

## Jury Reports CIA Events 2007 Summary

### **WORLD BALLOONING TROPHY and HONDA CUP 2007**

Echternach, Luxembourg  
Event Director: Claude Weber

25-29 July

Debbie SPAETH, USA  
Bengt STENER, SWE  
Rudy PAENEN, BEL

Jury report and debriefing report received.

28 competitors - 7 flights - 9 tasks

No complaints, no protests

#### **Jury recommendations for future events –**

The following are items that are recommended for incorporation into CIA practices.

- 1) Rule 12.19 – There should be clarification of Marker Scoring Area and Marker Measuring Area.  
This seems to be an area of confusion for some pilots. Perhaps adding a line that distinguishes the two would be helpful.  
I.e. Marker Scoring Area (MSA) = Rule 12.19.1 is OK.  
Add Marker Measuring Area (MMA) = That area where markers will be located and measured by the event measuring staff.
- 2) Computer Access for Jury – As events are working as “paperless”, it is necessary for the jury to have access to an event computer to do their work. It is not necessary that the jury have their own computer, but arrangements must be made for access at reasonable times.
- 3) MER should be checked for discrepancies between using marker scoring only and using GPS/Logger technology. The use of push-button loggers versus GPS trackers should also be clarified.

#### **Remark at debriefing. (20 pilots present)**

- Several pilots asked for observers.
- It will be good if the goal list is published on the web before the event. It is better if the PZ are included in the goal point list.

---

**15th COUPE d'EUROPE**  
19th LADIES WORLD CUP  
Mainfonds/Blanzac, Charente, France  
Event Director: Riadh Hadj Azzame

2-5 August

Don CAMERON, GBR  
Alain POULET, FRA  
Nancy van HUFFEL, BEL

No Jury report and no debriefing report received.  
Ladies Cup. 13 tasks

49 competitors in Coupe d'Europe and 13 pilots in the

---

**15th EUROPEAN HOT AIR BALLOON  
CHAMPIONSHIP**  
Magdeburg, Germany  
Event Director: Dominik Haggenev

17-25 August

Jakob BURKHARD, SUI  
Martine BESNAINOU, FRA  
John GRUBBSTRÖM, SWE

Jury report and debriefing report received.  
3 complaints, no protests

79 competitors - 7 flights - 20 tasks

**Complaint 1:** Scoring area boundary was centreline of road according to map. Complaint that road on map differed from actual road.

**Complaint 2 & 3:** Pilot wanting to be scored based on his own GPS track rather than logger track although logger track was usable.

### From the Jury Report

1. Before the event there was a discussion about one Ukrainian entry. Apparently one team from Ukraine had problems to obtain visas. The Ukrainian CIA delegate asked the CIA and the Jury to discuss this issue. There were a lot of emails exchanged just before the event. It seems that the organisers made great efforts to help the Ukrainian team but the visa application was too late and some documents had been manipulated by the applicant and the German embassy refused entry.
2. At the opening ceremony the costs for 4 persons from each team was covered by the entry fee. It was not mandatory to attend but was is not quite clear whether additional tickets could be purchased.
3. Recommendation from the Jury that pilots who had sent in all papers before the event should have a fast line check-in.
4. Roll call was made before the first task briefing. This was approved in advance by the CIA Bureau as the start date of the event had to be changed and came in conflict with a national event.
5. In some logger tasks, the rule about rounding to diameters caused a lot of equal results. The jury suggested that rounding to decametres should be done later in the scoring process so that more differentiated scores are produced.

### Event Debriefing. (80% of the pilots present)

Many positive comments regarding the competition and excellent task setting.

Comments on:

Check-in procedure took too long time.

Interpolation between logger positions. 5 seconds interval was used. Work in progress.

Study time before task briefings. 5 minutes is too short. (COH recommends 15 minutes)

Rounding of results. Pilots ask for rounding to whole meters instead of decametres.

Availability of logger tracks for pilots. Much work if many pilots want them. Available on the web.

