

## **AGENDA ITEM 8.3**

### **REPORT OF THE CHIEF JUDGE**

#### **V. EUROPEAN ADVANCED AEROBATIC CHAMPIONSHIPS**

**Joensuu, Finland**

**20-28 July 2007**

**Graham Hill**



#### **Briefings**

##### **Judges Currency Review**

The test was held at the hotel Sokos in Joensuu based on a questionnaire. Team Managers were invited to attend. Time was spent on the criteria for rolling circles spins and flicks which always seem to cause problems. We discussed the process of using the “Near Near, Far Far” etc system of tracking the positioning score

##### **Safety & Timing:**

Judges were reminded to give the benefit of the doubt in all matters except safety. Radio procedures and time limits for the various programmes were clarified. The use of “Break, Break, Break” and “Time, Time, Time” was covered. In addition we advised ( because of possible language problems) that we would also use “Land, Land, Land” if there was danger to the aircraft, or we felt the pilot was at risk. This was also explained at the general briefing.

##### **Score Sheets**

Judges were re familiarised with ”reader sheets” and the importance of clear marking. In the event the reader did not arrive at the airfield in time and all marks were hand entered

#### **Organisation**

A meeting was held with Matti Peura, prior to the start of the competition, to cover the points in the draft hand book that relate to the judging facilities. All but minor aspects or the requirements had been actioned or were underway.



---

## **Scoring**

Jürgen Leukefeld and Silvia Thole were, as we have come to expect first class. Their quiet, efficient manner and ability to prioritise if left alone is a great asset. Their quiet humour was refreshing when things get tough. Thank you both again!

## **Judging Positions**

These were checked and the distance from the judging line to the edge of the box was between 160 and 170 meters at the East, West, and main Southern positions. Although I was unable to see all the equipment before the start, I was confident that it was all available. This with one exception regarding communications, proved to be the case.

The terrain was fairly level and although trees were close to all judging positions there was no interference to the box view.

Slight adjustments were made after the first flights of the Q at the East position, which had been wrongly set up.

## **Management**

Transport to and from the hotel was by large coach: Around the airfield by a single mini-bus was used of insufficient size to accommodate all judging teams and the video man and equipment. This meant two journeys for each move and wasted some time.

Accommodation on the line... Excellent

Co-operation of the judging position set up team.... Excellent

Hotel Accommodation .... Excellent

Co-operation of the CD and willingness to find solutions ... Excellent

Co-operation of CD Staff... Excellent

Access to airfield tower, and scoring office etc;.... Excellent

Co-operation of starter.... Excellent

Co-operation with jury... Excellent

Communication was the only area where some problems were encountered. This was mainly between the judging line and the starter. In addition there was no easy contact with the CD and the Jury. I provided two radios for contact between the CD and the scoring office.

## **Safety Heights**

As mentioned above the box was surrounded by trees close to the box in the West side with rising ground and I proposed for safety reasons that the box and weather heights be raised by 50 meters. All agreed.



## **Video**

Natalie Brunet had a diving accident just before the start of the competition and being very ill in hospital was unable to attend. Matti Mecklin stepped in with improvised equipment at the last moment and did an excellent job in recording all the flights.

## **Flight Programs**

For the first 10 flights of the “Q” we held a debrief on each flight and discussions on both the level and difference in scores. This was reduced to a debrief every three or four flights as the consistency improved. We used the same procedure in Grenchen EAC 2006 and there is no doubt that as the Q progressed, so did the judging teams settle down. One Jury member expressed concern that the considerable conferencing during the Q would influence the results of the Q. This, is true but I pointed out, however, that the Q was a training flight (Rule.1 3 1 1 a ) and that of course there was to be no debriefing during the subsequent flights. Both Steve and I are convinced that this method of detailed discussion during the “Q” has major benefits in developing judging confidence and consistency during subsequent programs.

## **Protests**

There were none.

## **Judges**

### **Judging Line**

Ove Nielsen was unable to join the judging line as his assistant was unable to attend. Since organisation were unable to find a suitably qualified assistant at such short notice, Ove helped Steve and I on the Chief Judges table, where he ably took charge of timing, scribing, and the radios.

### **Standard of judging**

Judges were advised that JPIs would not be used to remove judges from the line. In any event the JPI element of the fair play system was not working.

Steve Green and I examined the scores in detail for the Free, first and second unknowns. There were very few anomalies and little evidence of bias or style preference. In one case we mentioned this issue to the judge after the completion of a sequence, and I am sure that this judge was completely unaware of this possible bias. It may be a style issue but related to pilots of his own nationality



The standard of judging was very good, and the scoring system took care of the anomaly errors that always occur at such a competitions. Use of scoring range, and the confidence to HZ and soft zero was evident in all sequence.

Steve Green is verifying and transferring all the data onto the UK scoring system where the JPI process is working (for reasons we do not understand it is not functioning on the ACMS ) so that we can have a look at the elements of judging performance. The initial analysis before verification looks good.

### **Pilots**

The Jury President writes a report, the Chief Judge writes a report, the Contest Director writes a report, but nobody speaks for the pilots. I asked the Jury President to ask Team Managers to think a little about the competition and give him any feedback to include in his report.

### **Additional thoughts**

#### **Rules**

Remove the rules that state exit and entry radii must be the same, for certain manoeuvres. They are not well judged in either humpties, stall turns, or lay down eights. The basic rule should be for entry and exit ... "Radii must be constant and smooth".

#### **Judge selection**

A discussion with several people developed the thought that the selection of judges should be by a knowledgeable and respected group under the Bureau which recommended an initial panel of known competent current judges to form a "Core Panel" of the next few selections. This should mean that out of 7 to 9 judges all but 2 must be selected from the "Core Panel". This would then allow the JPI to analyse the newer judges against the known competent group of judges

#### **Reader**

The logistics of getting the reader and the right paperwork seems to have been counter-productive and expensive over the last two International competitions. The amount of time saved by the reader when all is working properly is not worth the cost, maintenance and risks of non-performance. Manual input has minor disadvantages but it least it is reliable and less expensive.

#### **Contest Handbook**

In our last C J Report from Grenchen I included the following note on the Contest Directors handbook. I again repeat it:



**CIVA 2007**  
**Vilnius, Lithuania**

---

*I propose that the draft is finalised with the addition of issues from administration, scoring, and maybe legal. These should be added to the draft of the judging and other guidelines and formalised as quickly as possible.*