



## **AGENDA ITEM 6.2a**

### **CONTEST DIRECTOR'S REPLY TO THE CHIEF JUDGE'S REPORT**

#### **XXIV. WORLD AEROBATIC CHAMPIONSHIPS**

**Granada, Spain**

**24 June – 4 July 2007**

**Antonio Quintana**

Reference is hereby made to the report:

#### **CHIEF JUDGES REPORT**

**24<sup>th</sup> FAI World Aerobatic Championships**

**Granada, Spain**

written by Mr. John Gaillard and concerning the WAC 2007.

In this context, I kindly request that you forward the content of this document in the way you consider faster and more appropriate to:

- WAC 2007 International Jury Members
- CIVA Delegates

I have to add that, both as Contest Director of the above-mentioned event, and as President of RFAE (the FAI member for Spain) I consider that Mr. Gaillard, in different parts of his report, is making some misleading statements about various issues related to the WAC 2007, and in some parts he is making statements that are demonstrably wrong.

Due to the numerous congratulations received from most of the pilots, team managers, members of the International Jury and several judges, and taking into account that the WAC 2007 is correspondingly being considered as one of the best recent WACs, in my initial report as Contest Director I refrained from criticising the Chief Judge and exposing some of the other problems or mistakes that were beyond the Spanish organization's control. I did not do it because the final outcome was that all the programmes had been carried out according to the organization's planned calendar. In our community it is well known that not many world championships have carried out all the programmes while still having more than two days left and even pausing every day from 2 to 5 PM in order to avoid the hottest hours of the day for the pilots in Granada.

I am not surprised, but I must strongly object to Mr. Gaillards's report.

I am not surprised because I could not avoid noticing what appeared to be his political manoeuvring already before the championships in Granada, trying to undermine the current CIVA President, with the likely but undeclared objective of replacing him.

Apparently, he continued these manoeuvres in Granada, generating tension towards the International Jury – and with respect to the organisers, from the moment he arrived until he left Granada, his only contact with me was to ask for a 300 € refund, otherwise not showing any courtesy or politeness towards me not only in my role as Contest Director, but also as the President of the NAC-FAI for Spain, and therefore, the official host of the WAC 2007 in Spain.

### **Official Spanish reply to John Gaillard's report on WAC 2007**

#### **Judges Briefing**

*A questionnaire was issued at the judging briefing and all the questions were thoroughly discussed, during the briefing, no problems arose from this exercise. During the course of the briefing the Contest Director asked that the judges approve an extension of the aerobatic performance zone to take into account the density altitude of the airfield, this was referred to the International Jury, which was apparently taken as approval by the Board of Judges, which of course was not the case.*

It is untrue that I was present at that Judges Briefing, therefore it is even more untrue that I made such a crazy request pretending to mark out a Box that would exceed the statutory dimensions when the championship had just started. This idea, apart from being against the rules, would have forced us to mark out the Box again, hindering the starting of the championships as scheduled.

This statement from Mr. Gaillard is extremely serious, because the fact of attributing this request to me in the first Judges Briefing in Granada is untrue. If it were true, it would imply that the Contest Director would be ignorant about fundamental competition aerobatics aspects, and the corresponding rules.

#### **Line Judging**

*Line Judging had been an issue before the contest, where the organisers had proposed that no line judges be utilised and CIVA had insisted that they be present. What was apparent from the outset was that no proper preparation had taken place for line judges, which resulted in no proper paper work having been prepared by the organisers and no proper sighting devices having been set up in the appropriate places. It was decided that normal CIVA procedures would be put in place with regards to two*

*different radio frequencies on diagonals thus requiring confirmation of line outs, these to be called in to the Chief Judges workstation in real time, thus allowing calls to be validated by the Chief Judge. However in practise due to radio communication problems, this system frequently broke down, a language problem was also a factor, as a result each flight was confirmed after the flight using Nuria Quintana as an intermediary she was effective in this role. A problem in the Q Programme soon emerged as line judges were reporting difficulties in ascertaining outs as they only had two small flags as equipment, making the task almost impossible in marginal cases. Subsequently the International Jury scrapped the line out penalties for the Q Programme, by the end of which more appropriate devices were employed.*

*Line judging remained an ongoing problem throughout the contest and although I am confident that the calls as transmitted to the Chief Judge's workstation and noted ultimately by Weaver were correctly noted, the same confidence does not apply to the line calls per se. On numerous occasions an out call was not confirmed by the alternate line judge and could therefore not be submitted as a penalty. The problem with line judging was brought to the International Jury's attention at least twice and possibly more during the course of the contest.*

