

## Report of the President of the International Jury

10<sup>th</sup> European Advanced Aerobatic Championship  
5.8.2017 – 13.8.2017  
Chotebor, Czech Republic



Philippe Küchler, pik

## Introduction and Overview

The 10<sup>th</sup> FAI European Advanced Aerobatic Championship (EAAC) was held at the Airfield of Chotebor (LKCT), Czech Republic on 5 August - 13 August 2017. Contest Director was Vladimir Machula (CZE) and Chief Judge was Nick Buckenham (GBR).

There were a total of 45 competitors (46 in 2015) from 14 countries (12 in 2015). Detailed results are available from [www.civa-results.com](http://www.civa-results.com).

Jury members were Elena Klimovich (RUS) and Tamás Ábrányi (HUN). A big thank you to you guys for the work done and the many happy hours we had together.

Website: [www.eaac2017.eu](http://www.eaac2017.eu)

## Overall Winner

### Individual:



Dmitry SAMOKHVALOV  
Sukhoi 31M  
Russian Federation

**Team:**

Dmitry SAMOKHVALOV, Roman OVCHINNIKOV and Vladimir KOTELNIKOV  
Russian Federation

Congratulations to the Champions!

**Facilities and Contest Organization**

I already had the chance to visit Chotebor Airfield on the occasion of the Czech Nationals in Power Aerobatics a few years ago, where I was working as a judge. The airfield has numerous hangars where competition aircrafts could be stored. The main building has several offices, including the info-point and a big room which was used for judges briefings, video sessions and the jury meetings. A slight downdraft was the sometimes strong odor from the neighbouring kitchen.

The Info-Point was driven by the CD's staff, formed by the proven team of volunteers of the local and the Czech Aeroclub. One of the absolute highlights for me was the coffee machine in the info point, available for free for everyone. A big and heartfelt thank you to all the girls and guys working in there! It was a pleasure to work with all of you.

The catering was done on site by the local kitchen, run by volunteers. The dining room for everybody was a tent next to the main building.

The airfield itself is located on top of a hill, about 3 km from downtown Chotebor. The runway has grass surface and the whole airfield is big enough for such an event.

The box was marked well.

There were 2 judge positions used during the whole competition. One right next to the airport buildings beside the runway and the other one on the south west edge of the box. Transportation to the second one was done by mini vans.

A third one proved to be unusable because of being too close to the box.

The weather data was supplied by Czech Meteorological service and several internet sources. The data was then presented very professionally by the CD. Wind measurement was done by means of drone flights. Because of the high temperatures the Density Altitude had to be calculated on a regular basis. The limit of 3000 feet was passed on quite many flying days and therefore free breaks have been allowed (Section 6, Part 1, Paragraph 3.6.2.6).

The scoring office was run in a “one lady show”. Lenka Rejentova did a very good job, despite some issues with paperwork and the config of Acro. Thanks to the introduced verification of unknown sequences by radio between CJ and competitor bigger problems could be avoided. I think the scorer should always have a full time assistant who helps to verify and rechecks the tasks and paperwork sent to the judging line. Thank you Lenka for investing again so much time into this! I appreciate your important work.

Messaging was done by sending text messages to all interested parties. The CD had to fight with the Czech providers because they locked out the SIM cards used for spamming. This led to missed messages in the beginning. But Vladimir was able to deal with the problem and from then on it worked well.

## **Contest summary**

3 programmes were flown by 44 competitors. The 4<sup>th</sup> programme was only flown by the top half of the pilots (23 pilots) after 3 programmes due to weather conditions. 2 warm-up pilots, including Michail Mamistov and Marek Hyka, were flying for the judges.

Please note that of the original field of 45 competitors, one has dropped out due to health problems after Programme 1.

No major incidents nor any accidents took place. Thank you to the pilots for safe flying!

## **Complaints**

No complaint was handed in to the IJ.

## **Protests**

No protest was handed in to the IJ.

## **Other businesses of the IJ**

I only could arrive on site on Sunday, 6<sup>th</sup> of August because of my duty as CJ at the WGAC/WAGAC at Torun, Poland. I was replaced for the opening briefing by my fellow jury members. Thanks to Elena and Tamás for their work at this competition.

