1 - EXTRACTS OF THE CD’S REPORT

1

“Flying weather was for the outstanding with unlimited visibility and virtually no wind when flights were conducted.”

2

“Several times during the contest, the French team management violated general sportsmanship protocol when they ‘did not like the answer.’ One example: the French coach asked for a wind measurement. The request per the rules was denied by the Chairman of the International Jury as ambient conditions by inspection were similar or diminished from the previous measurement. This coach immediately sought a wind measurement request from the international jury member who was from coach’s nation.”

3

“The international jury’s governance, from the perspective of the CD, was hindered by Pierre Varloteaux. There was cohesive contest management with the Chief Judge, CD, and two of the international jury members and then whatever Mr. Varloteaux felt like doing. This jury member, as an example, against the explicit request of the CD launched a WhatsApp group, that created confusion amongst the pilots and operators’ group. The CD was assured all pilots had been included in the group. Initially only 58 members of the 110 people emailed daily with a plan of the day were in the group. It was good of Mr. Varloteaux to help write out the diplomas with help from Tamás Ábrányi at the banquet.”

2 - RULES (CODE 6)

DUTIES OF THE JURY

1.3. Contest Bodies

1.3.1. The International Jury

1.3.1.1. Responsibilities of the International Jury

The International Jury is the supreme arbitration body of international aerobatic events. The activities of the International Jury will be organised systematically by the President of the International Jury from the opening of the contest. The President of the International Jury should allot duties to each of the members of the jury every day. Those duties include:

a) Interpreting the general rules, the judging rules and the general regulations of the contests.

b) Meetings:

i) Attending the meetings of the International Board of Judges (dealing with familiarisation, evaluation, checking the marking sheets).

ii) If required, holding daily evaluation meetings (after the daily contest programme has been completed).

iii) Final meeting of the International Jury. Evaluation of the activities of the International Jury and of the development of the contest and a preliminary assessment of the experience gained during the contest.

c) Supervision:
i) Selecting two Warm-Up pilots several months prior to the event, based on applications to be sent by NACs to the President of the International Jury before a deadline to be announced for each event.

ii) Providing the CIVA “Declaration of Ethical Behaviour” sheet to the Chief Judge, who will sign it and require all other members of the Board of Judges to enter their name, signature and date to warrant their compliance with the requirements of this declaration before competition flights commence. The International Jury will retain this signed sheet among their official records for the event.

iii) Supervising the activities of the Chief Judge and the Board of Judges. This is to include preparation of the judging analysis for all judges. During judging, members of the International Jury must not remain in the vicinity of the International Judges.

iv) Checking the operation of the electronic positioning device (if in use) and supervising the official recording boundary infringements.

v) Overseeing the administration of the contest and ensuring that the Organiser of international contests meets the requirements as stipulated in the checklist provided to the Organiser for such events.

vi) Supervising the briefings and the drawing of lots.

vii) Supervising the activities of the Scoring Office.

viii) Supervising the activities of the meteorological centre.

ix) Supervising the activities of the Technical Commission.

x) Checking the publication of contest results; making visits to the pilots’ camp to gather or give information.

xi) Checking the availability and accuracy of medals and trophies at the beginning of the competition.

xii) Controlling the Unknown Programmes in accordance with Sporting Code; including supervision, composition, and explanation, as appropriate.

Etc.

### MEASUREMENT OF WIND SPEED

#### 3.6.3. Weather Information

3.6.3.1. The Contest Director must provide the competitors, the Chief Judge, the Board of Judges and the International Jury with half-hourly information on weather conditions and, at shorter intervals, on wind speed and direction at 300 m and 600 m height if required due to meteorological developments. In addition, the Contest Director must provide the Official Wind Direction, as determined by the International Jury, to the competitors at the beginning of each contest day and anytime that Official Wind Direction is changed.

