

Jury report suggestions. 2010 events

General: Suggested that the Jury Board review some CIA juror status.

From Jury reports and Event debriefing reports 2010. For full details – see original reports.

21st Ladies World Cup & 11th Wloclawek Cup, Poland, 18 – 22 August 2010

Report sent to CIA Jury Board, CIA Statutes WG & CIA Bureau.

Full summary with suggestions included in CIA Statutes WG agenda as annex 6.

The only sanction that would have been justified is for the Wloclawek Balloon Mayors Cup and that event was not mentioned in the sanction.

1. Suggested that we are a bit more careful with event sanctions in the future.
 2. Suggested that the Statutes WG take a look at chapter 7 of the Sporting Code, section 1.
-

1st European Women Championships, Alytus, Lithuania, June 16 – 20, 2010

See files EuroWomenJuryComments.rtf and EuroWomenDebrief.pdf

Jury comments:

Many positive comments. See Jury report.

Recommendation:

Results not yet calculated were initially labelled “No Result”. Should be “Waiting”.

General conclusion:

The event was a great success. Ballooning community owes thanks to the organiser who fought for the idea of feminine category hot air balloon competitions against all odds, to the event director and his team who ran an interesting, smooth and safe competition, and to the competitors, who gave birth to a championship with characteristically different and delightful atmosphere.

Event debriefing

Information before the Event

C: Information was OK but payment of 200€ deposit was not announced in advance. Should be mentioned in the invitation.

Briefing Room

C: Microphone should be used at briefings.

Refuelling

C: Refuelling should have been more organized. Officials should use coloured jackets. Fire extinguishers should be available.

Task Briefings

C: Briefings were very good. New or difficult tasks were explained until clear for all (applause)

Weather Briefings

C: Wind reading could be better, and format should be consistent and standardized.

On MET sheet altitudes were in meters but most pilots prefer feet.

On one page winds were given FROM. On another winds were TO.

Some wind data were given from altitude to ground – other wind data were from ground to aloft.

Forecast winds at the end of tasks were not given.

Use a large board for wind reading data on the field, not a small sheet of paper.

Task Setting

Use more than one declaration box in PDG's.

Use more than two measuring persons on targets.

Loggers

With this type of logger (Royaltek RBT-2300) the altitude was not visible to the pilot but is possible with bluetooth. This possibility should be mentioned in the Pre-Event information.

Publishing results online

This was much appreciated by all as results were available as soon as they were produced. The Jury recommended that it should be clearly indicated when scoring was in progress and when it was finished.

Other Topics

- Suggested that a Continental or World Championship should last at least five flying days.
- No Landowner relations officer. There were much livestock and therefore also angry farmers.

- Important telephone numbers need to be published. Why not make it a habit to print them on the backside of the badge. This includes phone numbers to key officials, emergency numbers and location of nearest hospital with GPS reference.
- Phone numbers to the measuring team could be printed on the task sheet.
- The target material was discussed. It is not specified in the rules but should be made of non slippery material.

After the event many competitors were very positive to the idea of female championships.

9th World Hot Air Airship Championship, Dole, France. 13-18 July, 2010

No jury report or debriefing report received.

According to ED report, many good suggestions appeared at the debriefing and will be discussed in the BX WG.

World Balloon Trophy, Echternach, Luxembourg. 21-25 July, 2010

Jury report.

The Jury found a big change in the rules for Events using loggers compared with the rules for events with observers. If a Pilot has violated distance limits set in the task data he was penalized with a “No Result” in that task, in accordance with rule 13.3.4.

We believe that the old rule penalizing with twice the distance infringement is fairer.

Debriefing report

The refuelling station was too far away and the refuelling took too much time. The pilots asked the organizers for improvement.

Pilots also asked for the possibility of electronic bank transfer to save costs.

Pilots proposed to marking MMA borders using some kind of spray chalk for better visible.

54th Coupe Gordon Bennett, Bristol, England. 25 September – 2 October.

From Jury report

The Jury noted many deficiencies in the organisation but were unable to correct most without jeopardizing the event and consequently penalising the entrants (*for detailed information please see the Event Debriefing Report*)

The venue, not located as agreed, was out of bounds for the public, and only a limited number of persons had access to the launch field. It is regretted that the public could not participate.

The competition center was located at the factory in Bristol. There were access limitations preventing the Jury members to enter the competition centre at any time.

