Event Questionnaire / Questionary for the European Championship 2005 held at Debrecen, Hungary.

by Gerald Stürzlinger

Individual Answers / Comments on the Questions

June 7th, 2005

Organisational part of the European Championship 2005.

1. Are you satisfied with the communication process (entry forms, information, web-site, etc.) before the Event?
2. Once in Debrecen, are you satisfied with the reception (room assignment, welcome desk, etc) of the Event organisers?
3. Are you satisfied with the handling of your individual wishes (rental car reservations, balloon renting, helium supply, etc)?
4. Are you satisfied with the competition headquarters facilities?
5. Are you satisfied with the refuelling facilities?
6. Was the communication process during the event (timings for "social" events, further schedule) sufficient?

individual remarks / comments

positively noted:

Briefing Room, Parking, Launch Field
Organisation in general
Debriefing, [we could go] home early
Parking very good
huge parking area, good cooperation with local police (traffic guiding)
i liked many CLP [launch areas]
i liked many CLP [launch areas]; but CLP4 [had] no launchmasters?; Briefing room; friendly officials
i liked very much the loggers; very good competition director
easy access + parking at the center, traffic guidance; long refuelling times (allowed to schedule breakfast/dinner)
wireless internet for results
Friendly, inexpensive, good weather
Debrecen and the organisation
great OPS centre facilities, wireless internet
easy farmer relations, fast retrieving
Good team of Organisers did a good Job

room for improvement - could be done better

no arrival arrows [signs]; refuelling: slow
Easier Check in
Accomodation, Social Events, Refuelling, …
Give Pilots more responsibility: Loggers with markering possibilities and more ILP´s
Check in very slow, in the queue for 2 1/2 hours
commmunication (1) Good to do entry on the web, otherwise poor communication, except for Mathijs-mails
reception (2): slow check-in otherwise ok
(5) refuelling opened [too] late at short flights
Social event, missed the observers
I would like more information by post. I have no printer and therefore I cannot get everthing on paper.
We (target team) could hardly understand the points of the briefing (accoustics), so we did not get everything we might need.
For similar MSA competitions local organisers should contact landowner organisations and owner offices in local communities so that target searchers know where/how to contact owners.
breakfast before briefing is ok, but should not be the same every day.
Improvements: access to the internet (PCs, not only wireless)
Improvements: Faster check in; Promotion of the europeans in the city;
improvement: the closing ceremony [was too] late
check in procedure too long; refuelling long waiting; please think about farmers! It is not only a job for the pilot! Clearly, this season, there was less place for landing, a specially with many wind! (we were lucky)
no FLY Ins; better communications and information from the organisers.
imrove refuelling; slow check in
no promotion; no arrival arrows [signs]
information about social events (e.g. night glow, air show) should be improved
check in procedure must take maximum 30-40 min, not 2 1/2 hours
Clearer advance notice of scheduled events needs to be improved.

the pre-event information was poor and confusing. Information on expected temperatures would have been useful (to know what clothes to bring)
computers for internet for competitiors; LAN in hall did not always work
check in procedure to be changed in rulebook so that the process can be speeded up
social gathering was missing, like a (cheap) group-meal. CHECK in system by Fax weeks ahead of the event.
Sightseeing or other alternative Programme for non-flying days would be nice.
improvable: Check in was tooooooo slow (took three hours)
quicker registration
The organisers could have offered some activity [programme] on the days we didn't fly.
social events were missing (not every day but 2 during the week would be nice);
check in was far too long (make 2 or 3 rows instead of 1, make pre check in via email)
refueling was too time consuming (make more than 1 row or find other place with access from 3 sides)
Opening and closing ceremonies seemed to be not well organised

Event Questionnaire / Questionary for the European Championship 2005
held at Debrecen, Hungary. --- individual comments on the questions

Competition Part of the Europeans 2005:

1. Are you generally satisfied with the competition pleasure of this Event?
2. Are you satisfied with the Task-setting?
3. Are you satisfied with the competition area in general?
4. Are you satisfied with the competition map (accuracy, features)?
5. How did you like the preparation / display of the Weather ?
6. Are you satisfied with the response time, result publication speed?

individual remarks / comments

positively noted / I liked:

Box over Town avoided Problems with low flying
Test more the skills of the pilot, involve crews
The box, M2m, angle flight
short debriefing
Competition with logger and without observer went much better than expected.
very creative[ly] use of task while less wind; briefings
use only logger
3d-flying
i liked the creativity of the Championship director in the first eight tasks.
creative use of logger system.
it was a great experience and [I] enjoyed it very much!

room for improvement - could be done better

I thought that the task setting was poor and ill thought out leading to either inachievable goals and/or dangerous flying.
4 [times] Hare and Hound is too much
Better opening ceremony
No Limit - the task setting by software!!! [don't limit the task setting by scoring software]
When using 5 second logging interval you get a moment of random, especially at hight wind speeds.
No climbs faster than 400ft/min
include observers and make a combination of loggers and observers. Missing the neutral observer to penalize
Quick ascends and descents caused dangerous situations in certain tasks (especially [task] Nr. 1)

Competition with oberservers improve the contact between officials and observers, as an official we hardly get in contact with the pilots and teams.
More tasks in general should have been set in the smoother and nicer east part of the competition area (more grass fields…)
Wanted: more socialising after the flights [due to] [lika a] dinner together like in Chatellerault
Improvements: [it was] not [a] good timing of event - autum is better
better meteo; Web [internet] meteo like in the past; better meteo from now [wanted]
Improvements: Meteo: also information for the future days / hours. Safety: clear answer with air law questions.
Do a seperate ranking for "normal" balloons and for "racers"
some tasks were set too long; i think 3 hours tasks in 30°C is not good [task setting]
MET: Also there should have been consistency between the information given (some in meters some in feet)
improvable: the lack of creativity during the last 3 flights of the competition
met forecast should be [of] good [quality] for such a competition

disliked the limited timing of some flights: some Tasks could not be finished. Disliked that the CD reassured himself that it was ok - it was NOT ok;
timetables and road signs (maps to get here at first) [were missing]
choose an area with better roads
send provisional results pilots from their PC terminal check in to a computer screen in the public area)
Provide at least two places for the results - We had some hundred interested people looking at one board.

Did not like the excuse "my software can it only handle that way". Let us fly tasks for skill-measurement, don't let the scoring software limit this (just make the software smarter or do some results by analysing the tracks by hand -- e.g. by finding the crossing point of the track with a boundary road.)

Improvement: The weather info should include a trend how the wind will be changing in the next 3 hours, not only that it becomes more variable.
Last task should not be solo flight
better meteo info

Event Questionnaire / Questionary for the European Championship 2005
held at Debrecen, Hungary. --- individual comments on the questions

Tasks & Scoring with GPS Loggers at the Europeans 2005:

1. In General: do you prefer competition with Loggers or Observers?
2. Do you think results are more objective with Loggers then with Observers ?
   Some of the standard Tasks are not feasible / manageable with Loggers.
3. Do you think the loss of old tasks is compensated by the new tasks that are now possible with the Logger scoring? (In slightly other words: is there enough task variety with the Logger scoring)
4. Are you satisfied with the 3-dimensional scoring?
5. Does flying with Loggers make ballooning competition safer?
6. Do you think the shortcomings of the Logger System today can be overcome by changes in rules or equipment in the future?

individual remarks / comments

I think that the present calculation is too crude and favors pilots who dive down very fast to goals. My suggestion is that we continue to use 3-dimensional scoring but within this calculation use HALF the balloon height.

Loger 4+5: The 3D scoring at targets makes people descent/ascent rapidly, which could be dangerous in crouwded air. Should be changed to 2D or e.g. multiple altitude with 0.10 or 0.05. 3D scoring is good at Box and similar Task. Box is a good task as you can have it over a city. Also good to avoid low flying which reduces the risk for disturbing cattle.