Remarks regarding loggers used. Old technology but work in progress.

Discussion regarding safety. Use of solo flying. Use of computers.

Members of the AX WG was present and will work on rules.

---

**51th COUPE GORDON BENNETT**  
Brussels, Belgium  
Event Director: Moniek van de Velde

13-22 September

Thomas FINK, GER  
Alan BLOUNT, USA  
Rudy PAENEN, BEL

Jury report and Event Director report received.

14 competitors - Event cancelled

### Report of the Jury President sent to FAI, CIA President and to Jury Board

1. Information of the Jury before and even during the event has been poor. For instance, we did not receive the information about the ATC Restrictions prior the event.  
Although we complained, there was no mailbox for the jury; at the flight briefing we did not receive the printouts of the met-briefing.
2. Working conditions for the Jury have been poor. We did not have a Jury's room and had to meet either before the director's room or in my van.

### Recommendations by the Jury to CIA

The Jury members share the opinion, that in general there are enough handbooks for ballooning competitions and we do not want an ever increasing bureaucracy. Nevertheless we propose:

1. CIA has to clarify, that the approved championship director is the head of the organization. He has to tell the organizers what to do and not the other way around. Otherwise CIA would have to approve the organizer. In our case the director has been strictly advised by the organizers not to interfere in their communication with the Belgian ATC-Units.
2. Maybe it would be a good idea to publish an organizers checklist with milestones.
3. It might be better to cancel an event well in advance than to let it run into a disaster. At least this saves travel cost and time of all involved and avoids frustration. Checking the milestones in the checklist proposed could have made the lack of organisation better visible to everyone before the event.

### **Highlights of the Event Director Report**

*to the President of the Royal Belgian Balloon Federation and to the Jury President*

With great regret I had to cancel the Event since the Authorisations of the Aviation Authorities obtained by the Organisers did not allow a take-off under the meteorological conditions.

Directing this competition has been jeopardised by shortcomings from the side of the Organisers:

Communication problems with the Event Manager and lack of cooperation.

Approval from the Authorities obtained only 2 days before the Event with very limiting conditions

A lack of communication between the organisers in the end led to double tracking system, with implications to the Pilots.

Hotel accommodation for three major –foreign- officials one night before check-in was at first rejected.

Cars for Officials were not available as requested by the Event Director.

The office for the Competition Centre was far below standards, in spite of clear requirements :

A Jury Room was not available as requested.

It overall showed great disrespect to the Officials, especially in comparison to the huge efforts that were made to please non-competition related VIPs.

The Event Director: instead of preparing to direct the Event had to clean, help repair a window, install electrical cable from one building to another etc...This all caused a very stressful situation.

Office equipment (photocopier, paper, beamer etc.) had to be organised by the Event Director.

The Event Manager was not reachable by phone, nor on location on the day of the General Briefing,

Planned gas filling Saturday Sep 15, 07:00 could not start since no fire brigade was on site (requirement of the Aviation Authorities).

The Event Manager was at first not reachable by phone nor present on the launchfield.

An hour later he came to the launchfield (after the take off of the hot air balloons in a nearby street) and stated *not to be aware of planned gas filling in the morning nor of foreseen take-off in the afternoon...*

The Event Manager was not present at a 10:00 crisis meeting with Jury, Gas Suppliers, Representative of Aviation Authorities, Flight Director, (Met Officer in conference call), although requested, and agreed by him by phone.

Pre-flight Briefing:

Although requested months before and confirmed, the Pre-flight Briefing tent had

- table and chairs for teams and Jury missing, table for officials missing
- no electricity, no sound amplifier, no screen

so that we had to transfer the pre-flight briefing to the VIP tent, that was not prepared for this occasion.

As a consequence the pre-flight briefing took place in a chaotic atmosphere in semi-public circumstances.

In general all efforts of the Organiser seem to have gone to fund raising and random activities and VIP receptions, but far too little to providing the necessary infrastructure and logistics to organise the Competition.

