

Jury Report from 12th FAI European Microlight Championships, Kamenica nad Cirochou, Slovakia

This is the report of the FAI Jury.

1. Venue

The venue for the event was a provincial airfield situation on the outskirts of the small village of Kamenica nad Cirochou, Slovakia. The airfield has one runway (07/25). The airfield is sited in a valley surround on three sides by raising ground which created variable and unpredictable wind conditions. The surface of the runways, associated taxiways and quarantine/parking areas was short stubbly grass with a rough, undulating and extremely hard packed base. Due to the nature of the runway surface the options for the position of the 100m deck were extremely limited.

Within the boundary of the airfield there was plenty of space for the quarantine, parking and camping areas.

2. Weather

During the practise week the weather was hot (plus 35c), dry with predominately still air conditions. At the commencement of the competition the weather conditions started to change with increased winds and cloud formations. On two of the competition days the strength/direction of the winds was such that competition flying was suspended for part of the day.

3. Facilities

The main facilities situated at the airfield available for use by the competitors consisted of:

- A large main hanger and associated briefing room (which doubled as the Jury and Stewards room) with adequate tables and chairs. The main hanger was equipped with a Wi-Fi network that performed well throughout the event. Adjacent to the main hanger was a small bar/café which was manned throughout the event. The competitors and officials had the opportunity to pre order
- Breakfast, lunch and dinner which was dispensed from the café and could be consumed within the main hanger area.
- Situated between the main hanger and the camp site was a temporary toilet and shower block which was more than adequate in size and was well maintained throughout the event
- The camp site was situated towards the eastern end of the airfield opposite the main entrance and railway crossing point. The campsite was equipped with its own Wi-Fi and electricity supply. It was noted by many competitors that the electricity

supply was better than normally encountered on competition campsites although the camp Wi-Fi connection could be problematic.

- Good waste management was maintained at all times
- The airfield had laid on a mobile mo-gas equipped fuelling truck which was available during all competition tasks
- There appeared to be no permanent/visible paramedic facilities on site although when the need arose due to a precision landing incident a local ambulance and crew were on site within 5 minutes
- At the start of the event there were a number of security concerns raised following an incident in the campsite area. The event organisers then arranged for overnight security to be in place from 19:00 – 07:00 on a daily basis for the remainder of the competition.

4. Administration

The organisers had a main office set up adjacent to the main hanger which housed the scoring and marshalling teams and on occasions looked a little cramped.

The marshalling team was headed by a competent English speaker and a support interpreter who assisted both the organisers and the competitors as required. There were sufficient numbers of marshals and assistant marshals for the tasks required although initially the support marshals seemed unsure of their role and required additional training and support on occasions especially with regards to the precision landing tasks.

The chief scorer and competition director were one and the same which greatly increased his workload although he was ably supported by 3/4 assistant scorers and administrators which appeared sufficient for the task.

5. Running of the event

All navigation and economy task was controlled by electronic devices and FR's.

Precision landings were videoed and also checked by a sufficient number of Marshals (would recommend that 2nd camera be used in case of problems).

The quarantine area was well marked with numbered signs for everyone to find their place.

Refuelling and the checking of the refuelling was done in pair between two teams checking each other. That system worked fine.

The scoring system was good and it was very convenient to have all scores, complaints, finished tasks, time limits etc. accessible via the web instead of having everything on paper. It was felt that the way the individual scoring sheets were presented could be improved in the following ways:

- What version they were
- Clear heading including title of competition, title of task, time & date etc
- When they were published/produced

- Clearer deadlines

Access to the web especially from the campsite could occasionally be problematic. A system of texts and music warnings was introduced by the organisers to signal to the team leaders, competitors and officials that something new had been posted on the web which proved both amusing and popular.

At the beginning of the first task the CD informed all competitors and FAI officials that due to the prevailing temperature, altitude of the airfield and the condition of the runway surface the length of the deck was being extended from 100m to 120m. All team leaders initially agreed with this change although later in the competition this proved to be a contentious issue with some of them. The director indicated that he had come to this decision based on section 10, Annex 4, part 2, 2.C8.

The overall handling of the tasks by the marshals was good. There were mmistakes but when these occurred and were noticed or pointed out corrections were made as soon as possible.

During the competition we are placed to report that there were no major incidents although there was 1 minor precision landing incident that required hospital attendance and one out landing again resulting in hospital attendance. In addition on the last task one competitors trike tipped over while nearly stationary resulting in damage to the trike but not the competitors.

6. Briefings

The briefings took place in the shared Jury/Stewards room which worked well and allowed a fair degree of privacy. The briefings were not minuted by the organisers or videoed as far as could be seen.

The briefings were announced on the web and via text messages to team leaders and officials' a system that worked well.

The tasks & task sheets were posted on the web, which was very convenient and shortened the briefing times. The tasks were presented by the competition director who were very well prepared and had immediate answers to the majority of questions.

7. Tasks

The number of tasks flown was 12, which is sufficient to validate the championships. The tasks presented were generally very good, imaginative and challenging and the competitors seemed to appreciate the variety of them.

The % break down of the tasks was:

- Navigation: 53%
- Economy 27%
- Precision 20%

The jury was comfortable that this meet the Section 10 requirements.

8. Complaints & Protests

Complaints were numerous (41) but with only two ending in an official protest. Most of the complaints emanated from misunderstandings and were sorted out fairly easily.

All complaints and protests and Jury decisions were published on the official championship web site: www.emc2013.sk.

9. Conclusions

Overall the Jury felt that Kamenica nad Cirochou airfield provided a good location for the championships and that the organisation team performed well.

It was felt that although there was an opening and closing party and ceremonies which were well organised and attended a number of opportunities were missed to foster a closer relationship between the various teams which was a shame.

Although the event was attended by a number of invited media representatives (TV/Radio) there appeared to be little advertisement of it in the locality which resulted in only a few local residents visiting the event.

It was felt that overall the competition was held in good spirit with numerous tight results. The organisation worked extremely hard to make the championship the success it undoubtedly was although as always at events such as these there will be those who are happier than others with the final results.

Jury President: Wolfgang Lintl

Jury Member: Nino Muelas

Jury Member: Grant Finney