Stewards Report – 4th FAI World Junior Gliding Championships.

Husbands Bosworth, UK.
6th to 19th August 2005.

Contest Director: Ron Bridges

1. Organisation
    - 1.1 Overall Organisation. Excellent.
    - 1.2 Quality of Officials. All officials were well qualified for their duties and performed them with charm and good humour.
    - 1.3 Experience of Officials. The organisational team run competitions from the site annually, regionals every year and Nationals every other year. Their depth of experience was a critical factor in the success of the Championships.
    - 1.4 Suitability of meetings and briefings. All statutory meeting were duly called, and ad hoc meetings were convened when required. Agenda's were circulated and minutes kept and published as a record.
    - 1.5 Suitability of weather information. The Meteorologist was a retired professional and a glider pilot. He only had access to standard web site data, but his thorough understanding of local weather conditions produced detailed forecasts that were remarkably accurate.
    - 1.6 Suitability of facilities. The airfield has a wide grass strip 07/25 and was adequate for this competition. The host club's facilities had been augmented with addition of portable offices, shower blocks and 240v power supply for the temporary camp site. The end result was a well designed, compact and practical infrastructure.
    - 1.7 Transportation. International Officials used their own vehicles, and were accommodated in private houses close to the airfield. At the airfield bicycles were provided for the Stewards.
    - 1.8 Information dissemination. A wireless network was provided to serve the campsite and the clubhouse. The Internet site www.worldgliding2005.com provided an excellent all round news service for competitors and public. A paper copy of all official notices and results was maintained on the official notice board. Provisional and unofficial scores were displayed on a large plasma screen in the bar. Preliminary results were calculated from the manual start and finish time, and updated with FR data as this was down loaded. The pilots provisional scores were on the plasma display in the bar by the time they handed their FR into control. If there were no outlandings unofficial scores were available within two hours of the last finisher handing in his FR. Unofficial score sheet were generally posted the next morning at 09:30hrs, becoming official at 23:30hrs that evening.
    - 1.9 Pilot Assistance. Registration was friendly and efficient. The organisation made it clear that they were there for the benefit of the pilots and this created a good working interface between the teams and the organisation.
    - 1.10 Retrieval. There were a relatively low number of retrieves, no problems with farmers or locating the pilot. Crews were provided with detailed directions generated from a computerised mapping system.

1.11 Technical Inspection. The technical team were well prepared and carried out their inspections efficiently. Each gliders configuration was recorded. The mass on the main wheel in tow out configuration was calculated from the maximum all up weight and this was used to check the gliders on their way to the grid.

1.12 Launch control for fair access and efficiency. Well organised and fair. Gliders were gridded in rows of 4 and rows rotated on a daily basis. By agreement with the team managers, teams were put together in the same row but the team's initial row was selected on a random basis. The position of the class on the grid was rotated daily. All Standard class gliders were weighed on a daily basis and were allowed to dump down on the scales if necessary. Club class gliders were only weighed on a random basis to ensure that there was no change in mass. Only one discrepancy was found and this was traced to an error in the original technical inspection.

1.13 Opening and closing ceremonies including presentation of Jury and Stewards.

1.13.1 Opening Ceremony. The formal opening was incorporated into the briefing of the first competition day. The previous evening there was a public parade through the streets of Market Harborough and a formal presentation to Team Captains by the Town's Mayor. This public ceremony was followed by a cocktail party in the town hall for Competition officials and Team Managers.

1.13.2 Jury and Stewards were introduced during the formal opening on the first day.

1.13.3 Closing Ceremony. This was conducted outside, was well organised, dignified and complied with FAI protocols.

1.14 Other Social events. There were several social events put on by the organisers during the course of Championships including an International evening. These were all well attended by the teams.

1.15 Total number of scheduled days was 14 and there were 9 contest days

1.16 Media Liaison. There was good coverage in the local media and the organisation received very good support from local communities and business. The accident was widely reported on regionally and nationally. National radio and television reported the final results. A hospitality tent was set up for sponsors who were invited to the competition for a days gliding.

1.17 No tracking system was in use.

1.18 Other organisational comment. The organisation responded promptly to questions, queries during the planning phase of the competition and were receptive to suggestions that were made. During the practice week a special airspace briefing was held to help visiting pilots understand the complexities of the local airspace

2 Rules.

2.1 Adequacy of the Local Procedures. The LP's were approved by the IGC prior to the start of the Championship and were adequate.

However several additions to cover operational details were agreed at the Managers meeting. In addition the activity on non competing gliders was discussed and a procedure to regulate their activity agreed with the Stewards.

2.2 Addendums or changes. Team Managers approved the following changes to the Local Procedures:-

- 2.2.1 To impose a maximum altitude over the entire task area, and to limit the competitors to the max start height for 2 minutes before their start.
- 2.2.2 To declare the start height for the class immediately after the last launch of the class.
- 2.2.3 To include the start points for the day as well as the airfield in the left circling only zone.
- 2.2.4 To allow competitors to advise ATZ's if they were entering their airspace.
- 2.2.5 To weigh all Standard Class gliders every day and club class gliders on a random basis.