A negative impression on the staff on site in general was created, whereby my team: the Deputy Director, the Safety Officer, the ATC Supervisors, the Launch Master, and my reputation as Event Director suffered.

### **Report to FAI by CIA President**

We are faced now with the same situation we had in Paris in 1998 and the CIA Bureau has decided to adopt a similar approach as at that time:

1. Inform the Belgian NAC that we require the organisers to refund the entry fees to all participants.
2. Inform the Belgian NAC that we consider that by cancelling the 2007 event they have renounced their prerogative to organize the 2008 event, and that the FAI will entrust the organization of the event to another NAC.
3. The CIA to start the bidding process for the 2008 event NOW, and closing it on December 15.
4. Sanction to be granted at the 2008 CIA Plenary meeting in Salzburg.

---

### **OMV CHALLENGE and World test event**

Hofkirchen, Styria, Austria  
Event Director: David Levin

15-23 September

Risto JALAVA, FIN  
Zoltán PALHEGYI, HUN  
Johann FÜRSTNER, AUT

Jury report and debriefing report received.  
3 complaints, no protests

41 competitors - 7 flights - 20 tasks

### **Comments by the Jury:**

A very good competition with excellent task setting and very reliable scoring but the number of competitors was only 41. For that reason the event can not be used for predicting how well the event organization can manage an event that has 100 competitors. Organizers of the 2008 World Championship must now focus on solving the problems that come with more than doubling the number of competitors (common launch areas, target areas, refuelling site etc.).

Invitation process and communication before the event were unsatisfactory and has to be improved for the 2008 World Championship.

Using intersections and road hard surface instead of nearby fields for Marker Scoring Areas (MSA) can cause problems (traffic on the roads, danger to measurers and power lines to pilots.) however, there were no incidents. At World Championship only large fields free of power lines should be used for marker scoring.

Restricted MSA resulted in logger result to pilots who dropped very close to goal but missed the hard surface. The measuring teams were understaffed and the allocation and competence of their work was not at Category One level.

We are impressed by the performance of the Event Director and his team including the smooth and competent handling of logger scoring procedures.

Two tasks were rescored on request from the ED and Chief Scorer. They had found errors after the results had become final. The rescoring was approved by the jury.

### **Jury's recommendation regarding rules**

If a competitor does not drop a marker in one or more tasks he could use his spare marker(s) for making more than one marker drop in a further task. We recommend that the following rule be added to AX MODEL EVENT RULES for GPS Loggers:

*"Unless otherwise stated in the task data only one marker drop per task is allowed. Competitor using wrong colour marker after not dropping a marker in other tasks will be scored by logger track."*

A rule to that effect was used at OMV Challenge many times as a modified task rule. See attached sample of a task sheet.

**Topics discussed at the event debriefing.** Key officials plus 12. 16 pilots and crewmembers.

- Organization: Planning of social events should be known in advance  
Requests for morning coffee provided before morning briefings  
Time for prize giving - evening or next morning.
- Goals Some of the modified (hard surface intersections) goals were really good.  
Next year more goals will be surveyed.  
  
Suggestion to use a target in nearby field if possible.  
ED: We have so few fields, also if the target is 100m off it can be a disadvantage for a pilot flying in to the intersection coordinates. Next year we want to use every available field in the area.
- Tasks & flights First task should take off from the common launch point CLP because pilots are still unfamiliar with the area.  
  
Conditions on the CLP. Dry hay had to be removed before inflation..  
  
For the task "crossing a line" some pilots had up to 300m disadvantage due to the shape of the field. ED will use a line or circle next year.
- Maps Would be good to provide the map on the Internet 10 days before.  
  
Jpg map quality was not good.  
Maps will be reprinted next year. Actually the digital map is not made by scanning the printed map. It is produced by a map software.
- Logger Some cases of failing loggers  
  
The quality of the eTrex is known to be doubtful. An idea is to use pilot's logger first, eTrex is backup.  
  
The André brothers work on a new logger. It is just a question of finding a sponsor for 100.000 dollars. Also the rules are being improved by the working group.  
  