*At the very end of the contest, I was approached by Robert Chomono, who was now acting as head of the Jury in the absence of Mike Heuer, as he had received two protests from the British Team about out calls which they claimed were impossible. On investigating, I agreed with them as the out calls were for the very first figure which I could recall being placed centrally for both pilots, clearly something was terribly amiss and I recommended to Robert that he uphold the protests.*

*CIVA needs to address the line judge issue as a matter of urgency, until a form of electronic or other device is available and given that the employment of neutral international line judges is not really feasible, I believe to have untrained local line judges leads to more problems than it is worth, reference to the distribution of line out calls in Spain may well tell a story, one team it would appear was far more successful in flying in the performance zone than all the others!*

#### *Recommendation*

*That if no electronic method or neutral International Judges are available, Line Judges should not be utilized.*

It is true that on the 31st of January 2007 (5 months before the judges briefing in Granada), Spain requested that no line judges were to be used in Granada, as it was already the case in the WAC 2005 in Burgos. The CIVA Bureau did not accept the request and confirmed that line judges should be used.

Among the reasons why Spain asked for the non-use of line judges, one of them is obvious and it has been supported for a long time by most of the pilots, and it is also recognised by Mr. Gaillard in his conclusions: *"That if no electronic method or neutral International Judges are available, Line Judges should not be utilized."*

The additional reason Spain gave was that in the specific case of the air fields in Burgos or Granada, with a high altitude, and in the case of Granada, with high temperatures and correspondent lower air density, the effect is that the effective area of the Box is virtually reduced due to the significant true air speed increase of the planes. Therefore, until CIVA institutes any other method to sort out the problem, in our view the line judges should not be used in high altitude conditions with high temperatures as in Granada's case.

In January 2007 we proposed that no line judges were to be used, and based on that Mr. Gaillard summarily concluded that it was clear that we therefore had not undertaken the necessary arrangements and that no proper sighting devices had been set up in the appropriate places.

Mr. Gaillard's statement is again factually incorrect. Line judges' positions had been fixed and arranged by the topographer who was in charge of placing all marks for the Box, including the positions for the line judges. These data are reflected in the maps produced by the topographer Mr. Carlos Gutierrez Alameda, the same technician who arranged the marks for the Box in the world championships celebrated in Burgos in 2001 and 2005. In addition, the measuring devices were the very same ones that we used in Burgos and Palma del Río in 2001.

What happened was that, as the line judges positions were close to the runway and the ring road of the Armilla Base, the military police, during the security watches that were carried out after the day's flying has ceased, dismantled the measuring devices because they thought that these devices could be obstacles unconnected with the championship. This actually happened in the Q Programme, during which the line judges only had alignment flags that were used for defining the axis and the position of the measuring devices.

When I was informed about this situation, we placed the measuring devices again and I spoke with the people responsible for the security at the Base who gave the appropriate instructions to the military police. After doing this, no problem arose again regarding the measuring devices.

The International Jury checked how the measuring devices had been again positioned. They even congratulated me because of the design of the devices, which, as I have already mentioned, were the same that we used in Burgos and Palma del Río during the WAG 2001.

How can Mr. Gaillard declare that the measuring devices were not adequate and were not ready? How can he confirm this fact when he did not even take the trouble to ask me to accompany him to check them personally and so be able to express an opinion after he really knew what had happened? And this even more so after the International Jury had checked them and confirmed their suitability.

Concerning the radio communication problems, I would like to confirm that there were really some problems, but they were not caused because the radios were not working properly, as stated by Mr. Gaillard.

Mr. Cacho was the technician in charge of this specific issue. He had some spare radios in his car and when a radio failed he proceeded to replace it - 90% the radios were new.

Logically, some communication problems could exist at some moment due to radio-electrical interferences, but also because at the same time, when handling the radios, some users were unblocking them and unintentionally modifying the frequencies. This incident happened even 6 times during one morning and Mr. Cacho had to return frequently at the judges' line to re-set the correct frequency. Finally, he decided to dismantle the buttons that allow frequencies to be changed, and even so these frequency changes still happened occasionally.

It is surprising that a Chief Judge who recognises that no line judges should be utilised where no reliable electronic devices are available, at the same time dares to question that some Box outs were not validated because they were reported only by one of the two line judges. Two persons are intentionally used, so that any of them, acting alone, will not be able to report a penalty without the other one concurring.