The FAI/CIA protocol for the event was not respected (no FAI/CIA flags at opening- and closing ceremonies, at briefing hall and launch field, no FAI/CIA presence on the podium during prize giving).

The appointed Safety Officer did not perform in accordance with the CIA guidelines

It is recommended that the CIA should implement existing rules and regulations in respect of event organisation responsibilities, and where these are deemed to be insufficient, to study the possibility to more tightly control the event and the organising bodies. The Coupe Aéronautique Gordon Bennett being the CIA flagship event, it is the CIA's responsibility to ensure that these events are organised in accordance with high standards in organisation, competition and safety.

From Event debriefing report.

Registration and pre-competition issues

Competitors complained that they had been inundated with far too many, too late and futile Email information in the last few weeks before the event.

It was also regretted that the competitors' dedicated web-page was not accessible and that this web-page could not be used to communicate important information.

It was suggested that all important information for teams, excluding publicity messages, should be distributed to the teams at the latest 2 weeks before the event, and that email addresses should not be communicated to outside parties.

Competitors were generally not satisfied that the competition area was not clearly defined until at the General Briefing. This does not allow for serious preparation and creates organisational difficulties (Visa, route planning, tactics, safety, etc). It was pointed out that the CIA policy in this respect is that the competition area should be approved by the CIA at least 60 days before TO and that this had not been respected by the organisers. It was regretted that the CIA Event Advisor did not take up this issue in good time.

To better prepare for the flight and to assist competitors who land in countries where communication is difficult, pilots would like to see some kind of standardised document with multi-lingual translations of all relevant GB informations and/or requests.

Organisers should also make sure that all pilots/crews receive the proper exit Visa upon leaving (border control on site)

Competition

Generally it was felt that launch field operations were not adequate and that lay-out, inflation, equipment checks and launch were sub-standard.

Pilots enquired about the status of their flight-plans as they were unaware if individual flight plans had been filed and eventually been closed by the organisers. Some pilots complained that they had difficulties with ATC due to the fact that ATC was unaware of the GB race. Also, some ATC centers handled clearance requests differently for several pilots, thus creating situations resulting in competitive advantage. Pilots would appreciate receiving their individual flight plans with copies of written authorisations (from the concerned countries) before TO. Communication with competitors should be simultaneous for all, preferably in written form.

As a matter of safety, the competition centre should be permanently manned and on watch, regardless of cost.

Some competitors complained that one on-site briefing was not adequately advertised and that there

was no roll-call. It was felt that this could be a competitive advantage for a few. Generally, pilots do not wish to have too many on-site briefings, only if absolutely necessary. Too many briefings do not allow teams to properly rest before the flight (safety issue).

Weather briefings were felt to have been inadequate because they were limited to the UK weather. No long-range en-route weather information and forecasts were made available by the organisers who felt that this was the responsibility of each participant.

Services

Some competitors complained about the inflexible cancellation policies at the hotel, and that they had many problems securing rooms (and booking flights) during the event. Organisers apologised for this but explained that due to the Ryder Cup (golf) happening at the same time, all the hotels in and around Bristol were overbooked. Unfortunately the GB must live with some compromises (money, full moon, etc).

It was recommended that organisers should share their experience and expertise with the following event organisers. It is a pity to see that GB event organisers apparently need to re-invent the wheel for each event. It was also suggested that the next organiser should have a representative participate at the Event Debriefing.

It was suggested that the Opening Ceremony should take place one day earlier, and not the same day as the General Briefing, in order to allow the competitors to rest and to concentrate on the competition.

19th World Hot Air Balloon Championship, Debrecen, Hungary. 2-10 October, 2010

Jury recommendations

No-shows

.....There was a discussion between members of the CIA Bureau, the ED and the Jury prior to the event about “no shows.”.....

Recommendation: The appropriate CIA subcommittees and/or working groups to review the subject of “no shows” and provide additional clarity to EDs and Juries about what constitutes a valid “no show”, the definition of “force majeure” and the discretion an ED may exercise in declaring “no shows.”

Rules

The rules for this event were submitted for review and made available to the competitors long after the CIA's standards. “Tunnel PZs” were added to the types of PZs without such PZs and their associated penalty formulas and recommendations being included in the current Model Event Rules or the Competition Operations Handbook.

