

## Summary of 2009 event jury reports

### 3rd World Air Games, Mondovi, Italy

#### Jury Comments:

Well organised and well run event. Although short on personnel, the organisers and officials team managed to run a well perceived and extremely competitive event. As far as the sporting issues are concerned, the Event Director and his team are to be congratulated for a high level sporting event. It is to be noted that the short supply of personnel by the local organisers constituted a severe shortcoming that severely taxed the competition officials.

Overall, the competitors were quite pleased with the event and showed their appreciation to the LOC and the competition team.

The Jury confirmed the Event Director's decision to declare a Brazilian competitor a NO SHOW at this event. *Note: The Brazilian NAC has filed an appeal against this decision. The appeal process is in progress.*

#### Conclusion of comments added concerning the Awards Ceremonies

Overall, the Jury finds that the Award Ceremonies for the WAG AX Event have been poorly organised and staged, and that the complete absence of FAI/CIA protocol at the "local" Awards Ceremony is unacceptable.

### World Balloon Trophy, Echternach, Luxembourg

#### Comments:

The events in Luxembourg are always well managed and well organized. Most comments on the event are related to the use of the new FlyTech Loggers that were purchased by CIA and used for the first time at this event.

The organizers gave the pilots a trial run of the GPS at the general briefing. A task, via walking, was set for pilots to do entry into the loggers and have the officials download the "results". This helped with confidence for the pilots and seemed to go well for pilots and officials. This type of practice should be a requirement for all events using loggers, no matter what the type, to be sure all participants understand the mechanics of the logger in use at a particular event.

**Comments from pilots** included that they liked the interactive capability of the FlyTech Logger. Pilots liked having control over their marker drop and result when compared to the option of the official finding the 'closest point' on a track for their result, as is the case with other GPS logger models. (It was noted that pilots still like dropping markers the best.)

**The jury suggests** that CIA documents be updated in terms of information on task sheets. If pilots are using interactive GPS, like the FlyTech Loggers, the task sheet should include the list of required points or information that the pilot must enter into the GPS for a proper result. This would include things like: 1) Goal Number/or Coordinates, 2) Altitude for Goal etc. (Suggest New Rule II.22 3D scoring).

There is a movement to stop all written forms of result printing and only publish web based results. At this event, no printed result documents were supplied to the jury. The Jury room was outfitted with internet access and computers for use. However, this jury felt it was easier to review information from the written documents and printed them for review. The "paper trail" has always been one way to confirm how results are reached. And the written/printed word, does mean there is a printed history of the event, not likely to be lost or altered via some electronic problem.

Congratulations to the event organizers and staff on a job well done.

### 16th Coupe d'Europe & 20th Ladies Cup, Mainfonds/Blanzac, Charente, France

Jury decision on a protest regarding nationality. Rule 2.2.2

#### **The case:**

The pilot had flown with a co-pilot of a different nationality who had flown in national and international championship events. The question was whether the wording in R 2.2.2 "...has competed in any previous national or international balloon competition (events)..." means a separation between the 5 subclasses or as the competitor claimed, means hot air balloons only.

### **Arguments**

The competitor argued that the word "balloon" was used in many occasions in the rules where it was clear that only hot air balloons could be meant and gave many examples. She had also mentioned the co-pilot in the entry form and had flown with her in other international Cat 1 events without problems concerning R 2.2.2.

The director said that she did not interpret the rules but applied them. He said that the rule shall prevent that an experienced competitor assists another competitor from a different NAC and that experience gained in one balloon category is very helpful for competing in another balloon category.

### **Jury reasoning**

R 2.2.2 does not refer to balloons but to "any...balloon competition". The word "any" is important and is stronger than "a". Without doubt, experience in balloon competition in one subclass is very helpful for competitions in other subclasses. Issues like licensing is not relevant.

The competitor's entry form did not specify whether the co-pilot was actually a flight crew member or a passenger and did not mention her nationality.

No penalty in past events does not mean clearance for the future.

The jury unanimously decided to reject the protest. The protest fee will not be returned.

### **Recommendations**

That the AQX rules subcommittee consider clarifying the rule and the intention behind it.

Competitors should try to address possible problems during the general briefing. Maybe if other competitors have no objections, the director can make an exemption.

