Jury report summary - Events 2018

10th FAI World Hot Air Airship Championship
Kreuth-Tegernsee, Germany. 15th - 22nd February 2018
9 pilots from 5 NAC’s, 8 pilots from 4 NAC’s actually competing.
4 flights, 5 tasks

Complaints: 1
Protests: 1 (covering 5 subjects, all rejected)
No-Shows:

Statutes WG, JURY Board

Jury Report

General

The organisation under the leadership of Helmut Seitz, supported by a small, but highly efficient and dedicated team, was flawless. The area round Lake Tegernsee is ideal for hot air airship competitions and provides spectacular views for spectators. The event was very well supported by the Kreuth community and the Tegernsee Tal Tourismus Agency. The population offered a warm welcome to the teams.

Thanks to broad media coverage the event can be declared as highly successful, despite the challenging weather conditions and limited number of competitors. EDS

JB note: Each NAC were invited with up to 5 pilots, thereby the 10% rule was circumnavigated.

FAI/CIA protocol

The opening and closing ceremonies were according to the rules. EDS

Competition

10 teams had originally signed up for the competition, with 9 of them participating. Unfortunately the Swiss hot air airship was severely damaged while setting up for the first flight, a damage that could not be repaired intime. Thus, only 8 competitors really took part, 5 of them representing Germany.

EVENT DEBRIEF

10th FAI World Hot Air Airship Championship

During the debriefing the following topics were discussed:

- General comments
- Administration
- Event Director
- Flying area
- Scoring
- Cost
- Briefing Facility
- Safety
- Communication

There were no (negative) comments. Most topics were not even discussed, they were approved by acclamation only. The sole suggestion from the pilots was to allow spectators better access to the competition by setting targets more accessible for them. No targets were at the launch site and most were far off any roads. EDS
Jury Report
32 pilots from 9 NAC’s, 7 flights, 22 tasks,
No complaints. No protests
No-Shows: 0

Jury comments
A well organised and well run event
Performance bond to be returned in full.

Event debriefing:
Comments, queries, suggestions:
- Adapt the refuelling schedule to better suit the competitors needs, e.g. avoid schedules that prevent competitors to have reasonable rest periods between flights. 
  EDS
- Avoid a refuelling site lay-out that requires crew or pilots to carry the fuel cylinders for longer than necessary distances. Parking at the refuelling site should be improved.
- Competitors appreciated that no virtual tasks were set during this competition. 
  AX WG
- Competitors appreciated to have had the tasks sheet at least 15 minutes before the briefing and to therefore have had ample study time. 
  AX WG
- Competitors commented on the WATCHMEFLY App and its use during the competition. It was suggested that a very stable 4G and internet network is a must if the program is to be successfully deployed.
- Competitors appreciated that the task related colour markers were not used during this competition. 
  AX WG
- Competitors felt that the Saturday PM task (HWZ) should have been cancelled by the ED (scattered rain showers)
- In general, the participants were happy with the event but would have preferred to have the meals in the building close to the briefing hall and not in the marquee on the launch site. 
  EDS
**3rd FAI Women’s World H A B Championship, Naleczow, Poland.**

6-11 August, 2018

33 pilots from 14 NAC’s, 4 flights, 14 tasks
Complaint: 1, Protest: 1 (later withdrawn)
No-Show: 0

**Jury Report**

**General**

The organization under the leadership of Eugenjus Komas (Championship Director) and Adam Gruszecki (Organizer) together with a highly efficient and dedicated team was flawless.

The countryside around Naleczow near Lublin is highly suitable for ballooning. The terrain is slightly hilly, with plenty of agricultural areas and small pockets of forest. There are sufficient roads to grant access wherever needed.

The event was supported by the local authorities, numerous sponsors and the local population.

Thanks to broad media coverage the event can be declared highly successful, despite the challenging weather conditions. The forecast was for sunny weather throughout the competition, but after 2 competition days followed a period with high winds. The winds exceeded the permissible speed for hot air ballooning by a multiple.

The response from pilots and crews was positive as well:
Some ideas were voiced to improve the situation when all teams take off from the same launch field and to align markers (please also see Debriefing Report and the protest).

**Pre Event Meeting**

The Jury met with the Event Director and the Event President shortly before the General Briefing to work through the Jury’s checklist. There were no issues and the Event Director cooperated fully with the Jury’s requests.

**FAI CIA Protocol, Opening Ceremony**

The Opening Ceremony was held in accordance with the FAI/CIA protocol and was well organized. It took place on the main square, observed by a large number of spectators. The weather was beautiful and the local band played typical Polish music. After the entrance of the 33 teams with their flags the Polish National Anthem was played by the band, followed by the FAI Anthem. The Mayor and the Head of the District held entertaining speeches, in Polish language with simultaneous translation into English. This was followed by a short speech of the Jury President (in English, translated into Polish). It was a special honor to welcome the CIA President Mark Sullivan – not as president of the CIA but as member of one of the teams. Then I – as the Jury President, on behalf of the FAI/CIA – declared the 3rd Women’s World Champion open, while a large number of colorful balloons took off into the clear blue sky.

