



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*



CIVA Rules Committee Report

Based on Rules & Judging Committees Joint Meeting

Agenda item 13.1

Version 1.1 / 29 October 2020

INTRODUCTION

The Rules and the Judging Committees jointly met online (over Zoom) in two consecutive sessions on August 5th and 6th, 2020.

In attendance:

Rules Committee (RC):

Matthieu Roulet - Chairman (FRA), Nick Buckenham (GBR), Elena Klimovich (RUS), Philippe Kuchler (CHE), Hanspeter Rohner (CHE), Pierre Varloteaux (FRA)

Judging Committee (JC):

Pierre Varloteaux - Chairman (FRA), John Gaillard (ZAF), Elena Klimovich (RUS), Philippe Kuchler (CHE), Vladimir Machula (CZE), Mikhail Mamistov (RUS)

Observers:

Mike Gallaway (USA), Quintin Hawthorne (ZAF, session #2 only), Carole Holik (CAN), Steinar Østby (NOR)

After the deadline of 15 July 2020 for the submission of Sporting Code “Normal Proposals”, the meeting package was assembled, and distributed on 26 July to the CIVA Bureau, RC / JC / GAC members, and to all CIVA Delegates.

In this report, we have summarized the actions taken by RC/JC Committees on the Power proposals (applicable to Section 6 Part 1). Actions on Glider proposals taken by the GAC (applicable to Section 6 Part 2) are reported in a separate Agenda report.

Those proposals submitted by Delegates which did not survive the RC / JC review are not included in this report, for the sake of brevity.

Passing the RC / JC review is the result of a consensus or majority decision by the attending Committee members, that those proposals shall be considered by the Plenary. Please note that passing this review does not necessarily imply that the RC / JC recommend those proposals to be adopted.

In one particular instance and by exception to the RC / JC usual practice, NP2021-19 is put forward to Plenary with a recommendation to reject – see detailed explanations in this document under the NP2021-19 headline.

Also for the sake of brevity, proposals are not reproduced in full in this report. Please refer to the CIVA “Rule Proposals for 2021” document for full details and rationales.



Matthieu Roulet
Chairman, CIVA Rules Committee
26 September 2020

NP2021-1:

Source: ARG #1

Document: **Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2** or tbd

Subject: List of available aircraft for rent

Proposal:

The organisers of World or Open Continental Championships to publish a list of aircraft available for rent by foreign pilots planning to participate.

The list must be published together with Bulletin #1 and must at least specify number of aircraft available, types and estimated cost of rental. The list must also indicate the conditions under which the aircraft may be rented and operated (licenses, insurances etc.). It's suggested to include the list with at least type, number available and estimated cost in the bids to be voted by the CIVA meeting.

Note from RC: The proposal has merit. The RC concluded that it was not relevant to the Sporting Code itself, and also identified some challenges in its implementation (impossibility for the Organiser to commit on such things in the bid and even later as in the end an agreement must be found between the aircraft owner and the pilot...). It is suggested to create a CIVA Working Group to make concrete progress on this important matter, e.g. by creating a tool to foster information exchange and support.

NP2021-2:

Source: ARG #2

Document: **Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2** or tbd

Subject: Nominating a point of contact for overseas participants

Proposal:

Organisers of World or Open Continental Championships to nominate a person to serve as point of contact for overseas participants. This person should assist participants in obtaining documentation required in the organising country in order to be able to fly with rented aircraft or to operate a foreign aircraft in the organising country.

Note from RC: The proposal has merit. The RC concluded that it was not relevant to the Sporting Code itself, but rather to the GCO (Guide to Championship Organisation) document. And this would be helpful for all participants, not only for "overseas" ones.

NP2021-3:

Source: ARG #3

Document: **Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2** or tbd

Subject: Create a Fund to subsidize participants from overseas

Proposal:

Organisers of Open Continental Championships to use 10% of entry fees to create a fund to subsidize participants from overseas. The money will be used to cover a maximum of 50% of their entry fees.

Note from RC: The concern is understood. However the proposal embeds ramifications and potential issues that would best be addressed outside of the RC, by an ad hoc Working Group – e.g. boundary conditions and limitations (definition of “overseas”, subsidies allocation formula,...), potential extension of scheme to World championships, whether support should come from increased entry fees (to which extent?) or through other means,... Such topics are not directly Sporting Code-related, hence the recommendation to create a CIVA WG.

