AGENDA ITEM 6.1

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL JURY

Karl Berger

VII EUROPEAN GLIDER AEROBATIC CHAMPIONSHIPS
Moravska Trebova, Czech Republic

6-18 July 2004

By the end of May, Marti Kalko informed me she regretted that she would not be able to attend EGAC 2004. After asking Elena Klimovich, Beatrice Gugelmann, and Bela Guraly in accordance with the voting at the CIVA meeting in November 2003, Bely Guraly was able to take over this duty. Therefore, the International Jury at EGAC 2004 consisted of: Karl Berger (Chairman, Austria), Mady Delcroix (France), Manfred Echter (Germany), Carlo Marchetti (Italy), and Bela Guraly (Hungary). As an international member of the Technical Commission, Heinz Dahl (Germany) was available.

Because of a technical failure of the HHMD System, this system was not available. The GASC decided after testing and voting in accordance with last year's CIVA decision and with the agreement of the Bureau of CIVA to use this new system (MHMD). Please see my report as the chairman of the Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee and the Proposals of the GASC to CIVA. Based on these decisions the use of the MHMD system at this championship was also accepted by the International Jury and the teams and the pilots. Used during the whole contest the new system worked without serious difficulties. For details see the attached report of the Technical Commission (by Heinz Dahl). Thanks to the organizer for their technical assistance to provide the contest aircraft with the necessary mounting.

Another decision was made on Wednesday, July 14th, by the International Jury in agreement with the chief delegates (Sporting Code, 1.4.1.6), to increase the wind limit in the upper height for Programme 2 in the interest of continuing the contest after a few days of bad weather without any chance to fly. After another rainy day, the International Jury decided to fly this program split between figure # 4 and figure # 5 if necessary (CIVA Regulations, Part 2, 1.4.7.2), so in this way the contest could be continued Friday morning.

Finally the contest was finished under perfect weather conditions on Saturday at 13.30 with three programmes flown by all pilots. With three rounds flown, the championship was completed and valid. There were no official complaints or protests, therefore the International Jury declared the contest as valid and closed its duty after finishing the scoring and evaluation process on Saturday evening.

Another problem which we had to fight with was the evaluation software as well as the hardware. Occasionally the electronic reader did not work and it was hard work for Ludwig Fuß and Mady Delcroix to keep it running. The reason could be, as Mady mentioned after

the contest, that the scoring computer was not only used exclusively for the scoring, but also for other purposes. Unfortunately, this happened also very unexpectedly at the finish of the contest and it was a time-consuming and hard work for several people to prepare the results. Without any spare time available, the victory ceremony had to be postponed until after the official closing ceremony.

I want to thank again all members of the International Jury for their hard and competent work. Besides the routine work, Carlo Marchetti for the supervision of the new MHMD procedure (together with Heinz Dahl, Technical Commission), Bela Guraly for the box inspection, and Mady and Manfred for their assistance regarding the scoring problems. A special comment about the experience with the JPI was already submitted by Manfred Echter to CIVA President Mike Heuer.

Thanks also to the organisers and the lots of enthusiastic volunteers, led by Contest Director Pavol Kavka and his assistant Stanislav Bajzik as well as the judges and the Chief Judge, Helmut Stas. The cooperation with all of them was excellent and it was easy to work with a perfect organisation.

Attached below are the comments of Manfred Echter regarding the JPI (added by Mike Heuer to this report) which were in an e-mail to the CIVA President:

Let me give you my impressions from the first use of the JPI-system at this year's EGAC.

1. JPI in principle is much superior to the traditional JPF. You know as well as I do that with JPF, we were rewarding those judges who deliberately gave marks in a very narrow bandwidth either side of the expected average of all the other judges. In fact, with JPF, the best judge would be the one who gave an "A" on every figure.

2. This year, I saw highly respected senior international judges who gave practically no more than 3 different marks: 7.0, 7.5 and 8.0. Still, these gentlemen ended up with fairly good, above average JPIs. I don't have to elaborate on the effect this has on the quality of our judging ...

The explanation is simple: There is only one of the five indices making up the JPI, which punishes "narrow-band-judging": The DI. A "narrow-band" judge never risks a poor LSI nor HSI, since he never gives any really low nor high marks. Nor does "narrow-band-judging" influence the RI, since this judge always stays close to the average marks of the other judges and never risks seeing a particular competitor much better or worse than the others.

