

STEWARDS REPORT

on

11 th EMC

Sywell/Northampton (UK)

6. – 14. August 2010

A. Facts

1. The British Microlight Aviation Association had applied and was awarded in due time the conducting of these championships. Thus organisers and competitors had sufficient time for preparations. However, unfortunately, the key person and former chairman of BMAA had to resign as Championships Director due to severe sickness. But he was replaced properly 8 months before the beginning of the championships.

2. There were 12 national teams present with 98 competitors on

	WMC 2009	EMC 2008
no RAL1	7 from 5 nations	3 from 3 nations
17 RAL2 from 8 nations	19 “ 11 “	16 “ 8 “
16 RWL1 from 8 “	9 “ 5 “	14 “ 6 “
24 RWL2 from 11 “	22 “ 9 “	22 “ 10 “

1 RGR2 from 1 nation

who flew on 6 days

5 navigation tasks	4	3
1 fuel economy task	2	1
9 precision landing tasks	8	8

3. What had to be feared since several years became reality : for the first time no RAL1 competed in the championships. During the last months before the championships big efforts were made by the organisers to attract a sufficient number of RAL1 pilots (S10, 4.3.2 requires from min. 4 nations) by free entrance and money prizes, to make the championship valid in this class. As CIMA had not found a solution to amend S10 according to the few number of 1-seater makes suitable for MCs, the organisers eventually cancelled this class two weeks before the opening of the EMC. One RAL1 pilot switched to RAL2 (and won the silver medal). Another switched to RWL1.
4. France returned to the championships with a team of 11 competitors, amongst which – also a “first time” – the crew of a well designed microlight autogyro.
5. Weighing of AC during the training days was left to the pilot’s own discretion – just to assure himself, if his plane was below the limits of 300 and 450 kg respectively MTOW (without rescue system). Surprising was, that one RWL2 was close to the limit. An official control of two AC was made during the competition itself.
6. The organisers formed a most efficient crew and had divided their tasks clearly among them as follows:

--- the COMPETITION DIRECTOR (very experienced microlight pilot and instructor, several times winner of FAI Gold Medals) briefed and conducted the tasks, dealt with the complaints

--- the EVENT DIRECTOR (microlight pilot, chairman of BMAA) was the official representative of the EMC and concerned with all organisational matters

--- the SCORING DIRECTOR (very experienced microlight pilot and proven event director in FAI class I events) headed the scoring team, was responsible for issuing information sheets and maps to the pilots and publishing the results.

--- the CHIEF MARSHALL (already had this function at WMC2003) headed the marshalls.

Communication between the FAI officials and the organisers was good.

7. These EMC were “paperless”, another important “first time” in Classic Class Championships, tested in last year’s WPC. This meant, in contrast to S10, 4.17, that there was no large permanent display board and all announcements or information, including the scoring results of the tasks were published on the Intranet only.

For this purpose the teams (and the FAI officials) were requested to bring along to the championships their own computer equipment including printer. It was planned to connect via the local “Aviator” server (of the hotel), which quickly proved to be inadequate for the almost steady and simultaneous use by teamleaders and competitors. Thus the organisers bought “dongles” for each of the teams, which allowed them to connect their computers via the mobile Vodafone net.

However, this was still not perfect, as unreliable because of poor coverage (as in many places in England).

It also remained unsatisfactory, as there was no alert made by loudspeaker, flashlight or siren, whenever a new message was put onto the Intranet.

Basically, a back-up by one only paper version on a board in a special tent inside the camp (as at Usti in 2007) would have been warmly welcome by the competitors.

8. The Local Regulations comprised an extensive Task Catalogue (4 limited fuel tasks, 3 type of navigation tasks and 9 precision tasks), each including the scoring rules. This enabled the competitors to prepare themselves at home and during the training days.

The final tasks sheets – of course in faultless English and unambiguous - were issued on the Intranet before the briefing on the evening for the following day.

During the briefings, however, no tape or video recording was made.

9. Scoring was rapidly done, as templates were well prepared for this purpose and thoroughly tested, into which only the measured data (from the flight recorder or otherwise) had to be written in. Thus individual results were available within minutes after the task was finished and the sheets with the Provisional Results were issued on the Intranet within record time.

10. Sywell is a commercially run airport with a tradition dating back to the 1930’s and the site of various companies serving the aviation industry and others. A hotel with restaurant is installed in the former flying school. There are 3 grass-runways arranged in a triangle. In parallel to one of it a concrete runway was constructed over the past two years. This was used by the normal

traffic (with radio contact). Thus the grass runways were free for the championships (without radio), but could be used only during the opening hours of the airport. A self-service station offering gasoline and Avgas can be used 24 h with credit cards.