NP2021-6:

Source: GBR #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Competitor eligibility in Intermediate

Proposal **amended by RC (RC amendments highlighted):**

- Modify 1.2.4.1. as follows (changes underlined).

1.2.4.1. A competitor who achieves an aggregate score of 60% or more in the programmes he/she flew (excluding the Final Freestyle Programme) at a World or Continental **Unlimited** aerobatic championship for powered aircraft, may subsequently participate in a **lower category power World or Continental Advanced** championship only in an Hors Concours capacity during that calendar year and the following two calendar years, subject to acceptance by the organiser as per 1.2.6.4. A competitor who has previously **completed at least one Programme** in a World or Continental aerobatic championship for powered aircraft in the Unlimited or Advanced **class category** at any time, may subsequently participate in an Intermediate category power championship only in an Hors Concours capacity, subject to acceptance by the organiser as per 1.2.6.4.

- **Delete 1.2.4.2. accordingly.**

1.2.4.2. The ranking of championship categories (higher to lower) for the purpose of rule 1.2.4.1 shall be:
a) **Unlimited**
b) **Advanced**

c) ~~Intermediate~~

Note from RC: Amendment brought to better define meaning of “who has previously competed”. The rest of the amendments are editorials.

NP2021-7:

Source: GBR #2
Document: Section 6 Part 1
Subject: Time limit Programme 1

Proposal:

- Modify 3.10.1.1. as follows (changes underlined).

3.10.1. Time Limits

3.10.1.1. Programme 1 will have a time limit of 12 minutes in all classes from the moment the aircraft is observed in flight by the Chief Judge / timers.

NP2021-8:

Source: GBR #3
Document: Section 6 Part 1
Subject: Time limit Programmes 2-4

Proposal:

- Modify 3.10.1.2. as follows (changes underlined).

3.10.1.2. Programmes 2-4 will have a time limit of 12 minutes.

NP2021-11:

Source: HUN #1
Document: Section 6 Part 1
Subject: Team competition

Proposal amended by RC (RC amendments highlighted):

- Modify 1.2.6.1. (and other subsequent paragraphs so that these modifications apply to all championships) as follows (changes underlined).

1.2.6.1.a)i) Every NAC shall notify the Organizer of a World Championships, not less than two months before it is due to start, of the number of competing pilots to be entered from their countries up to a maximum of twelve (12). Of these pilots, no more than eight (8) may be of the same gender. Of these pilots, a maximum of three (3), regardless of gender, can be eligible to a team medal. The names of these three (3) pilots will have to shall be given, at registration on site, by every NAC composed of four (4) pilots or more (regardless of gender) before the official start of the competition. All NAC composed of three (3) pilots (or less, when applicable) will have all pilots eligible for team medal without the need of any notification (...)

[Detailed wording tbd to take into account case of gender teams vs mixed teams, and perhaps case of teams of two vs teams of three]

- Modify chapter 5 (Awards) accordingly.

NP2021-15:

Source: RUS #4

Document: **Section 6 Part 1** or tbd

Subject: Separation of Advanced and Unlimited events

Proposal:

Advanced and Unlimited Championships (in any order) to be separated at least by two weeks.

Note from RC: The concern is understood. However not considered relevant to the Sporting Code itself, rather to CIVA Governance, possibly on an "as far as possible" basis.

NP2021-16:

Source: RUS #5

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Ambient air temperature limitation

Proposal:

- Add 3.6.2.7. (in Meteorological Conditions \ Minima) as follows.

3.6.2.7. The lowest maximum ambient air temperature operational limit of participating airplanes type has to be set as an overall limit.

Note from RC: This proposal triggered a complex debate. On the one hand CIVA cannot promote flying beyond the certified envelope of certified aircraft, on the other hand for some aircraft types the Outside Air Temperature operational limit is set so low (30°C on some Sukhoi types) that CIVA competitions could easily be jeopardized. This topic needs an expert assessment, therefore it is recommended not to submit the proposal to Plenary at this stage, but more appropriately to create an expert Working Group to investigate, report and recommend a workable solution which may then reach approval latest at the next Plenary.