The following party took place in the garden of a typical Polish restaurant, where participants were spoiled with local dishes.

The opening ceremony was stylish and local at the same time, close to perfect.

**General Briefing**

The general briefing and all task briefings took place at a gymnasium. Perfect technical equipment, including 4 large screens, guaranteed perfect view for all pilots on projected information. Pilots, Co-Pilots or Crew Chiefs were seated a numbered places. All other crew members were invited to follow the briefings from the stand.

EDS
Following important aspects were presented and hand-outs distributed during the general briefing:

- Safety (on ground and in the air), with special emphasis on the many low-hanging power lines that were not on the maps
- Air space (structure and rules)
- PZs (3 different types of PZs and quite numerous. But not all PZs were active at all times)
- Weather (the type and content of the data provided)
- Event organization, including the schedule of the whole event

**Competition**

At the beginning of the preparations and at the tender there were a number of questions, inconsistencies and issues. These were successfully solved with the help of Leslie Purfield – thank you, Leslie!

The event management aimed to give as many pilots as possible the opportunity to take part in the event. Unfortunately, the office of the CIA did not support this. Which is hard to understand, as one would expect the rules to support competition and enable exceptions from the norm. A lost opportunity!

(The organiser was aware of the problem in February. A formal request came to the Bureau May 11, after deadlines of the invitation process. The Bureau found that it was too late to open a 3rd invitation round. It is not clear if the jury president followed the invitation process. JB)

**Statutes WG JURY board**

After 2 cancellations (one for professional reasons, one because of pregnancy) a total of 33 teams participated. In 2 days 14 tasks were executed, which were both imaginative as well as challenging, absolutely suitable for a World Championship.

Noticeable was the perfect presentation of the meteorological conditions during the task briefings, the reports from the measurement teams and the highly efficient work of the debriefers.

The control of the files by the Jury did not show mistakes or shortcomings.

The evaluation of the events was done quickly, thus the results were available in a timely manner.

**Rules**

No comment, just a suggestion:
For a joint launch it would be preferable to have numbered launch positions. For safety reasons a Launch Master also would be desirable. And pilots should be given sufficient time to launch – the 20 minutes given were very tight, putting an unnecessary amount of pressure on pilots.

**Event Debrief**

The last task briefing was delayed by one hour. The Jury President decided together with the Championship Director to use this hour to hold the Event Debriefing, as all pilots, crew members and officials were on site already. For the content please refer to the Debriefing Report.

**FAI CIA Protocol, Closing Ceremony**

The Closing Ceremony was held in accordance with the FAI/CIA protocol at a local park at Naleczow, outside of the hotel Termy Palacowe.

The Polish anthem was played for the winner and the winners of the team event, all of the Polish.
While the FAI anthem was played the FAI flag was returned to the Jury President. As the organizer of the 4th Women's World Hot Air Balloon Championship is not yet known, the flag was returned to the organizer to hold it at interim. After an impressive night glow everybody met in a large tent on the city square for a farewell party and was spoiled with local specialties.

**Special Notes**
During every briefing the teams were handed out bottled water, something that was highly estimated because of the hot temperatures.

**FAI CIA EVENT DEBRIEFING**

**Attendees:** Pilots: 33   Officials: 31,   Crew: 40   Organisers: 15

**Topics:**

- **Communication.** It was good during the Event but was a bit slow before the Event.
- **Flying area and maps.** Area is nice, large fields for landing. Two printed maps have been received but the PZs were marked only in one map. Receiving of two same maps would have been more helpful. — **AXWG**
- **Debriefing.** It was good and fast. The only problem is that there were very few parking places in the yard of the building. Some cars had to stop outside on the narrow road. — **EDS**
- **Event Director and task setting.** Very good job, tried to do his best in difficult weather conditions. Many thanks to the Event Director. Task setting was good but more chance of dropping markers would be preferred. The color and the material of the markers were not sufficient enough. It would be useful if the FAI/CIA should establish standards for the markers to be used at FAI First Category Event similarly to the FAI loggers. (Specifications are in COH. JB) — **AXWG**
- **Meteo:** Met man was excellent. He made strong efforts to make flights possible. He did really do a great job.
- **Safety.** Overall no problem. Take off arrangement at the CLP 2 was not perfect. No launch masters, no assignments for the balloons. The area was too tight and it caused one incident during take off which result a protest. — **Safety SC**
- **Refueling.** Very well organised. It was fast and safety. Some crew member did not use gloves at the refueling which is dangerous and should be avoided in the future.
- **Organization.** It was excellent. The organizers did their best and they were very helpful and cooperative. One pilot expressed her highest thanks for the support she had received after her car accident on the way to the Event. — **EDS**
- **General.** An excellent and well organized Event. Nice area, good tasks, smooth and safety. Everybody had good common sense. The overall atmosphere was very friendly and sportive. — **EDS**
Jury Report
The Jury recommends that the Performance Bond be released in its entirety (No Penalty).