Recommendation: The appropriate CIA subcommittees and/or working groups to review the approval of the rules for this event with a view to better handling “last minute” rule additions and ensuring that the rules are available to all competitors and officials as early as possible.

Task Design

8.4.1 The Director may set more than one task to be performed on one flight. The tasks will be scored separately, with a winning score of 1000 points before penalties for each task. The combination of tasks should aim at the possibility of winning each task independently.

Recommendation: The appropriate CIA subcommittees and/or working groups to review such flight designs and provide guidance (in the Competition Operations Handbook?) as to the validity and design of flights permitting the “overlap” of scoring areas and goals for other tasks.

Safety Related Matters

Launch procedures

With respect the ED's decision not to use Launch Directors, I was not overly concerned that this presented a safety issue, as this practice is common in other (smaller) events. My major concern with this decision was the "editorializing" by the ED and Team that launching without Launch Directors was potentially safer than when using them. I believe that such public declarations are in conflict with, and undermine the efforts and standards of, the CIA's Safety & Education Subcommittee.

Recommendation: The appropriate CIA subcommittees and/or working groups to review launch procedures, the use of Launch Directors and relevant Model Event Rules and guidance in the Competition Operations Handbook.

The Propane Issue

The Event Organizer imposed a 3 tank limit for refuelling after Flight 3. His rationale was the flight was fairly short and therefore more fuel than that should not be required. His decision was also influenced by a few (number unknown) pilots refuelling numerous (in one case, 7!) tanks after Flight 2, and the assumption that these pilots were refuelling tanks used for practice flights and Flight 1 (when competitors were required to pay for their own fuel). The ED was extremely upset when he learned of this decision, which was made without his prior involvement, and asked me to assist in correcting the situation. I was able to work with the Event Organizer to remove the limit and to ensure that all competitors got all the fuel they required.

The Logger Issue

A major concern with competitors at this event was the quality (reliability and accuracy) of the GPS receivers used – the RoyalTek RBT-2300. Some pre-event questions and/or concerns by competitors were the result of competitor's previous experience (at other events) with these GPS receivers. Concern was enhanced and expressed during the General Briefing by a few failures during practice flights. Unfortunately, during the event two situations arose that further diminished the competitor's confidence in these receivers.

At the debriefing, the Jury president stated that the loggers used at 2010 WHABC (RoyalTek RBT-2300) did *not* fail – the loggers are OK as a simple (non-balloon competition specific) logger. The problems were in the way they were handled and how the data they provided was being interpreted.

Recommendation: The appropriate CIA subcommittees and/or working groups (New Technology Subcommittee) to be more active and engaged in the reviewing and approving of flight loggers.

Final Recommendation: The appropriate CIA subcommittees and/or working groups to review the role of an ED, the extent to which they can be expected to actually be in "overall operational charge" of an event, and how to ensure that all involved in staging these events live up to their obligations.

Closing Remarks

Clearly there were significant difficulties and tension while conducting this event. In the end though, the event was conducted according to the rules, a champion was declared, no one got hurt and despite the tension, everyone operated with the best intentions.

Debriefing remarks

The original file contain more than 6 pages. Here is a shortened version.

Registration and check-in.

- Surprised to come to an event where they seem to re-invent wheel. Organizers should have

check list, for things like Check-In.

- Hour queuing for pre-Check-In and several hours to Check-In. Can't electronic documents be checked at next Worlds?
- Start 1 day earlier and end day earlier to accommodate travel/driving needs.

Administration

- Communication and support to officials before the event was not adequate. In the end there were less officials and volunteers than promised. Those who arrived worked very hard and in a very professional manner.
- Everything has been received so last minute
 - Rules, maps (including electronic map)
 - Couldn't understand why everything was last minute
- Problems this year were same as at Pre-Worlds – not a lot got rectified.
- Website last year was poor – this year a little better.
- It was good to have results on the website.

•

logger team - expected network and computers with same software was not provided

- software not original
- server not working properly
- they had to use their own laptops (which was not the ED's plan)

- Looked like organizers did not read Competition Operations Handbook
- Competition Number weren't readable.
- Targets too dark, hard to see from air.

Debriefing

- Had to wait long time for loggers to be checked.
 - Use text message to ask competitor to return their GPS?
- The target teams have made a brilliant job.
 - Returned quickly so measured results could be published.
- There are more updated and efficient loggers which offer faster publication of results.