If you are having in future competitions with loggers you might as well have championships in simulators. Cost go down, always good weather and still no fun for lots of pilots and crew and oberserveers/measuring teams. We now are not looking for the best pilot but for the best computer technician.

Our suggestion is that the altitude in 3D scoring should be considered for safety reasons.

1. You have to change lots of the rules, in there there is only the first step done. 2. You have to improve the loggers itself. 3. You have to think about the amount of officials and the functions to be done.

A combination of both (loggers and observers) would be the best. A competition director should have the possibility to set a flight with oberservers and the next without observers (in this case they are the measuring team).

1) both;

we have to work on better loggers

one of the logger switched off once

the loggers are good for the pilots with much money, they can buy computers and GPS!! The Mix [of] Observers and Loggers is the best. The Logger is not safe, balloons high and too much same [balloons fly high and at the same altitude?]

it is not possible to do a different scoring for normal balloons (or "over 60" pilots). Too fast ascent or descent rates should be penalized. Now with loggers it is possible.

the best combination would be experienced observers and GPS loggers; Observers: should do their work as expected (measure, even if it is hard to do); should help pilots (on demand); - should observe the compliance of the flight with the rules (landowner, behaviour, ...)   GPS Logger should not be able to manipulate; should have the possibility to "drop marker" button (& store information); should be more satisfying [working] in hot conditions & near powerlines and other electrical/magnetical fields.

loggers + 3 dimensional scoring results in a lot of fast descents and ascents. This appears dangerous. By giving such a high penalty (m2) for the vertical component thsi seems excessive and denies the skill of a pilot who makes a good [marker] drop from 2000 ft but ends up close to the cross but just over the 100m [Marker scoring area]

with logger scoring a pilot who drops a marker from 6000 ft may get a score of 30 m while another pilot dropping a marker from the same height an place, but not getting in the [marker] scoring area will get a result of 2000m. This type of scoring does not reflect the skill of the pilot.

at briefings: describe rules for task setting of virtuals [3d-tasks] better

i dont think that the competitions will be successful without observers. We need them to make the competitions more fun and to fly different tasks.

keep on going

rules should not be written after what software can do. They should be as fair as possible for the competitors. It is possible to write a scoring program, but maybe not in Excel.

3) hard to tell with [Weather] conditions this week. 5) Hard to say

I can accept a mixture [of Logger and Observer];

4) raceballoons are a danger;

5) see above.

3- create logger with PDG/FON facility (keypad with display for coordinate input)

4- keep 3D portion in scoring 100% (=full 3D scoring). If it's felt that there are too big jumps from Marker in MSA at 99 m to Marker just out and 3D result is e.g. 200 m (because of the altitude), then make MSA smaller (e.g. 10 m). Then nobody will try to mark from the altitude but everybody come down and mark low.

5- if in future rules the climbing speed is limited, then maybe yes

I think that 3-dimensional scoring leads pilots to fly unsafe manoevers to get a better score close to the ground

logger is technically objective in the recordings, but it cannot talk to the landowner. 3) many more tasks are possible now, but don't overdo it (3 staggered boxes is like overkill)

4) 3d-distance is probably higher than a (risky) high marker drop, that made some pilots scream down near targets. Lets reduce the altitude factor in the contribution to the result (1/3)

4) with a changed altitude-scoring we can come back to smoother flying without skydiving and fast ascends.

6) sure we will develop and come to a better future.

In General: we see the advantages of loggers (controll of heights, PZ infringements, tasks as LRN, ANG where only position is needed) but loggeras and 3-d Scoriung are not only unsafe (balloons are "crashing" down), you won't earn the points you deserve when height is calculated. A combination of observers and loggers must give the best combination with the most variety - possibilities and controll on safety limits. But please throw the 3-d scoring away!

Observers are important in recruiting new crew, pilots and officials. Also land owner related issues might increase.