Mr. Gaillard describes as terrible that two Box outs were issued to two pilots in the first figure. On the one hand, this appears as a manipulation attempt intending to turn two individual cases (among 50 pilots), into something that is deemed to have occurred frequently.

But, what's more, the presumption he made to question the Box outs because they occurred in the first figure is really surprising because this statement is made by a Chief Judge who is supposed to have a great experience concerning the reality of the Aerobatic sport.

Any experienced aerobatic pilot knows that there are numerous situations which may cause a Box out to happen in the first figure of a programme, depending on the speed at the entrance, the position, the wind and drift conditions, and the relation of this first figure with the rest of the programme.

Based on the context of Mr. Gaillard's overall comments, it seems that he could be referring to the first figure of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Unknown. When flying that figure it is relatively easy to make a Box out at the initial part of the box through the B axis. After the spin, the flick is to be performed on the opposite direction and the pull can be done towards the judges or against the judges. By trying to fly near the judges a spin can be performed and the pilot can produce an out where the judges are placed because the pull to the vertical needs a large extension of space because the pilot is flying at a very high speed.

If, on the contrary, you intend to produce the spin outside the judges place, the pilot must adjust correctly to the line of the B axis because if not the pilot will fly too far away and it is possible to produce an out at the start of the manoeuvre if the pilot finds cross winds.

Additionally, the pilot has to adjust this manoeuvre to the beginning of the Box, because if he does not the pilot would probably produce an out in the third figure that needs a large extension of space, especially when there is no wind, and an adjustment to the limit of the

Box is needed in inverted and at a high altitude (between 750 m and 1.000 m), and therefore is much more difficult to make an adjustment and there are possibilities to make a Box out.

In addition, a Box out is possible in the first figure of the 1<sup>st</sup> Unknown because, when flying this manoeuvre, the pilot finds tail wind and then pulls, with which the pilot is not seeing the Box and can make an out, above all, if he finds more wind than expected (this can be generally found in Granada) it is feasible that the pilot makes an out because it is a manoeuvre carried out at a high speed and, normally, rolling and diving. With this, pilots tend to arrive with a higher speed than expected.

The reality is that there are so many causes for a Box out in the first figure as there are programmes and meteorological conditions, a reality which any expert in the aerobatic sport is supposed to know perfectly well.

In the last part of this section in Mr. Gaillard's report, he makes some statements that I doubt he has prudently considered, because they supposedly could bear legal responsibilities that are being studied at this moment by the affected parties.

Mr. Gaillard appears to utilise Spain as a scapegoat concerning the old question related to the convenience of using or not using line judges, when in fact Spain asked not to utilise line judges in Granada explaining the technical reasons above-mentioned, reasons that were rejected by Mr. Gaillard.

From the very moment that it was decided to use line judges in Granada, it was obvious that those teams that were able to train at a high altitude and temperature would arrive in better conditions at the championship and with less possibilities of producing Box outs. That was the case with the Spanish team, which had 5 training periods since the year started, the last session just one month prior to the start of the Championship, and most of the Spanish pilots made an training average of more than 35 flying hours during this last session in conditions of high altitude and temperature. And this point is further validated by the simple observation that the Spanish pilot who had trained less in those conditions was the one who produced more Box outs.

### **Judging Performance**

*Once again JPIs were not available at the end of this contest due to errors in the system, this situation needs also to be addressed as a matter of urgency, especially as a system already exists where the required information can readily be produced.*

*Judging performance therefore had to be assessed manually by extracting information from the scoring system, this however did show some clear trends.*

*It would appear that we had a mixture of very competent judges, some incompetent judges and some that were trying to influence the system to their own countryman's favour, this last group may or may not be competent in other respects of their judging.*

*Although not reduced to a JPI it is possible to highlight some of the CIVA indexes, which go*



*into creating a JPI and total sequence anomalies where a judges score has been thrown out in its entirety either high or low. As it is not my intention to embarrass individuals, I will not identify judges by name but rather by a letter, three judges appear to be very competent having ten or less total sequence anomalies and importantly having no pattern to these anomalies i.e. they were at random, as below Judge D had 6 anomalies and 0 for his own countrymen Judge F had 8 anomalies with no pattern and had no countrymen flying.*

*Judge B had 10 anomalies with no pattern and 1 high for his own pilots. In this group Judge H is fairly random, Judge C is definitely showing bias, Judge E again is defiantly showing bias, Judge A is showing less bias, but is all over the place with his scoring, Judge G simply appears to be attempting to manipulate the results.*