11. The campsite close to the hotel was suitable and the adjacent AC parking area spacious. Though aside of industrial installations, the power supply from the grid was evidently insufficient and 2 generators had to be installed for the camp, running 24 hours. The sanitary facilities in containers with 5 toilets and 4 showers were a bit scarce for some 150 people. The use of those in the hotel (some distance) was an alternative.
12. Catering was also possible in the hotel, but the prices were some 50% higher than in the pubs to be reached by own car. Members of staff could help themselves in a tent, where sandwiches, beverages and packed food was on display.
13. Rooms for the Jury and the briefings were limited in space. The Briefing Room was in the low attic of a hangar with no window and fresh air. Fortunately the Jury had not to deal with a protest, as this room would not have hosted the number of persons for the enquiries.
14. The Opening Ceremony had been restricted – in regard of the limited budget – to the marching-in of the nations on the apron in front of the hangar of the local microlight club, several welcome speeches and the declaration of the EMC2010 being opened by the Honorary President of CIMA.
15. The Closing Ceremony started also with the marching-in of the nations into the hangar, followed immediately by the prize giving, essentially by the Jury members and the declaration of the EMC being closed by the Jury President.
16. All participants were very pleased to meet on three evening parties - after the General Briefing, - after the fourth competition day(arranged by the Italian team) - and after the last competition.
17. The weather conditions in England are very variable, with brighter periods alternating with rain and wind. Forecasts beyond 24 h are seldom reliable. During the training period and during the first 5 days of the Championships the weather was suitable. On the 6th day a fly-out was planned to an aviation museum – with 2 navigation tasks (nr.15 + 16). These had to be cancelled as heavy rains were forecasted. Busses were chartered for the visit of the museum. The last day permitted only 1 round of precision landing.
18. All teamleaders and competitors made “fair play”. There were no “tactical” claims or complaints which could have disturbed the smooth evolution of the event.
19. Finally it must be mentioned that the British authorities require special procedures for foreign microlight AC and pilots to enter and fly during a limited time in the country:

–the Civil Aviation Authority has to issue for the microlights an exemption from the requirement to obtain a UK Certificate of Airworthiness. This was arranged after sending copies of the standard documents of the AC and payment of a fee (by the organisers) in due time.

– the Customs want to receive a General Aviation Report before arrival, in which the airports of departure and arrival, day, time (UTC), reasons for visit and all details of the persons on board are listed (as for the airlines) – heavy penalties for missing it !

(The one steward, who travelled in his own plane, never got aware, whether the CAA exemption was given – and nobody asked for it ever. The GAR was faxed to Customs by a British friend before the arrival on a private airfield.)

B. Suggestions for amendment of S10

1. Modification of the rules aiming at a revival of the RAL1 class in future championships. (For proposals in wording see Steward Reports on EMC/WMC 2007, 2008 and 2009).
2. Harmonisation of organisers' titles in S10 and its Annexes and with reference to other Sections of the FAI Sporting Code. (For details see also Steward Reports 2007-9).

C. Other Suggestions for future championships

1. Communication via Intranet (replacing the former "pigeon holes") should become standard, if a suitable server is available and its reliability has been tested before thoroughly.
2. The community must be informed by some type of signal (flashlight, siren etc) of the issue of fresh messages on the Intranet.
3. In any case a back-up should be installed in form of one printed copy fixed on an "old style" public announcement board.
4. Weighing of AC should be as in the past again obligatory (preferably with noting the max. admitted amount of gasoline to stay within the MTOW limits). There is sufficient occasion during the training period. This will avoid any disturbance during the competition itself.

D. Summary

1. **Problems that arose.**
 - 1.1. Communication via Intranet was hampered by the unreliability of the servers.
 - 1.2. Often competitors were unaware, that new information was issued. No alerts were made.
 - 1.3. During a precision landing the obstacle (plastic tape) oscillated about 0.5 m in height.
 - 1.4. During another precision landing there was cross-wind of changing direction and strength.

2. Situations that could have developed.

2.1. As no official weighing had been done, a request by somebody to weigh specific AC could have disturbed the smooth running of a day's program.

2.2. The Jury had no possibility to produce any document in writing in case it was required to deal with a protest, as there was no printer available for them.

3. Successes

3.1. A comprehensive tasks catalogue was issued with the Local Regulations well in time.

3.2. Well conceived and tested templates allowed quick calculation and editing of scoring results.

3.3. All partners contributed to a smooth running of the championships and there was no reason to file a protest.

3.4. Despite unfavorable weather more tasks were flown, than in previous years.

23 rd. October 2010

Gerhart F. Gerecht

Naaman Tam