The director is recommended to penalize only after making an official warning which was made in the response after a complaint. Furthermore it is highly recommended to apply the penalty proposed by the COH.

## **16th European HAB Championship. Brissac, France**

### **Overview**

There were 83 competitors from 23 countries competing in the event. 7 Flights and 21 Tasks were flown

There were 2 Complaints and no Protests.

One Competitor was disqualified by the Event Director for modifying a goal declaration on the marker, this did not result in a complaint or protest and the competitor surrendered his Sporting Licence and left the competition.

**Note from The Jury Board:** *The disqualification happened in task 4. Thereafter the disqualified pilot was still listed in all tasks as NS (No Start) and was included in the P-number. The disqualified pilot was also listed in the final result list of the event.*

*There are no rules about this situation and luckily we do not have much experience.*

### **Questions:**

*Shall the P-number be reduced after a disqualification?*

*Shall the disqualified pilot still be listed in the results of the event?*

### **Entry Process**

The entry process was not without minor hiccups. Closing Entry Date was 30/05/2009. One previous no-show had completed an entry form but was refused an entry by the organisers. (See below)

There were 2 other withdrawals before the deadline for entries. One was an NAC entry withdrawal, which resulted in the next NAC (Spain) being given an additional entry, the other was a substitute competitor from the same NAC.

*(17/04/2009) We have 81 pilots who have filled in their application forms in time.*

*One of them should be refused: MARIJA PETRIĆ MIKLOUŠIĆ from Croatia has been, if my information is correct, declared as "no show" at the last Europeans Championship. Croatia have sent their acceptance in time, with 2 pilots.*

*They have nominated (in time) : Igor Miklousic and Zlatko Putak*

*Igor has made his application (in time) but the second pilot who made his (her) application was not Zlato, but Marija Petric Miklousic. Tom Miklousic send us an e-mail explaining that Zlata was ill so they decided to send Marija as second pilot from Croatia.*

*And we had on stand-by a third pilot from Hungary. We had received a first acceptance (in time) proposing 2 pilots and then a second one (too late) proposing 3 pilots. We have decided to keep the third one on stand-by until the deadline of the second round.*

*As we do not have the 80 + top 3 pilots after the deadline, we accept him.*

*So, we have 81 or 82 pilots, depending of the no show of Marija from Croatia.*

*The next on the list, according to the Ranking Method, are :*

*1/ Spain*

*2/ Lithuania*

*3/ Poland (but they did not met their obligations as they have proposed 3 pilots but only 2 have send their applications)*

*3/ UK*

*4/ Luxembourg*

*5/ France*

*6/ Hungary*

At the closing entry date Ukraine still had 3 application forms and 1 entry fee outstanding (see below)

*(02/06/2009) The payment did not fail. The pilot tried to change his accommodation option on Saturday, 30th at 21:22. No one was at the computer to change the security of online payment to allow modification of the price to pay.*

*Anyway, we gave the Ukrainian Teams a new delay and the new deadline is on Thursday, 4th to complete the 3 application forms and, for the 3rd pilot, to pay his entry fee.*

## **Check-in**

The check-in process was quick and well organised. 70 competitors had checked in on the first day, the remainder checked in prior to the General Briefing.

There was separate check-in for Officials and Observers; the competitor check-in was at separate clearly marked country grouped desks.

No photocopies of the Competitor documentation were taken, so there was no way for the Jury to ensure that all documentation was in order. A problem occurred with 2 of the 3 Ukrainian entries, where it was discovered that the third party insurance produced was not in accordance with the entry application form, or the published rules (I.13). The 2 competitors were given until the first flight briefing to produce new documentation.

## **Organisation**

The organisation was very good, and the team of local volunteers ensured that all aspects of the event ran smoothly. Many of the competitors were in home stays which enabled the local community to be totally involved in the event.

## **Opening Ceremony**

The opening ceremony was held close to the check in area, with lunch provided for all the competitors and officials. Speeches from the Mayor and local dignitaries' concluded the opening ceremony. There was no FAI / CIA involvement and no Flags or anthem.

## **Briefings**

The General Briefing and all Task briefings were held in a large sports hall, which had just been completed in the previous 12 months. The competition HQ was also resident in this building.

The briefing room was of good size and could accommodate all competitors and crew. The PA system was difficult to hear if you were at the rear of the room but that was the only area of concern.