The improved logger – pilots can see what is recorded and can input some data.

**General discussion session**

Due to weather a task briefing was cancelled and replaced by a general discussion session. Almost all officials and pilots with teams attended. The following items were discussed.

Good practices this year:

Task setting, multiple targets, briefing time, staff and competitor interaction.

Matters to be improved 2008

Web site, Entry fee payment, pre-event training, hotel info, briefing facilities, common launch fields, signal flags, target fields, refuelling, pilot debriefing, recall procedure.

No change promised

maps 2008 already printed, loggers same as 2007, Austrian grid same as 2007, mobile phones will remain prohibited in flight.

Other

Use of launch masters, limited number of Fly-In as ILPs are difficult to find,  
Three task sheets for every team. Digital map should have better resolution

Lessons learned

Calling the event a test event made it difficult to find sponsors. Pre-World would have been better. Press and media information could have been better

---

**7th MOL CUP INT HAB Championship**  
Debrecen, Hungary  
Event Director: Mathijs de Bruijn

2-6 October

Risto JALAVA, FIN  
Sándor HIDAS, HUN  
David PAAL, HUN

Jury report received.

19 competitors -5 flights - 16 tasks

No complaints, no protests

### **No show Officials**

One jury member did not arrive, and remained unreachable. The CIA Bureau replaced him on October 3rd with David Paál, who arrived on October 4th before afternoon task briefing. Thus there were 2 Hungarian jurors but no other solution could be found at short notice.

The deputy event director nominated by CIA plenary meeting had cancelled his participation and was replaced with the safety officer. Jury accepted that as the only readily available option. However, the safety officer was not given any duties in his capacity as the deputy event director and he could have been able to continue the event only with fiesta flights in case the event director had been incapacitated.

### **General event comments**

The event deserves high marks in most of the important areas. The terrain is very suitable for competition ballooning, the map is excellent and facilities at the competition centre are excellent. However, there was quite a lot of confusion in the beginning of the event, including confusion about the time of general briefing. It was evident that the organizer had not delegated responsibilities to his personnel. The translator was excellent, but there should be no need for translation between the event director and his staff. The most important Hungarian senior officials — deputy director, safety officer and the meteorologists — spoke fluent English.

### **Scoring software**

The event director clarified all tasks admirably at task briefings. We were also duly impressed when event director demonstrated his logger scoring software's workings in the beginning of the event. When he gave us as xls-files all data produced by the software we were able to check any result and penalty by comparing the scoring data with logger tracks at our leisure and without using his time.

Doing that we became convinced that the software does not produce reliable results without using human intelligence for checking how the software has analysed the tracks and how the problems (for instance jaggies and spikes) should be handled. Event director must have highly qualified assistant(s) for manually verifying every track's validity before using the track for scoring, and for discussing any problematic matter that may arise. In this case he had no one.

It is our strong recommendation that he also allocates resources for further improving the software in two respects. The software should allow visualizing PZ infringements and three dimensional task results by printing graphics (horizontal and vertical tracks within relevant space) and detailed data, including the pertinent track point identification numbers (PIDs). That would make it very easy to grasp how the competitor's result or penalty had accumulated. PIDs pertinent to results and penalties should also be available on flight report forms. The verification of scoring should be made as easy and fast as possible. Right now it is neither easy nor fast.

We strongly advice against burdening one person with duties of event director and chief scorer. What would happen if there are complications in scoring and many competitors come to ask questions about their result? The event director would not have enough time for his most important duty, which is to plan the tasks. Replacing an event director (if incapacitated) who is also the only scorer and uses his own proprietary logger scoring software would be impossible in the middle of the event.

**Refueling** at the large parking place next to competition centre was convenient but the consequences would be very serious in case of a vapour cloud explosion or boiling liquid expanding vapour explosion (BLEVE). Cautious approach to site selection would dictate a place with no houses and busy roads within radius of 400 meters.

