

Report of the Chief Judge



Philippe Kuchler, pik



10th WORLD ADVANCED GLIDER AEROBATIC CHAMPIONSHIPS 2019 &
22th WORLD GLIDER AEROBATIC CHAMPIONSHIPS 2019

Deva, Romania

18.7.2019 – 28.7.2019

Overview

19 pilots (22 in 2018) from 7 countries (8 in 2018) competing in Unlimited and 31 pilots (35 in 2018) from 13 countries (11 in 2018) competing in Advanced.

Deva is located in the county of Hunedoara which is a part of the famous region of Transylvania. The airfield is called Deva-Saulesti and is located about 5 kilometers outside the town of Deva.

Aircraft that could be seen flying included Swift S-1, MDM-1 Fox, SZD 59 Acro

Website: <https://wgac2019.ro/>

The board of judges consisted of:

! COURTOIS, Bernard	FRA
! DOVGALENKO, Tamara	UKR
! DUGAS, Alain	FRA
! HAU, Steff	GER
! KANAO, Myiako	JPN
! PAKAY, Csaba	ROU
! WECHSELBERGER, Sandra	AUT

Scoring Office:

! Florentina and Radu	ROU
-----------------------	-----

Warm-up Pilot:

! ENGEL, Steffen	GER
------------------	-----

Overall Winners

Advanced:

Unlimited:

Individual:



Patrycja PACAK
Swift S-1
Poland



Ferenc TOTH
Swift S-1
Hungary

Team:



Octav ALEXAN, Lorand DAROCZI and
Ciprian LUPAS
Romania



Eugen SCHAAL, Michael SPITZER
and Tobias HACKEL
Germany

Congratulations to the Champions!

It is the first time in history of glider aerobatics that we have a female overall winner. Patrycja, well done!

Preface

For me it was not the first competition in Deva, as I already did several nationals in glider aerobatics there. I also had the pleasure to serve as the president of the international jury of EAAC in 2015 in Deva. My expectations were therefore quite high and I can confirm that I wasn't disappointed.

The on site catering was done by an uptown restaurant, served at an improvised counter of the main building at the airfield.

Only 1 judge position was used, thanks to prevailing wind from one general direction.

The HMD system used this year again was the one developed by Vladimir Machula and supplied the height limits but not the box ground tracking used for box outs. Again, we operated with box out penalties. The score for positioning given by the judges was therefore very important. My thanks go out to the 2 Czech lads who operated the system.

Accommodation for the judges and jury was downtown Deva. Sadly the hotel for the officials was clearly not up to the standard. Dirty rooms and bad service in general darkened the general image of the whole competition massively. This is very sad, as the accommodation is an important point for all officials to be motivated and ready for their volunteer job.

Judges Preparation

The judges and their assistants went again through a one day preparation session. This year the theoretical part was quite short as there haven't been any bigger changes in the rules. The practical part took place as usual with 5 flights each of Unlimited and Advanced class.

Competition Flights

Both classes flew all 6 programmes! This is outstanding and underlines the high sporting level of the event.

Flight Safety

I had to disqualify 1 pilot in Advanced from the competition after dangerous flying. The pilot was not well enough prepared to fly his aircraft (MDM-1 Fox) and exited a figure with very high speed and probably also quite massive G load. I had to call "break, break" to stop the performance.

Another one, also in Advanced, has resigned from the competition by himself. I also had to call him down with "break, break".

Judging Analysis

Advanced (WAGAC):

1	WECHSELBERGER, Sandra	AUT	11.2
2	HAU, Steff	GER	14.58
3	DUGAS, Alain	FRA	15.14
4	PAKAY, Csaba	ROU	16.49
5	COURTOIS, Bernard	FRA	18.8
6	DOVGALENKO, Tamara	UKR	21.27
7	KANAO, Myiako	JPN	27.92

Unlimited (WGAC):

1	WECHSELBERGER, Sandra	AUT	9.98
2	HAU, Steff	GER	11.25
3	COURTOIS, Bernard	FRA	12.3
4	DOVGALENKO, Tamara	UKR	14.32
5	KANAO, Myiako	JPN	14.73
6	PAKAY, Csaba	ROU	17.07
7	DUGAS, Alain	FRA	24.6

Please note that this was the first CIVA competition for Sandra Wechselberger as a judge. I would say this is remarkable! For the sake of completeness I need to mention that she served as an assistant before.

Other Issues

Regarding organization I want to mention that for me the final evening was not up to the standard as there was no official honouring of all the helpers. I think this definitely a thing which should be done by the organizer. Without them, such an event would not be possible. Anyway, a big thank you to the numerous of you!

Another thing that bothered me, is the fact that information was flowing through Whatsapp. No text messages. This leaves out everybody who doesn't want to use it for privacy reasons, like myself. I still think an organizer should use plain basic text messaging for on site information distribution.

Not really an issue but nonetheless something which should be mentioned was the situation with the tow planes. The organizer managed to find 2 Maule's, as requested by CIVA. In addition there were Wilga's. Despite the fears that the Wilga's wouldn't be satisfiable for towing on such a comp, they did work quite well and the competitors loved the precision of their pilots. The downdraft of the whole towing business was the relatively high rate of technical problems of all types used. However, somehow the organizer always managed to replace the outs somehow and repair the defects in time.

CJ Proposals

As a result of experiences and discussions with the IJ, I propose to amend the following paras in Section 6, part 2 (changes in red):

Inside Lines

B. 8.1.6 All lines that occur inside a figure are preceded and followed by part-loops. (Figure 9) The absolute length of lines within a figure is in itself not a marking criterion. The corresponding attitude, however, must be maintained **constant** long enough to allow judges to observe the angle and determine any deviations from the prescribed plane of flight. **Varying the attitude, making the line appear curved, must be downgraded by one (1) point.**

Rationale: This aims at my so called “Bananas”. A line should be a line a not a half loop or a big bend. The judges need to have a way to penalize this without having the need for a HZ because of wrong figure flown.

Loops

B.9.10.5 To better quantify deductions for irregularity of the radius of looping figures, the judge divides the loop into quadrants. **Any recognizable variation in the radius must be downgraded by a maximum of two (2) points per occurrence** depending on the magnitude of the variation.

Following paragraphs B.9.10.6 through B.9.10.8 contain no useful guidance for judges and should be deleted.

Rationale: There is no clear specification for the roundness of the loop and what the judge should deduct if its a famous “egg” or “plumb”. So this fills a whole in the rules.

Conclusions

From a sporting point of view an outstanding competition. Of course there was weather luck. But nonetheless the organizer did a very good job.

Main dark side for sure is the accommodation for the judges and the jury. Sorry guys. I felt with you.

A big thank you goes out to Gelu Luca, the contest director. He was always available and very helpful and cooperative. Gelu, many thanks for your time and effort, appreciated.

Once more I want to send a huge thank you to Schorsch and Marina. Even if we do not have the same point of view sometimes, I am very happy that you are there. I hope to have you with me for many years to come.

Philippe K uchler, pik
31.10.2019, Zumholz, Switzerland