*Judge H had 13 anomalies including 3 high for their own countrymen*

*Judge C had 13 anomalies including 7 high for their own countryman*

*Judge E had 18 anomalies including 7 high for their own countrymen*

*Judge A had 19 anomalies including 3 high for their own countrymen*

*Judge G had 20 anomalies including 8 high for their own countrymen*

*And 5 low for their countrymen's main opposition*

*In the later group there is one Judge A who I believe is simply incompetent, I had cause in the last unknown flight to call a conference, not to establish any particular fact, but to try and make this judge understand that he was giving an 8,5 to a figure where other judges were giving soft zeros and very low scores, he simply is not seeing the errors and scores within a narrow band, once the JPI gets produced for this contest it is unlikely he will be selected again. However what is perhaps more worrying is judges C, E and G who appear to be favouring their own pilots, this cannot continue to be coincidence. Judge G is simply playing games and will surely have a seriously low JPI when it is produced, we do not need this kind of behaviour on a judging line.*

*One Judge E was giving a massive amount of soft zeros which resulted in multiple errors which would have appeared on FPS totals had it been published, as a comparison Judge D (who came out on top of total sequence anomalies list) i.e. good judging had 20 errors, whilst Judge E had 115 errors.*

#### *Recommendation*

*That CIVA must ensure that accurate JPI figures are available at each contest; utilising alternate software if such is available to ensure such figures are issued.*

Mr. Gaillard statements in this section, though they do not affect the Spanish organization, are extremely delicate because he doesn't mention names but makes a reference to some judges and questions the performance of 5 judges (out of 8). They are not given any opportunity to defend themselves and they are being inherently accused of unethically trying to manipulate the results.

This is a terribly serious accusation, because most of them have been active in past championships and, until now, never anything like this has been ever formally stated in an official report.

Mr. Gaillard, through his statements, is questioning the fair play and legitimacy of the results of the WAC. This, in absence of hard proof, is slanderous and inadmissible, and may possibly imply sporting and legal responsibilities. If uncontested, regarding the judges concerned, it would presumably leave them in a condition of defencelessness.

## **Closing Ceremony**

*It is normal procedure at the closing ceremony to present trophies and certificates to the winners in their various categories and to thank officials and judges for their participation in the event. Unfortunately in this championship the thanking of officials was woefully inadequate, about 50% of the judges were thanked and given tokens of appreciation, but others were omitted including myself as Chief Judge and I believe the Contest Scoring Director. This may have been an administrative omission but perhaps indicates the level of competence of the organisation, which was experienced throughout the contest. Again the morale of those giving nearly two weeks of their time and money and not even being thanked for their efforts is really adversely affected.*

### *Recommendation*

*That CIVA task the Royal Aero Club of Spain to make amends to those Judges and Officials not thanked in the appropriate manner, by issuing an apology to those concerned and ensuring that the mementoes issued to some officials be retrospectively issued to all officials as appropriate.*

The corresponding medals, trophies and diplomas were awarded at the Closing Ceremony and we received no claims by any official present that indicated to us that something wrong could be happening with those awards. If some problem had really existed, and if we had been informed about it, we would have tried to solve it immediately.

Since Mr. Heuer was not present at the Closing Ceremony, Mr. Gaillard was the highest CIVA representative, and he was correctly treated as such. We asked him to act as the highest protocol representative (in a higher position than that corresponding to the General of the Air Force and the General Director of Sports from the Spanish Sports Council; authorities who were also present at the Ceremony) and kindly invited him to conduct the official closing of the Championship.

What happened was that at the moment that Mr. Gaillard was acting as the maximum representative of the CIVA, we were awarding the diplomas and, due to his unplanned ceremonial position, we recognize that by our mistake he was not awarded his diploma as Chief Judge at that moment.

Subsequently, when we realised that his diploma had been left on the trophy-giving table, we tried to contact him several times to ask him if he could provide us with his postal address to send him the diploma. Nevertheless, we did not receive an answer until he recently sent an e-mail in which he only indicated his address, without even saying "hello" or "goodbye".



He was assigned the highest protocol position; as such he conducted the official closing of the Championship, and we consider that it is not logical that he intends to convince people that the mistake we made with the award of his diploma is the proof of a general organizational disaster.

He should have reflected on this issue before making such statement.

First, because at that moment he was representing the CIVA-FAI, not himself.

Second, because he should have been conscious of such a disproportionate statement, which sheds more light on his judgement than upon the organization, because at the Closing Ceremony many people were present who had already been at many past championships and had enough experience and judgement to be able to assess the possible differences with those past events regarding the site, standards, quality, procedures, and so on.