In spite of all shortcomings mentioned above the event was a very enjoyable and successful balloon competition. Many things in logger balloon events are still in development and testing phase, and that includes jury work.

---

**2007 TOCHIGI HAB CHAMPIONSHIP  
and Japan HONDA GP Final**

Motegi, Japan

Event Director: Les Purfield

20-25 November

Garry LOCKYER, CAN  
Adam BARROW, AUS  
John GRUBBSTRÖM, SWE

Jury report and debriefing report received.  
No complaints, no protests

32 competitors - 7 flights - 25 tasks

This event was conducted in accordance with the FAI Sporting Code and Rules and Regulations approved for this event by the CIA. All results were verified by the Jury and no major deficiencies were found. All questions related to scoring were answered by the Event Director and/or his staff, and all appropriate action was taken.

Minor items observed by the Jury and discussed with the Event Director and/or his staff included:

1) Inconsistent averaging of GPS position data, yielding in at least one case, incorrect calculated results. This process (recording of GPS position data, averaging of position data and calculation and rounding of results) was reviewed with the Chief Scorer, who subsequently reviewed same with the Scoring Team, and reviewed and corrected results as required. The method used by the Jury to detect possible problems in this area was to review tied results to see if in fact results should be tied. Particular focus was paid to tied results below the median where a significant number of points may be at stake (between each ranking position due to the relatively small number of competitors). Time permitting; Scoring Officers and Juries might also inspect results (below the median and/or calculated by GPS coordinates) that differ by 10m (one decametre), to determine if in fact a 10m difference is warranted.

2) Measuring Team not consistently measuring (by tape) to the weighed part of the marker closest to a target. A few (2 or 3) cases were observed by the Jury where the position of markers were marked using a "flag" (metal stake with small flag to more visibility indicate location of a marker) in the approximate position (within 2-3 cm) of the marker and subsequent measurements were made to the flag stake, not the closest point of the weighted part of the marker. These observations were discussed with the Event Director, who reviewed measuring procedures with the Measuring Team. Note: The difference between the best and median result was generally around 100m, therefore an error of 3cm may result in point allocation error of (approximately) 0.14 points. Over the course of a competition, this error SHOULD be negligible (especially when rounding during points allocation is considered), however it COULD be significant when "Grand Prix" scoring is also – a minor point allocation error may result in several GP points being misallocated. While occasional random measuring errors should "balance out" over the course of several tasks and an event, care should be taken by the Scoring/Measuring Teams to remove/minimize any systemic/process errors.

3) Other minor "one off" (non systemic) scoring errors with no significant impact on overall results. These items were quickly corrected upon detection by the Jury and discussion with Chief Scorer.

Additional observations:

1) Power Line Contact: Competitors (and/or their balloons) made contact with power lines on at least 3 occasions. The Safety Officer dealt with each situation quickly, keeping all competitors and officials informed of the situation, working with the Event Director to assess penalties as appropriate, and repeatedly reminding all competitors of the absolute need to cross over power lines with adequate margin (2 times the high of the power line, at least). No injuries or damage resulted from these contacts. Light and variable winds may have been a contributor to the contact, but should not be considered a mitigating reason.

- 2) Mid-air Collisions: There was at least one mid-air collision between two balloons. As above for Power Line Contact, and deferring to the Safety Officer and his report for details, the Safety Officer and Event Director dealt with the matter appropriately, keeping all competitors and officials informed and applying appropriate penalties.

In summary, the Jury congratulates the Event Director and his team for conducting an excellent event, maintaining the high standards set at previous events. Further, the Jury thanks the Event Director and his staff for conducting the event in an open and relaxed, yet very professional manner.

**Event Debriefing**

Only 6 pilots and 7 crew members attended.

In general, all were very satisfied with the event. Sending Pi-ball data by SMS was very much appreciated. There were a few comments regarding check-in procedures and too little time to study task data before briefing.

**Recommendations:**

GPS loggers also for non-competing balloons and pre-flight briefing also for non-competing pilots.

Hans Åkerstedt  
Jury Board chairman