NP2021-17:

Source: ZAF #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: Accommodation of judges for judges briefing

Proposal:

- Add in 1.3.2.3 (Representation on the Board of Judges) the following.

The organisers shall take into consideration the travel schedules of judges and officials when making allowance for their hotel accommodation, ensuring that their arrival is in time to attend the compulsory judges briefing. The organisers must allow for an additional night's hotel accommodation if needed.

NP2021-19:

Source: SPA #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Remove Gender Distinction from Unlimited World and Continental Aerobatic Championships (Power)

Proposal:

- Remove all references to gender distinction (male v. female) from the Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1. That would include, but not necessarily be limited to: Unlimited team composition, Final Freestyle selection criteria, Unknown figure nominations, awards, and titles.

Note from RC: This proposal had already been submitted in 2018 and in 2019, and in both cases had been unanimously rejected by the RC in its review (for reasons that were reported in detail), hence had not been submitted to Plenary. Unlike usual acceptance by NACs when proposals do not pass the RC review, Spain reacted in a way which created increasing turmoil within CIVA. Therefore, while the RC has not changed its unanimous view on the detrimental impact of this proposal, it came to the conclusion that the best course of

action at this stage was to put forward the proposal for examination, debate and vote by the Plenary, in order to de-escalate and ease unnecessary tensions.

In this process the RC would like to underline the following findings:

1. Current rules do not imply that “women are somehow less capable than men”. The claim that women would be subject to a “discrimination” is a wrong interpretation of our rulebook, which does not stand up to a careful analysis of the facts.
2. Women participation in CIVA championships is very low – without doubt a strategic concern for CIVA – and should be encouraged. The proposal would do just the opposite by discouraging women participation instead. A reality check provides the following facts (using the same 2013-2019 period as in the proposal, and incl. H/C in those counts):

- Power Unlimited

Unl		Men	Women	Wom %
WAC	2013	49	8	14%
EAC	2014	35	5	13%
WAC	2015	51	7	12%
EAC	2016	36	5	12%
WAC	2017	36	0	0%
EAC	2018	31	4	11%
WAC	2019	54	7	11%
Total		292	36	11%

- Power Advanced

Adv		Men	Women	Wom %
EAAC	2013	47	2	4%
WAAC	2014	61	5	8%
EAAC	2015	45	1	2%
WAAC	2016	52	3	5%
EAAC	2017	43	2	4%
WAAC	2018	56	0	0%
EAAC	2019	40	1	2%
Total		344	14	4%

- Glider

WGAC/WAGAC	Men	Women	Wom %
2013	56	3	5%
2014	65	3	4%
2015	75	4	5%
2016	55	4	7%
2017	56	2	3%
2018	55	2	4%
2019	46	4	8%
Total	408	22	5%

Conclusion from these tables: the only class/category with gender distinction (i.e. Power Unlimited) shows a consistent pattern of attracting more than twice the percentage amount of women compared to the other championships. This gives a clear indication that gender distinction provides an incentive for women participation, and that eliminating gender distinction could only have a negative effect on the number of women competitors.

Gender titles and medals also increase opportunities for public subsidies and private sponsorship, hence directly contribute to support participation.

3. The aspects discussed above are further confirmed and emphasized by several testimonies and opinion pieces received from women pilots competing in Power Unlimited. These will be shared with Delegates (separately from this report) so that a fully informed decision can be made by the Plenary. Their

statements converge towards a strong opposition to the proposal and a feeling that what would be discriminatory would actually be to eliminate the current gender distinction.

Therefore, eliminating gender distinction would undermine CIVA's purpose. The RC recommendation to the Plenary is to reject this proposal.

NP2021-20:

Source: SPA #2
Document: Section 6 Part 1
Subject: 45° up rotations in Unknown figures

Proposal amended by RC (RC amendments highlighted):

- Modify A.2.2.4. as follows (changes underlined).

A.2.2.4. Combinations of aileron roll first, and then flick roll, may be added in Families 1, 7 and 8 on 45° up lines set initially with a positive attitude from a positive looping segment. Flick rolls must be from wings level and have the lower co-efficient. The combined extent of rotation shall not exceed 540° with not more than 3 **4 3** stops.