Jury Comments
Mark Sullivan:
Finding takeoff spots was a problem because landowner permission was next to impossible to obtain. Fields are very large and even finding who owns the land was not possible. Most fields are crop free so no damage could be done by pilots. Penalizing pilots excessive amounts for no land owner permission is unreasonable if no damage is done and pilots are just on the side of the road. Some pilots concerned about penalties would block part of the road causing traffic jams. Organizers running this type of event should notify all land owners in the area and explain how balloons work and seek their support. A good local land owner staff can help deal with any problems and should have a good system in place. Some damage control gifts or drawings for gifts are some suggestions.

EDS
Penalties: 500 points for hitting the ground in the target area is too much, 200 would be more in line with the infringement. AX WG

See Sporting Code General Section 6.2:
“6.2 PENALTIES AND DISQUALIFICATIONS
6.2.1 A competitor may be penalised or disqualified from participation in a Sporting Event in accordance with provisions designated by the ASC concerned.

6.2.2 Penalties may be imposed for Technical Infringements (including, but not limited to, failure to comply with rules caused by mistake or other inadvertence), Serious Infringements (including, but not limited to, dangerous or hazardous behaviour or actions) and Unsporting Behaviour (including, but not limited to, cheating or unsporting behaviour, including deliberate attempts to deceive or mislead officials, bringing FAI into disrepute, wilful interference with other competitors, falsification of documents, use of forbidden equipment or prohibited drugs and violations of airspace) at the discretion of the ASC concerned.

6.2.3 The ASC concerned shall decide where, when and how any penalties or disqualifications from participation are applied.

6.2.4 The ASC concerned shall decide how notification of any penalties and disqualifications will be published.”

and

Sporting Code Section 1 Annex 5:
“ANNEX 5 - PENALTIES AND DISQUALIFICATIONS
The Director of a Sporting Event may penalise a competitor as described in the rules for the event. These penalties may be in the form of an operational disadvantage, deduction of points, alteration of placing order, disqualification, or any other penalty designated by the Air Sport Commission concerned.

The severity of the penalties which may be imposed may range from a minimum loss of points to disqualification indicated below, as appropriate to the offence.

1 Technical Infringements
Technical infringements of rules or failure to comply with requirements caused by mistake or inadvertence
where no advantage has accrued or could have accrued to the competitor concerned should, as a guide, carry
penalties leading to a reduction of not less than 2% of the best score or maximum available score for
the task.

2 Serious Infringements

Serious infringements, including dangerous or hazardous behaviour or actions, repetitions of lesser
infringements and violations of airspace, should, as a guide, carry minimum penalties leading to a reduction
of not less than 5% of the best score or maximum score for the task.

3 Unsporting Behaviour

Cheating or unsporting behaviour, including deliberate attempts to deceive or mislead officials, bringing FAI
into disrepute, willful interference with other competitors, falsification of documents, use of forbidden
equipment or prohibited drugs, or repeated serious infringements should, as a guide result in disqualification
from the Sporting Event.

4 Publication.

Penalties shall be listed on the score sheet of the day on which the penalty was given.”

Garry Lockyer:

Request for Assistance, Complaint and Protest Procedure. (GS 5.4.1.1, MER 4.3.1 & 5.1, JHB 3.1 Advice)

There was one, perhaps two, instances of the request for assistance, complaint and protest procedures not
being properly followed. It was impossible for the Jury to tell exactly what was intended because some
communications were verbal, while other communications were done via text messaging and e-mail, with
some not in English. No protests with protest fees were ever filed. That being said, the rules concerning
requesting assistance, complaints and protests should be reviewed to see if changes should be made to
accommodate more modern technology than “in writing” which is generally assumed to be on paper.
Regardless of changes to the rules and procedures, EDs and Competitors should be advised to follow the
procedures “and” to maintain a good record of requests for assistance and submitting complaints, if for no
other reason than to enable the Jury to sort out procedural issues. Without a clear “paper trail,” it is unlikely
that Jury will be able to determine if the procedure was followed, within the time limits specified.

Rule 8.4.7 Marker order. Unless track points are used, the task data shall specify for each task the marker(s)
and/or electronic marks to be used. If no competitive advantage is gained, the penalty for releasing the
wrong marker or dropping the wrong electronic mark is 25 task points per task. If more than the allowed
number of physical markers is released in a task, the competitor will be scored by track point. If an electronic
mark is dropped more than once, the 1st electronic mark in time will be scored.

The ED called several tasks (13,14, 15, 16,18, 19,20, 21, 22, 23,26, 27 and 28, see attached Task Sheets)
were “Marker Color” was specified as “any.” For each flight, the correct number of markers were issued for
the flight and tasks. It subsequently became known that the ED was taking a very liberal view of this condition.
More specifically, the ED allowed competitors who dropped one or more markers to use additional markers to
teach the task and achieve a result.

Using Task 26 Maximum Distance Double Drop (Rule 15.18) as an example, if a competitor dropped their first
marker outside the scoring area, they were permitted to use two other markers (for a total of 3 or more
markers consumed on this task) to complete the task.

I believe that while some competitors determined that this was an acceptable strategy, I’m also convinced that
many (most?) did not.

