Overview

20 (-12 compared to 2015) pilots from 8 (-2) countries competing in Unlimited and 39 (-8) pilots from 12 (+-0) countries competing in Advanced.

Aircraft that could be seen flying included Swift S-1, MDM-1 Fox, MDM-1 Solo Fox, SZD 59 Acro, Pilatus PC11/B4 and a Cirrus K2.

Website: www.wgac2016.hu

The village of Matko is located about 70 km southeast of the capital Budapest, close to the city of Kecskemét. Its the same location as the 2016 edition of Danubia Glider Cup.

The judges gave 24540 marks, of which 270 where Perception Zeroes and 366 where Hard Zeroes, for a total of 288 competition flights.

The board of judges consisted of:

- BIAŁEK, Maciej POL
- BUCKENHAM, NICK GBR
- COURTOIS, Bernard FRA
- DOVGALENKO, Tamara UKR
- GURÁLY, Béla HUN
- HAU, Stef GER
- LISZKAY, László RSA
- TALABOS, Gábor sen. HUN

Scoring Office:

- MOLNAR, Sandor HUN
Overall Winners

Advanced: Unlimited:

Individual: Sebastian JANSSON Ferenc TOTH
MDM-1 Fox Swift S-1
Sweden Hungary

Team:

Dávid JÓZSA, Miklós HOÓS and Ferenc TÓTH, János SZILÁGYI and
Péter SZABÓ János SONKOLY
Hungary Hungary

Congratulations to the Champions!

Preface

This year again, I have been working at Matko Airport as CJ for the Danubia Glider Cup 2016 short before the Worlds organized by the same organizing team.

The airfield is well suited for aerobatic competitions with a hangar and an additional hangar tent and a huge open space holding grass runways.
The on site catering was done in a separate tent. This tent was also used as the briefing room.

The combined meals and briefing tent

2 judge positions were used. One position was in walking distance to the airport buildings with open view on the box and plenty of space for the judging line. The second one, on the opposite side of the box, was situated in the middle of a corn field. Despite that the corn was cut out, the visibility was slightly limited also due to a farm building obstructing the view on 2 corners of the box when flying very low. In addition the space was very limited for 8 judging teams to be seated with the usual distance in between them.

The judge position used in the morning in the middle of a corn field

The towing was done with a Piper Pawnee, a Decathlon a Zlin and a Cessna 182. The towing in general was precise and worked well.

Again, the number of available helpers was quite limited. Basically the whole competition was done again by about 2 handful of people. However, the construction of the judge positions (chairs, tents etc.) was well handled by the organizer.
Main problems on the judge line where collapsing chairs. However, the organizer did its best to replace broken ones quickly.

The HMD measurement system used this year was again the PHMD system, aka “red van”. The guys did a marvelous job in supporting the CJ and the IJ with all possible available information. In addition the team was beta testing the new automatic camera tracking system.
Official video was done through conventional “man-driven” cameras. At this point I want to say, that the video was one of the best we had during the past few years in terms of quality and usability. Thanks Bela, good job!

Accomodation for the judges and jury was downtown Kecskemet at the Four Points Sheraton. From my point of view it was excellent. Transportation between the airport and the hotel was partially by private cars, a car with driver from the organizer and a dedicated car for the jury.

For the very first time all score sheets where photographed at the judge line before they went to the scoring office. This was done with a custom tablet holder and a generic Android tablet supplied by Nick Buckenham. The additional man power, or better women power was supplied by Mady Delcroix's grand daughter who volunteered for the job. Thanks so much Océanne!
Judges Preparation

The judges and their assistants went through a one day preparation session. In the morning there was as usual the theoretical part which focused on general information for the judges regarding the organization of the contest, the changes in the rules for 2016, a summary of all the zeroes and a short figure refresher.

In addition this years judges proficiency check was done on site, based on a slide show with questions. The online seminar wasn't available this year. I definitely think we should go back to the online version and the possibility for the judges to take the checkride in advance before travelling to the venue. The meeting was also attended by some team managers. Some of them even went through the proficiency check, out of curiosity.

In the afternoon there where practical flights executed by competitors. The built in errors where spotted by most of the judges. I tried my best to wipe away misunderstandings and lack of knowledge about the complex rules. A thank you goes out to the pilots who volunteered for the job. The programs flown consisted of Known's and Free's in both categories.

The additional hotel night for all judges and assistants was generously paid by the organizer.

Competition Flights

Both classes flew 5 programmes. So from a sporting point of view this competition was again very successful. The new format with the Free Known worked well and I think its way better to have more Unknowns than a Free and a Known. The figure selection is the key task for the new format. I think the GAC has understood the problem.