On the other hand, it is fair and correct that judges are to be thanked but we should not forget that the pilots are the main actors - and I express this opinion as International Judge.

Several times I have seen that in closing ceremonies, when giving the diplomas, medals and trophies simultaneously, pilots did not have enough space in their hands for it all. In Granada's Ceremony I found reasonable and fair for the pilots the idea of giving the medals and diplomas together; but the trophies were given separately, so the pilots and the teams became repeatedly recognized by going up to the podium twice, giving double acknowledgement to the winners and assigning greater importance to each of the trophies.

I have evidence that this procedure was welcomed by the pilots, because some of them congratulated me for that nice gesture from the organization.

Does Mr. Gaillard consider that he is 50% of the diplomas? How can he say something so incorrect by stating that we did not thank Mr. Dupont in the appropriate manner, when I personally gave him a token of appreciation thanking him for his efficient work? (I was perfectly aware that he had health problems with one of his eyes and instead of abandoning his post he continued working until he had finished his tasks).

In the same way, I gave the official tokens of appreciation to Mr. L.G. Arvidsson and Mr. Robert Chomono, thanking them for their magnificent collaboration during the whole Championship as members of the International Jury.

So far, nobody has informed me of the fact that a judge did not receive his diploma and, according to the number of diplomas given, I understand that diplomas were given to all judges and official assistants. It is possible that there were some omissions, but what happened was that, besides the official judges, there were people who were collaborating in order not to pay the registration fee. I think it is not fair that somebody tries to criticize the

whole Championship because some person did not receive a diploma due to an unintentional omission, taking into account that we bore costs that were much higher than expected.

If Mr. Gaillard found any problem, he should have taken reasonable steps and should have informed us of it at that moment, and we would have tried to solve it immediately but, as I stated at the beginning of the report, Mr. Gaillard only talked to me when he asked me to give him back the amount of 300 € that he had paid and that were supposed to be borne by the Organization.

This point now requires further clarification.

This happened the day after the Closing Ceremony, when we met at the hotel for breakfast. At that moment, I did not know what he was referring to and I had no documents with me enabling me to administratively check the request – therefore, on trust I personally gave him 300 €. The surprising part came later, when I checked that the amount of money he asked for was concerning the accommodation fee for the nights of 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> of June, when everyone was aware that the Organization was taking charge of the accommodation expenses only from the 24<sup>th</sup> of June onwards.

He said to a person of the Organization that the reason why he asked for that money was that he had been informed that some judge had not paid for the accommodation during those days.

If any judge “was distracted” and did not pay for those accommodation days, it is just intolerable that he used this as an argument to ask for a refund of the money that he clearly had to pay. Obviously, it was a decision of the Organization to bear any extra costs apart from the official commitment between the 24<sup>th</sup> June and 4<sup>th</sup> July. One thing is that I can make a courtesy invitation and a different thing is that Mr. Gaillard considers he has the right to demand it.

## **Conclusions**

Mr. Gaillard finished his report stating:

*Again the morale of those giving nearly two weeks of their time and money and not even being thanked for their efforts is really adversely affected.*

I have the greatest respect for the International Judges because, among other things, I am one of them and I think it is clear that Spain has never been impolite neither to the judges nor to anyone else.

The accommodation offered in the registration for the WAC was at a 3\* hotel level, but I personally took the decision to accommodate all judges at the 4\* hotel level.



Spain has always been distinguished by offering accommodation, services and facilities of standards higher than the ones usual in other championships. And, of course, we have always tried to do our best to collaborate with teams which sometimes have needed some special help.

If Mr. Gaillard is worried because *“the morale of those giving nearly two weeks of their time and money and not even being thanked for their efforts is really adversely affected”*, he should have shown more respect and consideration towards those people who have been working for the CIVA with the organization of three of the four last world championships, devoting years of work, granting amounts of money superior to 300.000 € belonging to RACE and RFAE, and in some cases even losing their health.

What I have commented in the first part of this report concerning supposed political manoeuvres to control the CIVA, together with various incorrect statements that have been shown, brings me to the conclusion that Mr. Gaillard’s report is contaminated by extraneous interests which are not what they openly seem to be. In addition, it contains assertions that could supposedly imply legal responsibilities towards the affected parties.

Considering what has been exposed in this report, as Contest Director of the WAC 2007 and President of the NAC-FAI for Spain, I consider that the terms used in Mr. Gaillard’s report are unacceptable for my country.

Antonio Quintana  
Contest Director WAC 2007  
CIVA Delegate  
RFAE President (NAC-FAI for Spain)