Safety

- Some of the pilots ascend too fast or do not watch for other balloons.
- The Safety Officer didn't take his responsibility and the ED had to take over
- Launching without launch-masters is not good (dangerous) especially in case of 118 balloons
 - DL Response: The US Nationals and some other competitions are organised without launch-masters.
 - Some competitors for / some against.
- Number of competitors – should be limited
- 3D scoring outside MMA encourages rapid descents
 - "Accident waiting to happen."
 - Balloon Federation of America (BFA) uses (or may use?) 3 "bands"
 - Interested persons can get information from BFA
- Police escort from Competition Centre to launch areas was excellent!

Briefing Facilities

- Roll call procedure was not modern
- Briefing is not to be combined with "coffee and cake". People in "back crowd" not interested in

L

ballooning – were noisy, please keep them out.

- Additional task sheets and chairs for team managers was good, but not available from the start.
- Waiting area too small.

Costs

- Credit cards were not accepted by organizer.
- If a deposit or bank charge is required it should be published in advance.
- Accommodations offered by the organizers were more expensive than the normal hotels.
- Retrieve cost (for stuck vehicles) too high or not consistent.

Communication

- Website was very poor and it was never considered that some pilots didn't receive SMS in spite of giving 3 telephone numbers to the Steward
- Event should have been started one day earlier and ended one day earlier to allow for return travel

Loggers

- Loggers are not very good. The same problems happened at the German nationals some weeks ago. Why were the CIA loggers not used?
 - ED response: There are not enough CIA Loggers.
 - Jury president: Encouraged competitors and NACs to support CIA Logger program. Stated that the loggers use at 2010 WHABC (RoyalTek RBT-2300) did *not* fail – the loggers are OK as a simple (non-balloon competition specific) logger. The problems were in the way they were handled and how the data they provided was being interpreted.
- There were very few communications about the loggers before the event
 - Competitors were not sure about operational details.
- 2D-3D scoring, 3D scoring may be safety issue - Competitors SubCommittee can be asked to deal with the issue.
- Remote (Blue Tooth) read out was good.
- Rules for backup loggers?
 - Matching setup requirements?
 - Registering backup loggers?

Maps

- Should receive map ahead of event.
- The “little maps” (produced by the Target Team Chiefs and showing where they had driven the previous week while looking for target fields without getting stuck) were very useful.

Refuelling

- Refuelling time should be more flexible
 - Should be related to flight planning and landing times.
- Don't wait so long to start
- Long wait times despite many empty hoses
 - 8 vehicle limit?
- Actual refuelling quite efficient (after competitor got to hose)

The Jury President thanked all for their comments and assured all that they would be passed on to the CIA, but also encouraged all to talk with their delegates.

2010 Tochigi HAB Internationalm Championship / 2010 HAB HONDA Grand Prix Final
Round. 18th - 23rd November, 2010.

From Jury report

Checking the results, the jury found an inconsistency in the competition operations handbook concerning chapter 7.5 (PZ infringement):

Although the wording is very clear, the example assumes a straight flight path between entering and leaving the PZ. Penalties have consistently been calculated in the event according to the example which is not consistent with the words above.

In the theoretical case someone enters the PZ from the top and leaves at the same trackpoint, the penalty would be 0 points, even if the competitor flew something like a donut inside the PZ and descending almost to the ground. In case he enters near ground and leaves at the same point, the proportional offence would be 100% for altitude and 0% for distance, which leads to 250 points penalty. Crossing a circular PZ by entering at the top edge and leaving at the opposite top edge would give 100% for the horizontal and 0% for the altitude infringement, regardless wether the pilot flew directly below the top or lower.

For the jury it is obvious, that the vertical infringement should be calculated similar to the altitude infringement in chapter 10.14.

The rule for calculating the horizontal infringement is not appropriate for irregular shaped Pzs, a minor infringement will lead to more penalties the smaller the PZ is.

From Event debriefing

Some pilots had concerns with the increased number of tasks in each flight and having only a 5 minute study period. This is not a complaint for this event but a general observation. A suggestion was a 5 minute study period prior to the briefing was adequate for 3 tasks in a flight and an increase generally or by a formula for more than 3 tasks in a flight.

All participants agreed this event is one of the best Category One events in the World and few events were equal to organization and class here in Tochigi.

In closing there were many positive comments with regards to this event and we all look forward to attending this event again in the future.