



6th FAI World Paramotor Championships

Nove Mesto nad Metuji, CZE, 30 July – 9 August 2009

FAI Steward's report

General remarks

This event was organised with 5 months' notice, but despite this short planning period the competition was a success.

Facilities

Facilities on the airfield were good; teams were allocated a tent with electricity, and they also shared a hangar. Catering was good, as were the provision of toilets and other amenities. Entertainment was provided on several nights, including pre- and post-competition parties.

Registration was relatively efficient and the organising team was available to answer questions and solve problems during the event.

Pre-competition period

A lot of the procedures and information were published online in advance and discussion was encouraged in the months leading up to the event. This gave teams the opportunity to understand the tasks and procedures and to ask questions before travelling to the competition site. Focussing on smaller details in advance greatly lessens the workload for competition staff at the competition itself and should be encouraged.

Competition period

Because of the availability of information before the start of the event, the competition director was able to keep briefings short.

The competition director was highly experienced and set a variety of tasks. However, alongside the job of task setter he also acted as chief scorer and publisher of results and needed support to ensure that he was able to function effectively. The competition director should work closely with a separate chief scorer to form an effective team from the early stages of planning; tasks should be set which are relatively easy to score and are agreed upon by both the director and the scorer and others should be involved in the scoring process to ensure a strong link between setting tasks and producing scores.

The Chief marshal spoke no English which meant that translators were needed, though this was a weak link in the communication. The marshalling team performed well and were dedicated.

Competitors were encouraged to use PMR446 (licence free) radios for communication; in practice this was not successful as useful information was not transmitted in an official language.

Limited fuel amounts were by weight rather than volume; this weighing was done quickly and shows that the procedure does not need to be time consuming.

A new logger was used for the first time. The AMOD proved easy to use and quick to download. It is small, lightweight, relatively inexpensive and presented few problems.

The major difference between this competition and all others which I have attended previously was the use of the official website as the primary means of communicating information. This saved the organising team a great deal of work and also meant that team leaders were able to access the latest information via an internet connection.

This system brought other benefits; for instance, messages could be transmitted instantly, scores could be updated quickly, complaints were filed electronically, answered quickly and then both the complaint and the answer were published for all to see.

There were some problems; the smaller teams did not bring a computer or printer with them. The poor installation of the wifi system meant that access to the wifi was limited. These factors should not discourage future competition organisers from using this system, citing in local regulations that the official notice board is online rather than on a wall.

Conclusions

With only 5 months' notice, the Czech organising team was able to produce a very successful event and should be congratulated.

The competition director should be seen as one part of a team whose joint objective is to set the tasks and then ensure that the resulting scores are easily obtained and quickly published.

The use of the official website as the main communication channel should be encouraged.

Rob Hughes
October 2009