Rather then markers being intended for specific tasks, with the occasional mark being used for the wrong task
(usually in pairs with a 25 point penalty for each wrong marker), it is left entirely up to the competitor to
determine how many markers will be used for each task. This is a workable strategy because of logger
scoring outside MMAs. If a competitor uses more than the minimum number of markers for a task, they are
conceding to a logger score (to the limit of an MMA) on some other task. Conversely, if a competitor uses less
than the number of markers required for a task, they then have “extra” markers that can be used to achieve a
better score on another task.

The above also makes it more likely that a competitor throws more than one marker at a single marker target.
For example, a competitor with an extra marker might throw 10 m from a target and then throw the extra
marker 5 m from the target. Which marker would be scored? Would any penalties be applicable?

The Jury agreed that there is nothing in the rules to prohibit the above. If the above is permitted, the
intended and unintended consequences, scoring implications and applicable penalties should be
investigated and made known to all officials and competitors.
FAI CIA Event Debriefing

Administration:
Organizer’s web sites need to be made as user friendly as possible. Hard to find information. Mentioned every time but nothing seems to change, but a lot of banking fees are being spent on wire transfers for entry fees and other event charges. Organizers or the CIA should set up a credit card or PayPal account for collecting fees. Perhaps organizers could have advised visitors Austria is a “cash only” country. EDS

Event Director, Post Flight Debrief, Scoring and Flying Area:
Much applause.

Safety:
Better safety at refueling – not enough people to control, children at refueling, refueling in basket, etc.

Competitors need to watch ascent/descent rates. Safety

Event Directors should think about having two targets separated by around 50 meters to lighten up the congestion at the goal. AX WG, Safety

Calling CRAT task with a large field of balloons guarantees you will have a lot of congestion at the target and care should be taken when calling such task.

Collisions software takes up a lot of time for staff and pilots. Seems to “trigger” very easily.

.ED Response: we see more “active” flying, competitors not giving way, accepting low speed collision. Ask: “Is this the way competition flying is meant to go?”

Competitor Response: Not possible to give way.

Several pilots were seen flying with headsets earphones and CIA should consider rules to not allow this. Headphones prevent hearing other balloons. AX WG, Safety

Because of the electronic task pilots are flying with heads in the basket and are not paying proper attention to what is going on around them

Many pilots are climbing without knowing if there is traffic above.

Disappointed with “atrocious” driving – speeding, pulling off anyway, danger to persons on ground (children!).

Team Managers: Had to ask team managers to get out of way.

Perhaps there should be an individual official assigned to each competitor. Observer?, AX WG

Back To Scoring:
We wait a tremendous long time to see scores with no way to understand and learn how to fly a task and how it was scored.

Briefing:
Loudspeakers at back of room would help. EDS

Checking pilots in as they walk into the briefing room is much more efficient than calling roll each morning. EDS

Social:
“Which social events?” Small applause.

Long wait at opening before pilots were introduced.

Opening “dinner” – treat them well, in a tent.

General Briefing to Opening Ceremony – very busy, better to get loggers early so computers can be set up soonest.
An opening party is a proper way to start a Cat 1 event and should be required in the bid.

**Cost:**
Meal Plan: High cost plan to reserve lunch menu at dinner. When holding an event in a small town organizers need to publish as much information as possible on hotels in the surrounding area. Tried meal plan three times then went to local restaurants. Some persons were able to get their money back.

**Communication:**

**FAI Loggers:**
Like them in combination with post-flight debrief. Would be good to have height. Some applause. Logger tasks cannot / should not be scored to 1 m given accuracy of GPS.

**Maps:**
Maps OK but would like goals on maps.

- ED Response: “Targets” are only located days before event while maps are printed weeks in advance.
- Competitor Response: Pre-worlds to make thing more “perfect.”

Should paper maps be required anymore? Save money. Rules require paper map? Electrical wires should be marked. Would like updated coordinates for actual target to be able to check logger scoring. Not so important to have goal list. All judge declared tasks can be flown with coordinates given on TDS.

Air law requires paper map? Maybe true/false country-by-country. Many pilots relay on targets being in the correct location especially when using logger marks. The current rule of target within 150 meters should be reduced to 50 meters.

**Re-Fueling**
Much “booing.” Organizers did not control re-fueling but improved. Someone within the CIA or event staff should make sure propane refueling is as efficient as possible before the event starts. Large capacity pumps and reasonable octopus system. Plenty of hand dollies should be in the propane area to help move tanks around. Need to improve way information from one event/year is passed to other events. Need enough room to park vehicles, unload tanks, etc. Would be good to be able to get fuel before first flight and to empty tanks after last flight, for people travelling long distances. Organizers should have re-fueling adapters for all manufacturers.

**General**
Nothing on FAI website. Traffic Management: Need traffic management plan for MMAs.
Time to organize WHABC for Seniors. MUCH applause.

More roving microphones at briefings.

More water on dusty roads in/out of CLA.

Congratulations to the organizers for a very good event. EXTENDED applause.

Rules: Co-pilots acting as Pilot-In-Command. Only registered pilot should pilot balloon.

Should we talk about single pilot competitions and two-pilot competitions?

Should we have (Senior?) competitions without GPS?

