
#1 Safety: concerns expressed about the lack of briefing between pilots, manifest and the organisers which saw out-landings due to erroneous GPS data (see item #12).

#2 Aircraft: competitors were happy with having dedicated aircraft (as opposed to being used as ‘fillers’ for FS sorties).

#3 Aircraft suitability: competitors were disappointed the Bulletins didn’t indicate what steps and hand-holds (or lack of) would be attached to the Pilatus Porter which required teams to modify their exit mode and for the videographer in particular.

#4 Compulsory rounds: pre-competition briefing regarding Rounds 2 & 5 explaining what the judges were expecting, in particular, the ‘presentation’ criteria and its scoring. This was appreciated by the competitors. The competitors were satisfied with the judges assessment (of the compulsory rounds).

#5 Stand-up Star: the wording of the videographers position (level with…) as the possibility of a hidden grip was a concern. General agreement was not to change the wording.

#6 Animated description: competitors and judges were delighted with the series of animated footage released early this year for both the FreeStyle and Freeflying moves of the compulsory rounds, arranged by Ron Miasnikov, as it offered a visual description of requirements. (the following applause was well deserved).

FreeStyle animation:
http://www.fai.org/ipc-news/37307-video-animations-ofae-compulsories

FreeFlying animation:
http://www.fai.org/ipc-news/37307-video-animations-ofae-compulsories

#7 Camera/s: happy with the option of two (or more) units.

#8 Routine Description Sheets: the majority of teams provided drama sheets to the CJ. The judges went on to say that the descriptions saves a good measure of time and eliminates the possible over-sight of new moves/variations and perceived difficulty. The EJ’s informed the teams that for future competitions, they could forward the descriptions via email before them arriving on-site.

#9 Videographers role: requests for more action in the compulsory rounds. Advised to send suggestions to Ronald anytime, but wouldn’t be implemented within the current cycle (post WPC).

#10 Erroneous Results: the unfortunate publication of standings for the European category was explained by the CJ. The correct standings were published in due course but not before the British team had informed all-and-sundry, of their ‘success’ in placing 3rd.

#11 YouTube: Tamara Koyn (via email) suggested setting up a YouTube forum so as to put out items of interest pertaining to our discipline. Susan Dixon stated that whilst the FAI does have a channel for competition videos (see; IPCwresulstsvideos) a specific channel for the Artistic Events was needed (will consult with Ronald Overdijk).

#12 To exit or not to exit: concern as to whether to exit or land in the aircraft, against one’s better judgement (in either case) was voiced citing an instance when the pilot was adamant that a team must exit or forfeit their score, indicated that many teams are unsure of their rights. Claiming
‘safety’ as a ‘pertinent reason’ was met with suspicion as there were claims that they have been penalised at local competitions. Something to bring up at the next pre-competition briefing (att: CJ).

#13 **Competitor-cum-Judge:** following on from Dubai 2012, asked if any competitor had sought judge training etc. Replies were negative (and with no intention to do so).

#14 **Attendance:** Thirty-six (36) attendees.

  Manual Almeida, Arne Helge Andersen, Nada Attia, Peter Brookes, Alex Dand,
  Susan Dixon, Andy G?, Bernard Garsault, Tina Gradisnik, Bich Ha, Steve Howes,
  Steinar Lillas, Michael Jung, Robert Krauss, Dimituiy Manashov, Ferlan Marko,
  Ron Miasnikov, Rozomalov Mikhail, Daphny Morali, Alex Parkhomenko, Jami Pillasch,
  Alexandr Ragulin, Eugene Tarakhomin, Oleksiy Tolstoy, Marlus Sotberg, Konnov Valery,
  Ray Williams - Chair/Scribe

#15 **email addresses of attendees:** Available on application to the FAI Communications
communication@fai.org