3.6.3.2. The wind speed and direction must be measured on the site of the competition, or in the immediate vicinity (less than 5 nautical miles). The wind speed and direction must be measured either:

a) by a qualified weather station crew using the appropriate tools: radar or balloon ascent.

b) or with a drone, using equipment, operations and software as specified in a separate document approved by the CIVA Bureau.

c) or with an aircraft using a GPS, according to the method described below in 3.6.3.3.
3 - RATIONALE

MEASUREMENT OF WIND SPEED

It is the duty of the Organiser to provide wind measurement every time it is necessary, especially when a member of the Jury on the judges’ line detects that the wind has changed, and also in a situation in which previous information on weather conditions has not been delivered for hours. Many teams asked the Organiser for this basic piece of information throughout the whole the contest.

The President of the International Jury agreed, after some discussion, that the member of the Jury on the judges’ line may have asked the Organiser questions concerning the weather conditions whenever it was necessary from the Jury’s perspective.

The CIVA Code 6 states clearly on the means usable for the wind measurement. The one supposed to be initially used by the Org was a drone. This drone was on site, but:

- During the first 3 days, Mr Duncan Koerbel avoided giving precise information about the use of the drone to the teams and the Jury;
- The reason appeared after the pilots’ questions (on the What'sApp group, see below) and investigation of members of the Jury: Apparently, the FAA authorities had never given the authorisation to the Organiser to operate the drone above 400 feet;
- The initial given measurements were subjected to doubts;
- The obvious CD’s ill will to launch measurements and the poor communication with the Jury resulted in several protests for Programme #1 (and re-flights).

3-4 days after the beginning of the competition, the CD accepted another way of wind measurement with the on-board device belonging to one of the warm-up pilots.

Mr Koerbel obviously forgot that all the competitors have the same right to fly with the same chances to win. Asking for wind measurement by pilots or a member of the Jury in a reasonable time is, without a shadow of a doubt, a basic question of rules and sport. Mr Koerbel deliberately misled participants by writing in his report “virtually no wind” when the wind was at times close to the limits.

Above all, the allegation by Mr Koerbel against a Jury member is unacceptable. Such accusation could be perceived as an attempt to hide his own incapability to fulfil his tasks properly.

COMMUNICATION DURING THE COMPETITION (WHAT'SAPP)

It is the duty of the Organiser to provide updated information.

To provide updated information, the Contest Director decided to use the following:

- Email
- Website

Difference between an email / website and WhatsApp or equivalent

In the first case, the information must be searched, in the other one, the information is pushed to the addressee. This, during a “live” competition, makes a huge difference.

The Jury (and not only Mr Pierre Varloteaux) asked the Organiser twice to set a “push information” group in a common application. WhatsApp had been used for years in all CIVA competitions, but another app would have been acceptable as well.

Two days after the beginning of the competition, Mr Koerbel argued that:

- He could not set such a way of communication because he had not had all the participants’ phone numbers;
- The US team does not use WhatsApp.
Within 2 hours, the Jury set up a WhatsApp group with all teams (including the US, without any problem; it occurred that apparently this application had been used during the US National). On the third day of the contest, all pilots and team managers were present in the group. Mr Koerbel finally decided to be one of the members as well. Some staff members regularly used this channel to push information.

Mr Koerbel deliberately emphasised the difficulties in creating and using a “push information” group and continued sending not updated information via email.

### 4 - CONCLUSIONS

Obviously, and for months (see email exchanges between the Organiser and CIVA), Mr Koerbel did what he wanted, with no respect for the CIVA regulations, the team managers, the pilots who paid a lot of money for a regulated contest, and a lot of officials.

In his report, Mr Koerbel omitted lots of points indicating irregularities in the organisation of this CIVA contest, amongst others:

- Lack of updated information for the teams and officials;
- Lack of meeting the requirements for the Jury’s Office, Scoring Office, Judges’ Office for video reviews, etc;
- Lack of national anthems and flags at the closing ceremony;
- Initial plan of distributing blank diplomas to pilots (2 members of the Jury did not accept this idea). Taking into consideration the lack of the Organiser’s willingness to fulfil the diplomas with the pilots’ names, the Jury solved the problem during the Closing Ceremony.

In my opinion, respect for the participants, fairness and sportsmanship were obviously not the priorities for the WAAC 2023 Contest Director.

---

**PIERRE VARLOTEAUX**

WAAC 2023 Jury member

*Document submitted to CIVA in NOV 2023*