Kudos to organizers for having a repair station.

Flying as co-pilot is great way to learn. Top X (15?) pilots don’t fly with co-pilot.

Should be give medals to co-pilots and include them in awards ceremony.

Ground Safety: Organizers to have traffic control, not necessarily police, at targets, especially in evening. Crew must drive more carefully.

Ballooning is a team sport. It would be a nice touch to list a pilots’ team members in the program with the pilot. MUCH applause.

It costs to do things, who will bear cost, organizer must find equilibrium. 2018 WHABC organizers did a good job.

This was an incredibly good event. Events should be fun and save. We drove about 100 km around countryside.

No additional comments were received after the Event Debrief.
4th FAI Junior World H A B Championship, Wloclawek, Poland.
11-16 September, 2018
49 pilots from 17 NAC’s, 4 flights, 17 tasks
Complaint: 2, Protest: 1 (Rejected)
No-Shows: ?

Jury Report and Event Debriefing notes

The Jury recommends that the Performance Bond be released in its entirety (No Penalty).

Administration:
1. Pilots would prefer receiving the flying area map earlier to help pilots make decision on whether to attend. EDS
2. The website did not contain enough applicable information for pilots EDS
3. Pilots are asking for another way to make international payments such as paypal or by credit card instead of costly and cumbersome wire transfers. (A request that is repeated every year. JB) EDS

Social Events:
1. Social event at beginning of event is appreciated for pilots to meet other pilots.

Communication:
1. Pilots would like a definitive answer before travelling on the availability and cost of 100% propane for training flights. EDS
2. Pilots would like more assistance from organizers on car rentals and equipment rentals. EDS
3. Pilots want to have loggers for use during training flights. They appreciate training session on use of loggers. NT SC

Safety:
1. Pilots would like information on air law of local region and any regulation modifications in airspace provided. Safety SC

Briefing Facilities:
1. Sound system needs to be better in large spaces like hangars. EDS

Event Director and Task calling:
1. Applause was given for the task calling and the use of loggers. There is still a split on marker use versus electronic tasks. AX WG
2. On afternoon flights letting the pilots throw markers instead of dropping would help during unstable conditions. Pilots prefer not to have two tasks in the same exact location because if you miss one you miss both and with 2,000 points on the line this is not good. AX WG
3. Pilots would like larger MMA’s when the fields allow for it, 50 meters is too small. AXWG
4. Pilots are split on their preference for gravity versus free drops.

Maps:
1. Pilots asked for grid coordinates on map centers not just on the outer edges. EDS, AX WG

Refuelling:
1. Refuelling needs adequate lights for night time refuelling. EDS, AX WG

General Comments:
1. Food is difficult for pilots to find late at night. They would like a list of open restaurants or even better, simple dinner meals provided for pilots at common place. EDS
2. Pilots applauded organizers for the event.
3. Pilots would like a 10 minute quiet period before starting briefing to prepare maps with task data. **EDS, AX WG**
4. Discussion on who competes at Junior Worlds and representation at General Worlds. Pilots advised to contact their CIA delegates with comments.
5. Pilots would like current weather and wind data to be no more than one hour old.
6. Pilots were told that there is no bidder for 2020 Junior Worlds.
20 teams from 10 NAC’s, 1 flight
Complaint: 0, Protest: 0
No-Shows: 0

The Jury president followed the invitation process and did not find any problem. One team was rejected as they did not have the necessary hours stipulated for the event. I believe this was one of the best organised competition I have been too. The check-in for the teams was good and sufficient. The field launch positions (areas) was marked with plastic tape. The filling of the Balloons was efficient with staff to take care of it. We had a long and efficient General Briefing where all information to the teams was given: Weather, ATC information and competition information.

The launch of the balloons was quick and effective.

The Jury followed the event in the operations center and found this effective as well. Someone from the ATC contact and the Event Director or his Deputy was in the room the whole time.

Two teams were penalised for flying at restricted flight level. The Director informed the Jury about the process and how they calculated the penalties.

We had a very good event debrief with majority of the teams present. Please see separate report from the debrief.

The only general comment is that the Event organiser did a good job. And The Event Director had a very good team to assist him. They are to be congratulated to a very good event.

EDS

Event Debrief – 62nd Coupe Gordon Bennett, 2018

Present: Jury, officials, pilots and visitors: 74

Team GER-1 distributed a 1½ page writing concerning ATC and air space inflection penalties.

1. Invitation process:

Mark Andre suggests to pilots and crews to try to ‘sell’ the GB event to the general public as good as they can to further our wonderful sport.

That is the pilots need to send in stories (bios) and pictures to help organizers.

2. Communication before event: was to everyone’s liking.

3 Briefing

German Document/Airspace: Long response from MH. ATC clearances lots of work. Italy more complicated. They issued a NOTAM – can’t ignore a NOTAM. Need to have procedures that were communicated. Complicated airspace but we got Night VFR. Swiss airspace ‘most crowded’

Penalization: Fair/Not Fair? MH not airspace police. Monitor what’s happening. Three airspaces of concern: Switzerland, France and Italy. Italian airspace was modelled similar to what is done for hot air Blue PZ violations. Tracks reviewed to understand flight profile and seriousness of any infringements. MH does not want to see GB decided on penalties. Thin line to fight for airspace and sending message about enforcing airspace violations, for future events. MH: explanation of his sentence saying ‘Ultimately... No Result.’ – English?
Jury listened to MH’s arguments. Checked with meteo and ATC to take whole picture into consideration.