There were no FAI / CIA flags at the General Briefing and the Anthem was not played. The flag situation was rectified before the first task briefing.

### **Weather**

The weather briefings were delivered by a lady from Meteo France; they were quite basic and relied on pi-ball readings that were taken 90 minutes before the briefing. Pi-ball updates for the competitors were only available occasionally at common launch sites. However the ED had total confidence in the forecasts produced, and the competitors were able to achieve good results in all tasks.

*Note from the Safety Officer: Probably not known to the Jury the weather forecasts given were based on an extensive research of weather charts and radar pictures and were very accurate. The forecasts were also constantly verified and updated by phone to the Event Director and the Safety Officer.*

### **Scoring**

The scoring programme was developed by the Chief Scorer using Excel spreadsheets. The Jury President had obtained a copy prior to the Event and checked that the formulas had been correctly applied.

The scoring process was interesting as they would only publish "Official" results after many "Provisional" results had been posted, which were therefore deemed to be of good quality. This gave two issues, some competitors thought that they could only ask for clarification of their score when the result was official; also the Jury were only checking the data files against the published official result. The jury subsequently checked data files at provisional status so as to meet the reduced time limits at the end of the competition. (See recommendations)

Another problem with the published results was that there was no result before penalties. The published result was a single result and score with the penalty listed in the comments. This was not easy to quickly work out when distance penalties and points penalties had been applied to the result. There is nothing in the rules or the COH to specifically say that results before penalties should be published, but it was the normal practice in all previous scoring programmes.

The audit process was difficult, as the debriefing sheet was rarely filled in. Numerous requests were made to the scorer and ED to complete this but without success. However a "data input sheet" was produced and included in the task file for later flights. This data sheet contained all the references and penalties for each competitor.

### **Complaints**

There were 2 complaints concerning results.

Competitor #25 Sven Gohler, Flight 1 Task 4 and Flight 2 Task 5.

Competitor #49 Bartoz Nowakowski, Flight 3 Task9.

These were resolved after discussion and a written response from the Event Director. (See attached)

### **Protests**

There were no protests.

### **Rule recommendations.**

There are no rule recommendations

### **CIA Debrief**

There was a good attendance at the CIA debrief with some good suggestions raised. Approximately 125 people attended, including 19 competitors, 14 Observers and 33 Officials. (See attached debrief report).

## **Prize giving**

The Prize giving was well attended by approximately 600 people, including the FAI and CIA Presidents. It was typically French and very long with fashion shows, jazz bands and speeches, but overall was a very good event.

## **Other Recommendations**

That EPAS define a declaration in the Sanction Application which ensures that Organisers comply with the Sporting Code.

That EPAS / Jury Board review the use of an Invitation Process Questionnaire

That the Scoring Working Group reviews the requirements for publication of Provisional Results.

That the Scoring Working Group review the publication of results which do not contain the results before penalties.

*Note: The Jury President has developed an Invitation Process Questionnaire that would be a good tool for Event Organisers. Copy attached.*

## **EVENT DEBRIEF**

**Attendance:** Approx 125 persons, 19 Competitors, 14 Observers, 33 Officials

**Entry Process:** Easy no problems

**Registration :**Quickest ever

**Briefings:** Problems with seeing screen

Too much echo at rear of room

Breakfast would have been better if it had been in the briefing room on tables outside or at the back.- Food generally excellent.

Competitors had supplied photos of Balloons and people, none were used in the official program. – Balloon photos could have been used by measuring teams to identify competitors rather than trying to read basket banners with binoculars

**Tasks:** There should have been a solo flight. – Eric replied that he did not set a solo flight due to safety reasons.

The problem was raised about the poor quality of markers. (Markers were white with coloured stripes on one side. The edges were not cut with a hot tool and therefore frayed very quickly)

Task setting generally liked – would like to see more variety. Could have had more tasks on launchfield

Would be good to put reflective tape on markers so as to aid finding them at night. – Competition is about flying not pilot's ability to find markers in the dark.

Use printed sheets with landowner permission in both languages (French / English) so that competitors and Observers knew what was being asked for.

**Observers:** Have certificate or exam for observers. – Some were lacking in experience.

Observers were picking up other markers, which led to delays for other competitors looking for markers that had already been found.

