CIVA Catalogue Committee Report

This year the committee rejected proposal NP2024-10, which sought to address deficiencies in the scoring of rolls on the bottom of looping segments. While the proposal rightly stated that “these rotations are much harder to execute than on straight horizontal lines or on curved lines on top of loops,” our response was this:

NP2024-10: this seems logical because the proposal rightly points out that these rolls are much more challenging than rolls on level lines. One side effect of this addition would be that K values would be specified for rotations that will probably (hopefully) never be used, like a 1 3/4, 2x8 combination at the bottom of a loop. It seems much easier to add a footnote to the base figures that says "add 2k to any roll applied at the bottom of the looping portion".

While I sympathize with the effort to make the K values fully reflect the challenge of each figure, this proposal would not modify the K value enough to justify the added complexity. Ultimately I emailed the rules chair that it could be rejected for being too granular.

It also happens that without some contact with the Aresti family I am unclear on how any changes could actually be adopted. So on that basis alone we are not able to process any requests for changes, unless we were to adopt a policy of creating a separate book with our preferred exceptions to the Aresti tables.

Aresti Committee Report:

I’ve reached out to the Aresti family several times with no response, each time simply introducing myself and asking if we could enjoy a conversation by telephone or video conference.

I understood when I took this position on as Chair that it could be difficult to establish contact. My most recent effort was in the form of a postal letter.

If I am able to make contact I will report any results.

My understanding is that the FAI’s goals are reasonable and meager, with the hope of reestablishing contact to simply make the catalog more accessible.