistic task, on subsequent days the tasks were more related to the weather conditions. The organizers did not verify met conditions prior to launching and on one day did not change to B task when it was appropriate and on another changed to B resulting in a devalued day. The stewards on one day gave written notice to the organizers to use the task set with great caution, the task took pilots over an area of poor landing possibilities in a potentially changing met situation. The organizers subsequently used the B task. In other respects the tasks set were safe and fair.

The scoring system was accurate and quick, small changes had to be made to the presentation of the results sheets at the start of the contest. The scores, start and finish times were available to the competitors and crews promptly.

There were two protests, for more details see the Jury report. The protests were handled promptly by the Jury and their conclusions widely accepted.

15. There were two accidents during the contest, both accidents were the fault of the pilots concerned. The airfield was rather small for the number of gliders, the blue conditions resulted in several gaggle finishes. The pilots and the organizers are to be congratulated for their safe handling of mass landings.

16. The organizers relied on local emergency services but thankfully did not have to call on their services. Repeated requests from the stewards for a notice of action to be taken in an emergency to be issued to all competitors was ignored.

17. A pilot committee was formed, it had no formal meetings and only one informal approach regarding a pilots conduct.

Summary

The contest was conducted safely and fairly, this was a considerable achievement for an organisation with such little experience. There was a good atmosphere amongst the competitors and crews, despite the poor facilities on the airfield and locally. The WAG objectives of increased media coverage and promotion of gliding as a competitive sport were not achieved directly by this event.

The cooperation between the stewards and jury was excellent, the cooperation between the organizers and the stewards was for the most part satisfactory and improved once the contest had started.

My Thanks to Jaroslav Vach for his excellent advice and hard work, and to Henrique Fernandes Pinto who despite his lack of experience in gliding contests provided a useful insight into Iberian customs and practice.

Brian Spreckley
7.07.20