Observers were making decisions themselves without consulting competitors or crews.

Too many instances of observers walking off and taking pictures.

They took too long to do GPS measurements then missed the scoring periods on subsequent tasks.

Observers required more training. – GPS use/measuring. Should have their own GPS so no need to use the logger one.

General view that observer/GPS combination should be used more.

**Refuelling:** Too compact, should have had more space.  
Tanker pump too noisy  
First flights, there were no TEMA connectors for refuelling.

**Scoring:** Was quick.  
Phones not always answered when requesting extensions.

**Flying Area:** 10000ft was good. – The use of Blue PZ to control cloud base was good decision

**Weather Briefings:** Winds should be given in feet not meters.

**AOB:** Distribution of CSC Questionnaire to be by email after the event.  
Statement requested about the disqualification of the Hungarian competitor. –  
Reasons. Decisions, Rules etc.

### **53rd Coupe Gordon Bennett, Geneva, Switzerland**

#### **Jury comments:**

Overall, the Event was well organized and was run in accordance with the FAI and CIA rules and standards. The Event Director and his team are to be congratulated for their efforts to provide the participants with all kinds of assistance and help. Competitors expressed their gratitude for this service after the event.

The Jury discussed several GB Rules related issues and would like to make the following recommendation:

#### Competition area

The Competition area for the event should be clearly defined in a written document presented to the competitors well prior to the General Briefing. Detailed information on to whether out-of-bounds areas are prohibited or restricted, what the restrictions are and if these areas are air-space or over-flight restricted/prohibited, should be given to the competitors. During this event, some pilots came close to, and some penetrated air-space of an out-of-bounds area without exactly knowing the penalty for doing so, even if there was no over-flight of the concerned country.

The Jury also recommends that the Event Debriefing notes be presented to the CIA AA Working Group for consideration and eventual actions.

*Note: Event Debriefing Notes hav not been received.*

### **9th Debrecen Cup & Pre-Worlds, Debrecen, Hungary**

#### **Jury comments:**

The number and expertise of staff responsible for task setting, measuring, logger handling and scoring was very adequate for World Championship test event. The Jury is very satisfied.

The BFA scoring software proved to be reliable, as far as we have tested it. If its transparency and retraceability can be further improved from the standpoint of a pilot who wants his result to be explained, or the jury which wants to see on their own how the result has been reached, so much the better. Another software was available for checking possible hazardous flying and for cross checking.

The terrain is very suitable for competition ballooning, but the field roads do not favour U-turns. At the 2010 World Championship routes to launch fields should be marked with temporary road signs at field road crossings. A convoy of 120 balloon vehicles should not take a single wrong turn.

The map is excellent and facilities at the competition centre are excellent. The meteorologists were excellent. The Royaltek RBT-2300 loggers produced clean tracks.

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). A courtyard of an elementary school is less than 100 meters away from the refueling site. We recommend a safer site for the World Championship. Markers and loggers could be collected at the entry to refueling by using a minibus or van as a mobile office. A shuttle car could deliver loggers for early downloading at the competition office.

Preparations for this event had not been adequate. The event web site provided only the outdated rules from year 2007 and competitors were not given printed rules at all. In spite of some such initial shortcomings, which were solved in time, the event was a very enjoyable and successful balloon competition and served well as test of task setting, measuring, logger handling and scoring.

If the 2010 World Championship gets the promised financial and manpower support from state and local government both during the event and during the preparation, the Jury is convinced that even a 120 balloon championship will turn out very well in Debrecen.

These comments were discussed and written during the event. All three members of the jury have accepted both the content and the wording.

### **Event Director report of the PreWorlds, 30/9-4/10/09 Debrecen, Hungary**

The PreWorlds were successful; we had fine tasks, good weather and happy competitors. For me as ED it was a good opportunity to test the new team of officials. I am very happy with the team members and believe that a good working climate evolved. Next year the number of officials needs of course to be bigger by at least three times the amount of this year.

Disappointing was that the Organisers obviously not considered this event as a final repetition for the Worlds and the preparation was under what should have been expected. Since we had several events here already and the Europeans 2005, I know that the basics are in place. The competition centre is perfect and parking facilities are fine. The flying area is very good and the beginning of October is a good time with 90% of the fields harvested and just before the onset of autumn weather. Areas that need to be tackled are police escort for 123 balloons to get through the city.

