

## **IGC Steward Report**

### **7th. FAI World Junior Gliding Championships**

**Musbach Germany 5th to 20th August 2011**

**Contest Director: Axel Reich**

#### **Competition overview.**

The competition was well organised and successful despite poor weather conditions, the social activities were in keeping with the Junior competitions and all the participants had a great time.

The size and orientation of the airfield required the club class to launch first on all days and presented a challenge to the organisers to launch all the gliders in a reasonable time. Cars were not allowed on the airfield which caused complaints from some TC's but the formation of the grid and glider manoeuvring worked well and there was no need for the constant demands to remove cars from the grid.

#### **Pre Competition**

A National Junior competition with overseas participation was held during 2010.

In 2011 the site was closed for the week prior to the official practice days but this caused no inconvenience to team preparations as there are many sites in the area.

The weather was poor during the practice period and a full operational practice day was not possible.

#### **Organisation**

The contest organisation was efficient and the principle members of the organisation were well prepared for their role. The secondary aspects of the organisation lacked sufficient experienced helpers, which resulted in the directors often being diverted from their principle duties.

#### **Suitability of meetings and briefings.**

A team captains briefing was held on most mornings and allowed the main briefing to focus on the operational aspects of the contest. Briefings were fairly well prepared and information delivered clearly.

#### **Suitability of weather information.**

The weather information was comprehensive and well delivered. The very difficult weather patterns during the event made forecasting very difficult and required constant updates from the meteorologist to the organisers.

#### **Suitability of facilities**

The briefing hall was excellent and included a café that provided a centre to the operational and social activities.

The organisations facilities were sufficient for a competition of this size but the site was only just large enough for a JWGC and some operational limitations were imposed to ensure a safe operation.

#### **Information dissemination (Announcements, schedules and decisions)**

All briefings and daily schedule were sent to all TC's by SMS and announced on the radio, this system worked extremely well.

#### **Launch control and launching**

On most days grid launch time would have been improved with two more tow planes however the launch time did improve during the competition and the control of the launching procedure was good.

The tow pattern discipline was poor and problems occurred on a number of occasions. There was a near miss between two tow planes during the final descent phase and a near miss between a glider and a tow plane during his climb out.

#### **Finish procedures**

The finish ring worked well and the penalty structure seemed to be fair, by the end of the competition most of the initial criticism of the finish ring had been answered and the system widely accepted. On one competition day four pilots landed within the ring without a valid finish and one made a valid finish but with penalties that meant he was scored to max distance. This resulted in five equal first places on the day and was accepted as being a just result.

### **Opening and closing.**

Held in Freudenstad town centre with an excellent band and regional radio coverage the opening ceremony was a "gas" and a great time was had by all despite the occasional rain showers.

Prior to the concert the teams marched in to the square and the Jury president made the official opening after the usual local VIP speeches.

The closing ceremony was held in the briefing hangar and was well conducted. Official speeches were kept short and the emphasis was put on the winners.

Due to amount of manual work required, results of the Team Cup were not calculated for closing ceremony. Organisers announced it will be published soon on the competition website, however as for September 5th it still has not been done.

### **Steward and Jury facilities**

The office provided for the IGC officials was small but adequate for two people to work in at any one time, it had hard wired internet which proved to be very useful.

### **Other social events**

The organisers held two International evenings and several ad hoc parties were organised by teams and crews.

### **Media liaison and internet coverage.**

The contest web site was very good and constantly updated with all news also updated through Face Book and Twitter.

### **Public and Internet display of real-time aircraft positions and information**

The organisers had ten tracker units supplied by a German group (way.aero) who are developing their own system. The trackers are of a compact design and worked well but the data transmission rate of 50secs would need to be increased for SGP style presentation. The system will also accept data via Spot trackers but this was never made to work during the contest.

### **Task setting and operations**

Task setting was limited by the poor weather conditions, local airspace and terrain restrictions but in general the organisers made the best use of the area and conditions available.

### **Compliance with the sporting code.**

During scrutineering the organisers decided not to enforce the rules in Annex A requiring competition identification to be evident under the wing. (see recommendations)

The organisers decided they did not require start times to be handed in, this was discussed and agreed at the first TC meeting.

The organisers asked for and received agreement with TCs that preliminary scores would not be published on the notice board, however they were available on SoaringSpot and updated frequently.

Mis en forme

## **RULES**

### **Adequacy of Local Procedures**

The local procedures were amended several times prior to the contest and the final amendments were issued during the practice period.

The LP's included.

- Finish ring procedures and penalties.
- Airfield boundary including fields adjacent to the airfield
- Scoring enquiry procedure.