Competitor Response: One of the competitors that was penalized? Airspace and cloud cover caused him to change strategy.

Another Competitor/Team: Need clear conditions for next time. ‘Limited to FL195(?)...’ ‘Recommended to avoid...’ What do these mean. MH Response: ‘Recommended’ means please try always subject to ATC. FL195 = set IFR level. Competitors negotiate best clearances unless the ED has something in writing he must share (Switzerland, Italy and France). Fine line to send message.

Another Competitor: Where the trouble is the last clearance... It was not clear at the second briefing.... Communication must be clearer.

MH: Errors in ATC documents – got fixed in competitor’s favour. Should change briefing schedule: GB then ATC specific briefing. Friday too crowded.

Final Statement from Competitor (who produced paper?): Be clearer.

Deputy ED (DED) pointed out missing sentences in sentences quoted for MH.

A Competitor: Define Day/Night by UTC times.

A Competitor: Need more time for travel, complaints, and protests, etc. DED: need to provide media with results. MH: planned release so as not to disadvantage pilots – they had lots of time.

Another Competitor: We seem to discuss same rules every year. BS: report will go to various CIA groups.

3 a) Briefing – Rules and Regulations.

Markus Haggeney (MH): – if you have any suggestions, talk to FAI working group.

Much work were performed in the 6 weeks before the event by Swiss ATC. We also went to France and Italy to negotiate, so that finally night flights to Italy were possible. To reach agreements for 16-20 balloons is extremely hard to do.

Pilot complains that

MH: As above, tell CIA – delegates, working groups, this debrief.

3 b) Briefing – Penalty

MH: air space IT+FR were handed out. Only those 2 were monitored for serious violations. The penalties were not supposed to influence the final result.

Pilot: we need clear conditions, example Valencia (may be entered) to know when we would be penalized. MH: we must put the pilot to responsibility.

Pilot: at 2nd briefing clearance was not clear. MH: I tried to delay because ATC talked to IT all day. IT agreed so late that we could not inform all.

Pilot: ‘will be disqualified’ made me afraid. I decided to avoid Italy.

Pilot: suggests ‘pilot should ask’ MH should clearly say night flight allowed. If asked it might not be allowed.

Eimers: The announcement of ‘disqualify’ got frightening. We were afraid of Padua.

Pilot: At briefing night/day should be precisely explained.

Pilot: we seem to have the same discussions every year. Can they not be fixed in 1 year?
Bengt Stener: talk to the FAI working group!

3 c) Briefing – Meteorology.
Pilot: please mark Bern on the maps
Flight plan was not forwarded from SUI to GER.

4. Documentation.
Pilot: please provide more documents on paper. Reading them in the basket is much easier
Another Pilot: Agrees with above – more paper.

5 Infrastructure – launch field
Pilot: Why delay of 1 hour?
Pilot: we missed lighting on the launch field. Hard to get sand/equipment packed up.
Pilot: all of a sudden people were let on the field and were swarming all around us.
   We had to police area ourselves! Should be avoided. DED Response: miscommunication with organizer – no plan to let public in launch area.
Pilot: we were supposed to be ready for filling. We were, but our filling was delayed twice, thus kept us waiting instead of being able to get some sleep.
Pilot: Filling sequence confusing – change of sequence, filling team taking breaks, lost several hours before take-off while other teams had a lot of time off.
Pilot: SAND was wet because not covered overnight. Our sand froze in high altitude.
Pilot: ‘Give us dry sand – without stones’

6. Communication during event. No complaints.

7: Safety
Muffled, hard to hear comments, then need ‘No Smoking’ signs on launch field.
MH: please try not to send pictures of landings which can be interpreted by bystanders as emergency. For example we had a landing on a mountain top, perfectly proper because in the valley there is no space. Somebody notified the police and even set the fire brigade in motion.

8. Social events
Pilot: was surprised to have to pay for the hotel.
Mark Andre (DED): 4 nights were included, you could chose the nights for yourself. DED recommends organizers DO NOT deal with hotels. Very difficult exercise. Lower entry fee without hotels.
A Pilot: Welcome back venue cramped, dark and hard to see people.

9. General Comments
‘Jury debriefing’ does not mean that the Jury is debriefed – rather, the Jury does the debriefing as requested by FAI.
The fact that everything was so conveniently reachable by tram was very much appreciated
Questions about Prize giving setup. Tables per team, decorations, etc? REPLY: Teams together or with others that speak same language.

Bengt Stener: What do you think of media coverage?

Little difficult to find things on the GB website. Didn’t have much English, Live Tracking was picture from last year.