3. If we want to force judges to be more selective, we must penalize "narrow-band" judging. With the JPI system, this could be done by weighting the five different indices, so that the DI becomes more important than those indices which are based on the average of the other judges' marks or ranking.

If you agree with my interpretation, please discuss this with John Gaillard and ask him to compare my observations with his analysis of the power championships of this year.

Best regards, Manfred

Technical Commission
Report EGAC 2004 in Moravska Trebova, July 7th – 17th 2004

1. For the contest, all aircraft's radios were sealed (selected on the safety frequency).

2. At the beginning of the official training flights the HHMD (Huber System) was not available. On agreement between the chairman of the GASC/chairman of the International Jury and Dietmar Poll, the new Height Measurement Device (PM234 from MGT-Technics Meierhofer) could be used free of charge. This would also test it under international contest conditions. In the aircraft, the necessary mountings were installed and the use of the new system was made quickly possible. The aircraft of the last 16 training flights were already equipped with these mountings and the MHMD (PM234) was tested during these flights.

3. The following equipment was provided:

   - a radio receiver ground station MGT-PM-234.2 at the judges position.
   - 3 to 4 mobile transmitters MGT-PM-234.1 to install in the gliders.
   - a calibration station MGT-PM-234 to check and adjust the transmitters.
   - evaluation software for data recording and viewing the flights at a computer at the judges position.
   - evaluation software to read out the transmitters on a computer and to print out the data.

4. The ground station was situated at the judges (close to the chief judge) and was connected to a computer. The data of each flight were recorded on the computer. With the software installed it was possible to view the flight, to evaluate the flight, and if necessary to print out the flight. The operation was done by a volunteer of the organizer and supervised by a member of the International Jury (Carlo Marchetti).

5. The transmitters are menu steered and it is easy to select the steering for different heights if it is necessary. Four memory places for pre-selecting are available. The handling of the transmitters at the flight line was done by the members of the Technical Commission or volunteers of the organizer under the supervision of the members of the Technical commission.

6. The transmission power of the transmitters are higher than the HHMD (Huber) and therefore the need for electrical power is also higher. The power supply is provided by four batteries of the size Mignon AA 1,5V, which is a operating tension of 6,5V. The batteries available were „GREENZELL EXTRA HEAVY DUTY" 15G R6 SIZE AA 1,5V. After about 3-5 contest flights the tension sunk with these batteries below a value (5,2V) after which the the tranmitter turned off. But the flight was recorded and stored at the transmitter.

   After the flight the memory content can be read out with a computer. An evaluation is now possible in the same way as with directly received datas.

   At the last run batteries were provided by Mr. Meierhofer and also used. The type was: VARTA Maxi Tech **Alkaline** 1,5V 4706 Mignon LR6 AM3 MN1500 Stilo. The tension of these batteries were still about 5,6 V after 15-17 flights. The batteries

could used until the tension display reduced to 5.2V.

7. The transmitters (mobile stations) were proved with a calibration device. The height value for the devices were at a tolerance of max. 15 m at the corresponding adjusted heights. See table below.

8. At three flights there was no signal to hear at the judges station, therefore the data was read out from the transmitters at a computer in the computer center and stored for a later evaluation.

9. During one programme a failure occured with one device. This device was rejected and no longer used.

10. With the computers equipped with the evaluation software, the transmission, recording, and evaluation of the data is easy to handle. Printouts of the data are easy and quick to make out if there is a printer connected to the computer.

11. Devices needed:

    At the judges position a computer must be available, on which the evaluation software to store the data is installed.

    To read out the data in the case of a failure in transmission, it is reasonable to use a portable computer (laptop or notebook) with the evaluation software at the flight line to avoid long distances to a computer center. The power supply for this must be established at the flight line.

12. The transmitters have a hose interface for static pressure. At the gliders the transmitters are mounted without connection to the static system..

13. No complaints from the pilots were received.

Summary: I judge the System MGT-PM-234 to be ready for use and with appropriate preparation (computer - laptop) easy to handle. Important is the use of the right type of batteries.

Heinz Dahl

Table

device	Nr. 0	Nr. 3	Nr. 6	Nr. 8	remark
1250m	1242m	1250m	1252m	1245m	Signal tone present
1200m	1209m	1203m	1203m	1201m	**no more signal tone**
800m	795m	794m	805m	785m	comparison
	723m	715m	729m	715m	comparison
	223m	221m	230m	215m	comparison
	202m	198m	210m	199m	comparison
200m	197m	190m	191m	189m	Signal tone present
100m	105m	100m	114m	103m	Signal tone present