A major issue this year was lack of financial support because as told several sponsors pulled out. The financial crises hit Hungary hard and during my visit to the airport, the director told me they had 18 commercial flights compared to 130 the year before. For this reason there were some frictions between me and the organizers concerning the availability of cars, travel allowance, hotel and food. The travel allowance issue could be settled and the officials received the agreed amount.

The Website was a disaster but next year the Website will be outsourced to an outside professional entity I have been told.

A mayor problem is that the key person in the whole unfolding of this event also wants to compete. This leads to various conflicts and must be changed! I have been told that next year the professional organization in the Phoenix hall takes charge of the event organization and they did a good job in 2005. The good side is that they are an experienced and professional organization; the disadvantage is that they lack ballooning experience. **Therefore we need a good EDS advisor and I propose Gabriela Slavec then she has been in Debrecen as senior official since two years.**

I asked Martin Tregale to take charge of an event questionnaire. He just emailed me the results. We will fine-tune them and publish them on the web before the end of the week.

All by all Debrecen is ready for the Worlds, they want it and can do it. CIA will have to closely watch the financial situation of the Organisers and the EDS-advisor with myself will have to be in constant communication with the Organisers about the operational preparations.

The Organisers are considering asking CIA to reschedule the dates to the end of August. I have no personal opinion about that however one thing that needs to be considered is that the crop situation is less ideal as it is at the end of September.

Hofheim, 27 October 2009. Mathijs R. de Bruijn, Event Director.

### **Tochigi Hot Air Balloon International Championship and 2009 Hot Air Balloon Japan HONDA Grand Prix, Final Round, Tochigi, Japan**

#### **Comments:**

The 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.

The event deserves high marks in most of the important areas. The terrain is suitable for ballooning competition, the map is sufficient, facilities at the competition centre are very good and met service was outstanding.

Event Director and his staff have made perfect job in running and managing the competition very smoothly and properly. Task setting was very good.

Although GPS loggers were used for all competition flights, they were not used for scoring purposes but only for flight parameter verification. An integrated logging/scoring software (ECLIPSE) was used during this event. Due to the well designed software having a good potential for logging, flight verification and Internet integration the results could be published very soon after the flights.

Chief Scorer and his staff was also very professional with high skills and routine since they worked together at the previous Events.

Competitors (and/or their balloons) made contact with power lines on 2 occasions. The Safety Officer dealt with each situation quickly, keeping all competitors and officials informed of the situation. He repeatedly reminded all competitors of the absolute need to cross over power lines with adequate distance.

Fortunately no injuries or damage resulted from these contacts.

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, and very professional manner.

#### **Recommendation:**

Event Director published the General Notes that had been prepared for the General Briefing and the goal list some week prior to the Event. According to the Jury it was an excellent idea offering enough time for the pilots to study them more carefully and this method makes the possibility of saving time at the General Briefing.

**Jury recommends that this practice could be followed at other events, as well.**

#### **Event Debriefing**

11 pilots, 7 crew members and 16 officials attended. In general, all were very satisfied with the event.

There were a few comments:

Sending Pi-ball data by SMS was very much appreciated.

Observers have made perfect job.

Pre-event organization was satisfactory, but some pilot had problems with transferring the entry fee by credit card.

Task setting was good and correct.

Met service was excellent. It was good that they included the uncertainties, as well. Such experts should be applied at each event.

### **Austrian National Championship in Mattsee/Salzburg 15-19 July, 2009**

#### **Protest:**

In a Maximum Distance Time task several pilots flew outside the defined contest area and then re-entered. Those pilots were scored to the last track point before leaving the contest area.

One pilot made a formal complaint stating that he wished to be scored to the furthest track point after re-entering the contest area.

The ED rejected the complaint with a reference to Rule 7.1.

The pilot then made a formal protest on the following reasoning

- Scoring area for the task was the competition map
- The pilot was scored to the last track point before leaving the contest area. He should be scored to the furthest track point within the scoring period after re-entry of the contest area.
- Rule 12.17 states no limitation as to leaving the contest area.
- The task sheet had no changes of rules regarding flying outside the map.

The jury decided unanimously to uphold the protest and made a reference to rule 12.22, a valid track point must be within the scoring area.