**Pilot:** The web page should contain a link to the teams.
## JURY REPORT

### Subcommittee for action

#### JURY REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
<td>Refuelling. Should be scheduled to not interfere with competitors rest. Avoid site layout requiring carrying fuel tanks a long way. Improve parking.</td>
<td>Successful event with broad media coverage.</td>
<td>Food was difficult to find late evenings. List of open restaurants needed or even better simple dinner served at a common place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
<td>Using WATCHMEFLY App was liked but a very stable 4G and internet network is a must</td>
<td>Long and efficient General Briefing</td>
<td>General EDS SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
<td>Meals should be served close to briefing and not on launch site</td>
<td>Quick and effective inflation and launch</td>
<td>General EDS SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation process</td>
<td>Statutes WG, Jury Board</td>
<td>SC1 5.6.4.3. 10% rule. Request from organiser to waive this rule. Due to late request, CIA Bureau unable to approve.</td>
<td>The deputy ED suggests that pilots send in more bios and pictures to be included in info to public and sponsors to help “selling” the event</td>
<td>Invitation process Statutes WG, Jury Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Shows</td>
<td>Statutes WG</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Doping</td>
<td>BX WG</td>
<td>No testing at event</td>
<td>No testing at event</td>
<td>No testing at event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>BX WG</td>
<td>One pilot damaged his airship and could not compete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Rules SC – AX</td>
<td>No virtual tasks set. This was liked by pilots</td>
<td>On small common launch areas consider marked places and/or launch masters. 20 minutes launch period was too little</td>
<td>500 points penalty for hitting the ground in target area is unreasonable. Ref: GS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Rules SC – AX</td>
<td>15 minutes study time before task briefings was liked by pilots</td>
<td>Rule 8.4.7. Marker order. Using “any order” on Task Data can lead to conflicts and more than marker can be used by pilots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Rules SC – AX</td>
<td>Pilots liked that marker colours were allowed in any order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints</td>
<td>Statutes WG, Jury Board</td>
<td>Ref: GS 5.4.1.1, MER 4.3.1 &amp; 5.1. JHB 3.1 Request for assistance &amp; Protest procedure. Review requirement for “in writing”. More modern means can be used. ED’s and competitors should maintain records of requests for assistance and complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest</td>
<td>Statutes WG, Jury Board</td>
<td>1 with 5 separate subjects. Will be addressed by SC</td>
<td>Protest regarding congestion and obstruction at launch. Later withdrawn</td>
<td>Task setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAI/CIA Protocol</td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
<td>Ceremonies according to protocol</td>
<td>Ceremonies according to protocol</td>
<td>Ceremonies according to protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT DEBRIEFING</td>
<td>Subcommittee for action</td>
<td>EVENT DEBRIEFING</td>
<td>Subcommittee for action</td>
<td>EVENT DEBRIEFING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of WhatsApp: Not everyone has mobile internet</td>
<td>Excellent and well organized event</td>
<td>Use a modern way to collect entry fees. Too much money is spent on bank fees. Advice about countries where cash only is accepted, i.e. if credit cards are not commonly used in shops and restaurants</td>
<td>Pilot wanted a more modern way than bank transfer to make payments</td>
<td>Much work before event with ATC clearance, especially with Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For spectators the competition should be more concentrated to one place</td>
<td>Limited parking for debriefing</td>
<td>Meal plan was expensive and difficult. Information on available restaurants needed</td>
<td>General opinion was that this was a very good event</td>
<td>General EDS SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General congratulations to organisers for a very good event</td>
<td>Website need to be more user friendly and to contain more information</td>
<td>Website did not contain enough information</td>
<td>Not much info in English</td>
<td>Web site EDS SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good during event but slow before event</td>
<td>Pilots wanted definite answer about availability and cost of propane before travelling</td>
<td>Pre-event: Very good</td>
<td>Communication EDS SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good during event but slow before event</td>
<td>Pilots wanted definite answer about availability and cost of propane before travelling</td>
<td>Pre-event: Very good</td>
<td>Communication EDS SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent facilities. Loudspeaker system and large screens</td>
<td>Loudspeakers at the back of the room would have been valuable</td>
<td>Better sound system needed in large spaces like a hangar</td>
<td>Briefing facilities Rules SC – AX EDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More mobile microphones needed at briefings</td>
<td>Repair station much appreciated, thanks</td>
<td>More mobile microphones needed at briefings</td>
<td>Logistics EDS SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes study time before briefing. Found by jury to be too short</td>
<td>Roll call at large events take too much time. Consider check-in at entrance</td>
<td>Good task setting and good use of loggers</td>
<td>Task briefing EDS SC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good but pilots wanted more marker dropping tasks</td>
<td>Targets should be in correct locations. Current rule says within 150 m but should be reduced to 50 m</td>
<td>10 minute quiet period needed before briefing to prepare maps</td>
<td>Task briefing Rules SC – AX EDS COH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good met info</td>
<td>Pilots wanted weather and wind data to be no more than 1 hour old</td>
<td>Team GER-1 handed out 1.5 pages on ATC and airspace violation penalties</td>
<td>Task briefing Rules SC – AX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark launch position on MET map</td>
<td>Provide more printed documents. Reading in basket during flight is then easier</td>
<td>Provide more printed documents. Reading in basket during flight is then easier</td>
<td>Task briefing Rules SC – AA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary of Jury reports and debriefing reports 2018 Events (for more details, see full reports)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DEBRIEFING</th>
<th>Subcommittee for action</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DEBRIEFING</th>
<th>Subcommittee for action</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DEBRIEFING</th>
<th>Subcommittee for action</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>DEBRIEFING</th>
<th>Subcommittee for action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th BX Worlds</td>
<td>Kreuth, GER 15-22 February 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Post Luxembourg Balloon Trophy</td>
<td>Mersch, LUX 18-22 July 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Women AX Worlds</td>
<td>Naleczow, POL 6-11 September, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd AX Worlds</td>
<td>Gross-Siegharts, AUT. 18-24 August, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Junior AX Worlds</td>
<td>Wloclawek, POL 11-16 September, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd GB</td>
<td>Bern, SUI 27 September – 6 October, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Jury reports and debriefing reports 2018 Events (for more details, see full reports)**