### **Recommendation for possible improvements of Rules and/or Local Procedures**

#### **Weight penalties.**

Mis en forme

Annex A should clearly state that overweight penalties also apply to any glider exceeding the MTOW. Annex A should contain clarification regarding use of fixed ballast in Club class and how weight penalties should be applied.

#### **Glider identification.**

If the requirement to have under wing competition numbers (4.3.1) is to remain in Annex A, it should be reinforced by a paragraph in the LP's stating that any glider not complying with the identification rules will not be offered a launch.

#### **Scoring**

On 18.08 in Club class, an AAT task was set with minimum distance of 69,2km. About 1/3 of the finishers had their marking distance below 100km. This has caused significant devaluation of Day Factor.

Annex A committee should discuss the scoring of finishers with Dh below 100km to evaluate whether scoring formulas need some slight corrections to cope such situations. Perhaps the finishers should be counted to N1 parameter even if they didn't reached Dh of 100km?

In principle this should only apply to AAT but could also occur in handicapped scoring classes.

#### **Finish procedure.**

At the beginning of the contest there were some critics of the finish ring and penalty structure but the system worked well and by the end of the contest most of the early critics were satisfied the system worked better than a finish line could have.

We suggest that the finish penalties in Annex A should be amended to one point per meter (maximum 100m) below any minimum height, and applied to all offences.

#### **Control points.**

The organisers arranged adjacent control points about 8km from the airfield, in practice these turned out to be a little too close to the finish ring. On most days we used only one of these control points with a turn point about 25k out for the second class and this worked well.

#### **Start times.**

The Annex A committee should consider if the requirement in 7.4.7 is still valid.

#### **Class rotation on the grid**

Future competition bids should state if there are any limitations for rotation of classes on the grid.

### **SAFETY**

#### **General safety of the event**

The event was conducted in a safe manner with procedures being modified to improve safety whenever they were identified..

A pilots safety committee was elected at the beginning of the competition and met with the Stewards after flying on the first valid competition day. In all reported case of hazardous or dangerous flying the pilots concerned met with the stewards to review the circumstances. The stewards made a video of the incident using IGC files and this was used to review the incident.

A Pilot safety comments Box and was introduced and pilots were encouraged to post any comments in the box either signed or anonymous. This was a very successful initiative and resulted in many comments from pilots providing feedback to the stewards.

Safety briefings were made during main briefing by the Chief Steward when it was considered appropriate to do so.

#### **Summary of comments received in the Safety box:**

- Cloud flying complaints: 4
- Behaviour in thermals: 12
- Task setting: 1
- Dumping water in thermals: 2

(there were complaints about towing, but none in writing)

Other:

- 1 complaint against close fly-bys of military jets
- 1 complaint against insufficient information delivered to teams
- 2 suggestions regarding data printed on a task sheet
- 1 suggestion on topics raised at daily briefing
- 1 suggestion regarding too close distance from checkpoint to finish ring

#### **Occurrence of incidents and/or accidents.**

There were two accidents involving damage to gliders, both occurred during field landings. In one case the pilot spent one night in hospital for observation due to some back pain but was released without treatment and the other accident was without any injury to the pilot.

There were two near misses during towing both of a serious nature and requiring action by the stewards to improve launch procedures and discipline of the tow pilots.

#### **Availability of medical personnel**

There were no medical personnel on the airfield and response was required from the local emergency services based in Fruedenstadt

#### **Use of safety officers**

A safety officer was appointed by the organisers who also took the role of co-ordinator in the event of an accident. The organisers produced a document for the team captains outlining action to be taken in the event of an accident.

#### **Pilot skills relating to safety**

A briefing by the CS was held at the last practice day briefing for all pilots flying.

On two occasions pilots made deliberate low pass finishes, both cases the pilots were penalised on the first offence as deliberate failure to follow procedures.-

#### **Stewards**

The organisation responded well to input from the Stewards and a good relationship brought positive benefits to the smooth running of the contest.

The mix of steward skills worked extremely well and as far as possible this should be an objective for future WGC events.

The CS made three safety briefings that according to feedback from TC's were well received and had the desired impact on pilot behaviour.

During the competition the Chief Steward was airborne prior to grid launch, this brought several advantages to both the Stewards and the organisation.

- Opportunity to discuss criteria required for critical decisions.

- Preparation of detailed timescale for critical decisions.

- The opportunity to observe pilot behavior and extent of thermal congestion prior to start.

- Assessment of pilots start discipline and tactics.

- To provide accurate and timely advice on need start line opening delay and need for start height limits.

Mis en forme

Brian Spreckley  
Wojciech Scigala  
9.11.2011