2.3 Fair application of Rules and Local Procedures. The rules were applied fairly.

2.4 Possible improvement of Rules.

- 2.4.1 Annex A.
  - 2.4.1.1 Resolve the conflict in the wording related to penalty zones around turn points and areas. Rules 7.5.5 and 8.9 – Incorrect rounding of Turn Points and Areas.

2.5 Task Setting and operations.

- 2.5.1 Task setting. The task setting team did an excellent job. The complex airspace restrictions and fickle weather patterns called for innovative and thoughtful tasks. The task setters achieved this admirable as can be judged by the relatively low number of out landings and minimal airspace penalties.
- 2.5.2 Briefings. Daily briefings generally lasted about 30 minutes with an emphasis on clarity and recognition of the daily winners. The atmosphere was informal and the interaction between the organisation and the competitors was excellent. Day winners were asked to give a brief account of their flight and it was gratifying to note that all the pilots did this with humour and confidence though in the majority of cases English was not their home language.
- 2.5.3 Launching. 9 tugs were used and launched the two classes within 48 to 50 minutes. Each class was taken to its designated drop zone. There were no more than 5 relights during the entire competition. A "sniffer" was used to determine cloud base and the start height was set just below the mean cloud base. Non competing gliders were launched after the gate for the last class launched had been opened, however on days when competitors had delayed their start there were reports of

non competing gliders causing a nuisance to competitors.

2.5.4 Finishes. Finishing gliders provided an exciting spectacle and attracted many spectators. There were several occasions when returning non competing gliders landed just prior to or among finishing competitors. While this was not cause any dangerous incidents we think that this activity could be an unnecessary distraction for competitors.

2.6 Scoring System (use and application).

2.6.1 The scoring system was made up of three components:-

- Tasknav was used to set the task, produce the task sheet, download FR's, validate the task and output task data to the scoring program.
- The Crabb scoring system was used to calculate the scores, maintain running totals, produce results for display on the bar screen and in printed form and html for display on the web. The scores were updated automatically on a minute by minute basis as new data was computed.
- Airspace checking was done with a special program developed by Tim Newport-Peace that automatically checked every Flight Record and produced an audit trail of infringements. The detailed analysis of infringements was then done using Tasknav. Where there was an infringement, the team captain and pilot concerned were invited to look at the incident before penalties were posted.

During a routine check of the scores a minor rounding error was discovered that resulted in a one point adjustment to the scores of 12 pilots. The user defined area on the task sheet produced by Tasknav does not provide sufficient space for airspace and other important task information and designated time for Assigned Area tasks is incorrectly named. Generally this scoring systems worked well.

2.7 Complaints and Protests. There were no complaints and no protests.

3 Safety.

3.1 General safety of the event. The safety committee was established at the first briefing, Standard Class representative was Daniel Rossier of Switzerland and the Club Class representative Christoph Nacke from Germany. We consider low high speed finishes using "ground effect" are an area of risk that requires consideration in the future. We think parallel club operations also create increased risks particularly launching non competing gliders into the start area before competing gliders have started, and allowing non competing gliders to land during finishing.

3.2 Occurrence of incidents and/or accidents.

3.2.1 A photographer standing in the flight path of finishing gliders was hit by a finishers wing tip and fatally injured.

3.2.2 Incidents. There were two complaints lodged with the safety committee concerning the aggressive behaviour of pilots while thermalling. The flight records of these gliders were examined and the incidents were discussed with the team managers and pilots concerned.

3.2.3 There was no outlanding damage to any competing gliders.

3.3 Availability of Medical Personnel. The organisers had prepared a comprehensive emergency plan that complied with FAI guide lines and integrated their operation with that of the police, fire and ambulance services. There were "first aiders" available on site at all times.

3.4 Launch Safety. No problems.

3.5 Grid Safety. Grid was well managed and there were no incidents. To minimise the risk of rope runners being hit by tug propellers, competitors were asked to provide their own rope that they just attached to the tug when it was positioned ready to launch. Rope runners wore coloured tee shirts and tugs were directed to a given colour.

3.6 Pilots Skill relating to safety. Generally pilots displayed an extremely high level of skill and flew safely. There were 7 airspace infringements the resulted in an automatic outlanding at the point of entry and 4 start height infringements. All these infringements were of a minor nature.

3.7 Suggestions for future safety enhancements. In the interests of a safe and fair competition we think that the activity of non competing gliders flying from the same site needs to be regulated. The bid document should ask organisers to declare their policy regarding any parallel operations from the competition site.

Stewards Name Dick Bradley

Stewards Signature……

Stewards Name Jaroslav Vach

Stewards Signature…….