### Task setting
- **Rules SC – AX**
- **Scoring-COH**
- Throwing instead of dropping markers would help during unstable conditions. In general, pilots are split on throwing versus dropping markers

### Task setting
- **Rules SC – AX**
- **Scoring-COH**
- Two tasks in same location is no good. If you miss one, you may miss both

### Task debriefing
- **Rules SC – AX**
- **Scoring-COH**
- Good and fast. Few parking places

### Launch
- **EDS. Rules SC – AA**
- Lights missing on field. Hard to arrange sand and preparing equipment

### Maps
- **Rules SC – AX**
- **Scoring-COH**
- Only one map per pilot marked with PZ's were distributed. Would like goals marked on maps. Answer: Targets decided late after printing of maps

### Maps
- **Rules SC – AX**
- **Scoring-COH**
- Electrical wires should be marked. Pilots want grid coordinates also on the map center. Not only on edges

### Refuelling
- **Safety SC – EDS SC**
- Very well organized. Better safety needed. There was not enough people to supervise, children and refuelling in basket etc. If tanks must be transported to refuelling, trolleys should be available.

### Refuelling
- **Safety SC – EDS SC**
- Early fuelling before event and defuelling after event should be prepared for long distance travellers. Lights need for refuelling in darkness

### Safety
- **Safety SC**
- On small common launch areas consider marked places and/or launch masters. 20 minutes launch period was too little

### Safety
- **Safety SC**
- Consider 2 targets, 50 m apart to avoid congestion.

### Competition
- **Rules SC – AX**
- Consider 2 targets, 50 m apart to avoid congestion.

### Scoring
- **Rules SC – AX**
- **Scoring-COH**
- Long wait for scoring to be published. Difficult to understand how scoring was done
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10th BX Worlds</td>
<td>Kreuth, GER</td>
<td>15-22 February 2018</td>
<td>Traffic management plan needed at targets and traffic controllers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Post Luxembourg Balloon Trophy</td>
<td>Mersch, LUX</td>
<td>18-22 July 2018</td>
<td>Marketer standard was not good. Review standards in AX MER and COH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Women AX Worlds</td>
<td>Naleczow, POL</td>
<td>6-11 September, 2018</td>
<td>Can co-pilots fly the balloon. (JB note: Confusion about “Piloting pilot” and “Pilot in Command”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd AX Worlds</td>
<td>Gross-Siegharts, AUT</td>
<td>18-24 August, 2018</td>
<td>Keep the rules simple without too many changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Junior AX Worlds</td>
<td>Wloclawek, POL</td>
<td>11-16 September, 2018</td>
<td>Consider assigning an official to each team to control driving and behaviour during flight. (JB comment: Would these be called Observers?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62nd GB.</td>
<td>Bern, SUI</td>
<td>27 September – 6 October, 2018</td>
<td>Everything close and reachable by tram. Very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Jury reports and debriefing reports 2018 Events (for more details, see full reports)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Rules SC – AX Scoring-COH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Rules SC – AX Scoring-COH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>EDS SC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rules Rules SC – AX Scoring-COH**

Logger task shall not be scored to 1 meter accuracy. (Hurray, Hans)

**Rules Rules SC – AX Scoring-COH**

Traffic management plan needed at targets and traffic controllers

**Rules Rules SC – AX Scoring-COH**

Loggers distributed late

Pilots wanted to have loggers for training flights and training session on logger use

**Rules Rules SC – AX Scoring-COH**

Marker standard was not good. Review standards in AX MER and COH

Can co-pilots fly the balloon. (JB note: Confusion about “Piloting pilot” and “Pilot in Command”)

Keep the rules simple without too many changes

Consider assigning an official to each team to control driving and behaviour during flight. (JB comment: Would those be called Observers?)

Mandatory Pre-Worlds can make organisation more perfect, like targets on maps

Ideas: Senior events? Without GPS? Medals to co-pilots? List team members in the program?

Everything close and reachable by tram. Very good

No social events. Opening dinner of low quality. Should be required in the bid

Social events appreciated

Welcome back party was cramped, dark and hard to see people