International Jury President’s Report for the 12\textsuperscript{th} World Advanced Aerobatic Championship

4\textsuperscript{th} to 13\textsuperscript{th} August 2016, Radom-Sadków, Poland

Nick Buckenham, Jury President

The International Jury members at WAAC 2016 were

- Elena Klimovich, RUS
- Madelaine Delcroix, FRA
- Nick Buckenham, GBR (president)

Contest site

Radom-Sadków is a shared military and commercial airport 3km east of Radom city centre. The box was sited almost entirely within the airfield boundary, there being three possible judging positions – to the West and East within the airfield security area, to the South outside the security fence.

The Jury and Judges were able to use rooms with good facilities within the airport buildings under the north central aspect of the aerobatic performance zone. Briefings were conducted in a good size lecture theatre with excellent projection facilities, located outside the secure area.

Continuity

Entry into and exit from the secure military airfield area via the single main gate required a personnel and vehicle check that could take several minutes, but this did not too often impact operations during of the event. The late evening arrival of some US Team aircraft before the event started led to them becoming locked within the secure area while attempts were made to locate military personnel to enable them to leave the site.

There were however two commercial flights into and out from the airfield on most days, these requiring the event to halt for 15-30 minutes either side of their movement, and in addition
there were some military formation arrivals, departures and training flights in the overhead that did interrupt the progress of WAAC programmes. Neither of these intrusive items was mentioned to CIVA when the event was approved, nor in the two bulletins that the Polish Aero Club issued in advance of the start date. In total the event lost probably a full day due to these unexpected activities. The International Jury strongly recommends that any such overriding requirements by airfield operators must be explained in the bid documents before an event can be approved.

The 2013 WAC in Texas suffered similarly intrusive stoppages due to known but seemingly unavoidable training activities during the event, and CIVA must be reassured when approving any championship bid that these will not occur or that their effect is minimal and can easily be accommodated within the event timescale – this should be a pre-condition stated either in the Guide to Contest Organisation or the forthcoming ‘Requirements’ document.

Briefings

These were generally well run, with no cause for concern.

Communications

A good standard of Motorola PMR (personal mobile radio) was available to the Jury and judging personnel. For the Boundary Judging Team however small walkie-talkies had been issued which were barely able to reliably transmit/receive the necessary exchanges, see below.

Boundary Judging

The organisers had erected simple pole-and-cord sight gauges at the four buffer zone corners, two within and two outside the security area. We soon discovered however that the boundary judges themselves knew nothing about Aresti figures and had received little instruction, the issued radios were barely capable of satisfactory operation, and the organisers initially intended to operate without the necessary supporting paperwork. It took the whole of the first contest day and part of the second to train this team to an initial standard, a poor situation especially in view of the several previous championships at Radom where boundary judges had been operated.

Eventually this team, under the control of Leif Culpin at the Chief Judge’s station and Maciej Bialek as their manager, achieved a moderate standard. Once again however there were comments from competitors that this operation was inaccurate and possibly biased, clearly emphasizing the need either for an experienced boundary judging team or an electronic system overseen at all times by a nominated CIVA official under the control of the International Jury.
Video recordings

The organisers provided two video operators, one whose camera was unable to provide HDMI output. There was no display available for video review at the judging locations, flight review conferences necessarily being held during the lunch break or after flying had ceased using display equipment adjacent to the judges room. At least one non-unanimous HZ could not be resolved because the figure (flight?) had not even been recorded. This served to underline yet again how critical good video recordings are to all CIVA championships, whose results can be significantly affected by the standard of operator and equipment provided.

Protests

No protests were received by the International Jury during the event.

Nick Buckenham
International Jury President, WAAC 2016