Flight Safety

No major incidents took place. So flight safety was again on a very high level. No Low-Low's have occurred despite that the figures in the Unlimited Free Known (Programme 1) where very challenging and altitude consuming. I would like to say thank you to all competitors for flying disciplined, safe and in a professional manner.

Judging Analysis

Advanced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HAU, Steff</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DOVGALENKO, Tamara</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUCKENHAM, Nick</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TALABOS, Gabor sen.</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BIALEK, Maciej</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COURTOIS, Bernard</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>18.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LISZKAY, László</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>19.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GURALY, Bela</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unlimited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HAU, Steff</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>9.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DOVGALENKO, Tamara</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>18.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BUCKENHAM, Nick</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>14.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TALABOS, Gabor sen.</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BIALEK, Maciej</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>COURTOIS, Bernard</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LISZKAY, László</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>GURALY, Bela</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Line Judges**

Again, and this is an ongoing problem in glider and power aerobatics, the IJ had to deal with many complaints regarding box outs. Please see my last years report(s) to understand the situation. I have already proposed there, to get away from human driven line judging. On one end we have every year volunteers who are ready to do this important, but sometimes rather disappointing job out in the field. I trust, that they do their best in trying to be fair and correct.

On the other hand, we have every year on competitions the issue that pilots don't trust them and feel mistreated regarding the penalties received. We definitely need to end this discussion and move on to a solution which is not to be disputed so easily.

I know that there is a proposal for the 2016 CIVA plenum to remove the line/border judges completely. I disagree to this easy way out by opening the topic for new discussions based on positioning score given by the judges. I am also fully convinced that the box and its space of 1 by 1 km is a very important part in an aerobatic contest. Especially for gliders with no way of taking a brake and repositioning for the remaining sequence but also for power as an additional element to evaluate the quality of the performance in a classical sequence.

To remove the line judging and connected penalties from aerobatics is not the way we should go. In practical terms this means the removal of the box itself. Not at this moment because there is light on the horizon. This light is the new development by the PHMD team: The automatic tracking camera. The development of a system capable of doing this without the need of an on-board transmitter is in progress.

The first step, the tracking of the aircraft in the box even in 3D, is already reality. For the moment its only possible with the mentioned on-board transmitter, which we use in glider aerobatics since many years. This year the IJ already used the output of the system as a reference to verify pilot complaints regarding box-outs. But also to verify the accuracy of the new tool. The system works reliable and is a very welcome addition to the PHMD.

Together with the GAC, the IJ 2016 and the PHMD team we have defined the target to use the system next year on the World's in Torun. So we take the first step to get away from human line judging!
There will be the World Games in Wroclaw, Poland just before the comp in Torun 2017. On this event the system will be tested regarding its usability during the Worlds at Torun. Its even the target of the development team at the university of Poznan to use for the first time the automatic camera tracker as the source for the official video.

Other Issues

We had this year at Matko another doping control from WADA. I wasn't personally present at the control because we where still flying. I haven't gotten any feedback if there was any positive probe. So I can't give any feedback at all on the outcome of this.

On the last flying day, Friday 29\textsuperscript{th} of July, the 5\textsuperscript{th} Programme Advanced, I had to exclude one judging team from the line because they where not present at the warm-up flight and only showed up when the first flight was already airborne. I am heavily disappointed by this kind of behavior and for sure this doesn't spot a good light on this particular judging team. Whatever the true reason for the late coming is, we definitely have to avoid such incidents which show a certain disrespect against the pilots performing on a comp.

Conclusions

For me the event was well organized by the contest director and his team of volunteers. Tamás Ábrányi, a well known power pilot and experienced aerobatic contest organizer, did a wonderful job with a lot of heart-blood invested to make all happen out in the Pusztá. “Schatzi”, many many thanks for a wonderful and to be remembered 2016 glider event!

A special thanks goes to Hanna (see above picture) from the Hungarian volunteers team. She was the best local CJ assistant that I ever had. Many thanks for your efforts in supporting me and the whole judging line with your friendliness and very supporting attitude even during stressing times! Hanna, I would always work with you.

And of course the judging teams: Thanks for the good cooperation and the time you have invested again for our sport. A special thank goes out to the newcomer at glider events Laszlo Liszkay and our President Nick Buckenham for giving support at a glider comp.

Since many years I can count on my assistants Schorsch and Marina Doerder. Where would Glider Aerobatics be without you?

Philippe Küchler, pik
26.10.2016
Payerne, Switzerland