## **Judging Analysis**

1	Timmo BARTHOLDI	FIN	9.22
2	Lyudmyla ZELENINA	GER	9.64
3	Oleg SHPOLYANSKIY	RUS	11.2
4	Jerome HOUDIER	FRA	11.86
5	John GAILLARD	RSA	16.18
6	Algim ORLICKAS	LTU	16.61
7	Zuzana DANIHELOVA	CZE	18.55
8	Jurgen LEUKEFELD	GER	19.92

## **Proposals to CIVA plenary or respective commissions**

As a result of the contest operations supervised by the IJ the following proposals are submitted to plenum or the respective committees:

- | Reduce the number of on site jury members to 2 or even 1 (the president of the IJ). The remaining members should be available by phone or video messaging for conferencing in case of need. From my point of view 2 on site are enough and could also take, most of the time, decisions as a majority.

Rationale: Most of the time the jury is idling somewhere on the airfield by following the flights. Supervision of the judge line doesn't seem to be a really necessary job as the CJ's know well their business and operate after the rules. For video session supervising one member is enough and for possible needed decisions there is plenty of time afterwards. The same applies for handed in complaints and protests. There is normally no time constraint which gives the need for immediate on-spot decisions. In addition, such a move would clearly relieve the cost structure of every event. All other businesses of the IJ can easily be handled by 2 or even one member.

- | Set the CJ to scoring and reduce the number of minimum judges by one.

Rationale: It surfaced on this competition the question why the CJ is set to non-scoring. Our CJ's are all experienced judges and their knowledge could be very welcome to be used in the regular scoring. I also noted that Nick as a CJ on this comp gave a mark to every figure anyway. So the information was actually available. I myself do it also quite often. One could argue that the work load for the CJ on a scoring config would be too high. I don't believe so, if there are good assistants. In addition, again, this could relieve the cost structure of every event by reducing to an even number of judges (6) plus a scoring CJ.

- | Rework the judging criteria for rolling turns. This should be forwarded to the Rules Committee.

Rationale: It clearly showed on this comp again, that the judging of rolling turns is a very difficult and discussion provoking task. The main problem is the remaining roll at the end of the turn. For clarification: If the judge sees a remaining roll of 45 degrees or more the mark for the figure is 0.0. If the judge sees more than 90 degrees of rolling on axis, then the mark for the figure is Hard Zero. Exactly this part was on many video sessions a big discussion point. The main issue is, that such an error can't be checked, proven or even validated on the video. This despite being a HZ and therefore eligible to be checked by video!

- | Add the need for a reason for 0.0 and Perception Zero (PZ) given by the judge to the rules (as already in place for HZ).

Rationale: Currently a judge is only obliged to state a reason for a Hard Zero on his score sheet. However, the reason for 0.0 or PZ has actually the same importance to be stated. This mainly because of paragraph 4.4.6.2 in Section 6, Part 1. This rule had to be applied quite often during this competition, also on rolling turns by the way. Not having a written reason on the score sheet of the judge who has given another zero (0.0 or PZ) makes it very difficult to apply 4.4.6.2 on a fair and transparent base. Not only during a video session of the judges but also in an explanatory task to a pilot.

- | Treat an obstacle in the box the same way as a technical defect.

Section 6 (Part 1, para 3.11.2) should be amended in a way so that the pilot has the option to act on an obstacle in the box the same way as in case of a technical defect. Verification and confirmation should be within the IJ (instead of the technical commission as on the technical defect). On this comp (and its not the first time...) we had a balloon flying close to or even through the box. On this particular case, the pilot performing was unsure about his options to break the flight, clearly for safety reasons. Safety first, as we always say. No pilot should be forced to fly in such a condition. And to scare the pilot of breaking the programme in a potentially dangerous situation because she/he fears not to be allowed to refly the missing figures is for sure not what we want.

## Final Words

Despite some adverse weather I again really enjoyed this competition for being competitive and for good sportsmanship.

A big thank you goes out to all the volunteers and the local organizing committee, headed by Honsa Adamec. Honsa not only managed to create a wonderful competition but also supported the event on the financial side very actively. Thank you Honsa!

And last but not least a thank you to Vladimir who again managed to create a professional environment for a good championship.

Philippe Küchler, pik  
28.10.2017  
Zumholz, Switzerland