NP2021-21:

Source: SPA #3
Document: Section 6 Part 1
Subject: 8-point roll at bottom of loop in Unknown figures

Proposal:

- Modify A.11.1.3. as follows (changes underlined).

A.11.1.3. Unlimited: Flick rolls are not permitted in figures in columns 3 and 4 of 7.4.1 to 7.4.4, nor on the lower lines of any figure in 7.4.5. Eight-point rolls (9.8.3.4) are not permitted on 7.4.1.3 or 7.4.1.4.

Note from RC: The eight-point roll restriction had been adopted at CIVA Plenary 2007 for entry into force in 2008.

NP2021-22:

Source: SPA #4
 Document: Section 6 Part 1
 Subject: Standardise unlinked and opposite aileron rolls in Unlimited

Proposal amended by RC (*RC amendments highlighted*):

- Modify A.2.2.2. as follows and remove A.2.2.3 (changes underlined).

A.2.2.2. On vertical and 45° **up** lines, opposite aileron rolls may be added as long as neither the total extent of rotation nor the number of stops exceed the limits shown in the table below.

Line Direction	Total Rotation	Stops
Vertical Up	450°	4
45° Up	540°	4
45° Down	450° 360° 540° *	<u>3</u>
Vertical Down	360°	3

A.2.2.3. Unlinked and opposite rolls are not permitted on 45° down lines.

** Note from RC: The initial proposal was submitted with 450° as rotation limit. Because 450° cannot happen, the RC made an amendment to 360°. However, in an e-mail dated 28 Oct 2020, Spain's Delegate A. Moore informed us that 450° was a typo in the initial submission, and should read 540° instead. This new version reestablishes the intent of the proposal (this is the only update in v1.1 of this document compared to v1.0 from 26 Sep 2020).*

NP2021-23:

Source: SPA #5
 Document: Section 6 Part 1
 Subject: Permit combination of flick rolls followed by aileron rolls on 45° line down

Proposal:

- Add A.2.2.6. as follows (changes underlined).

A.2.2.6. Combinations of flick roll first and then aileron rolls, may be added in Families 1, 7 and 8 on 45°down lines. The combined extent of rotation shall not exceed 540° with not more than 3 stops.

NP2021-24:

Source: SPA #6

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Permit flick rolls and aileron roll combinations

Proposal:

- Modify A.10.1.1. as follows (changes underlined).

A.10.1.1. All Categories: Flick rolls are not permitted on the horizontal entry lines of figures in columns 1 and 2, nor on the horizontal exit lines of figures in columns 3 and 4, of 7.2.1 to 7.2.4.

NP2021-25:

Source: SPA #7

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Remove the limitation in the number of flick rolls permitted in Programmes 2,3 and 4

Proposal:

- Remove paragraph in 2.3.1.4.a) “Total of Families 9.9 and 9.10 not to exceed six, at least one of which must be vertically climbing”.

Appendix 1 – Initial list of proposals from the “Rule Proposals for 2021” document

Highlighted in Yellow: Proposals for which the GAC and the RC/JC were to aim for a common position.

CIVA#	NAC	#	Subject	Allocation
NP2021-1	ARG	1	List of aircraft available for rent	RC / GAC / Bureau
NP2021-2		2	Point of contact for overseas participants	RC / GAC / Bureau
NP2021-3		3	Fund to subsidize participants from overseas	RC / GAC / Bureau
NP2021-4	FRA	1	Selection of Unknown figures	GAC
NP2021-5		2	Drawing of lots	GAC
NP2021-6	GBR	1	Competitor eligibility in Intermediate	RC
NP2021-7		2	Time limit Programme 1	RC / JC
NP2021-8		3	Time limit Programmes 2-4	RC / JC
NP2021-9		4	Safety manoeuvres Programme 1	RC / JC
NP2021-10		5	World championships in same year for all cat.	RC / Bureau
NP2021-11	HUN	1	Team medal eligibility	RC / GAC
NP2021-12	RUS	1	Entry fee with options	GAC
NP2021-13		2	Increasing the number of Free Unknowns	GAC
NP2021-14		3	Cable release conditions	GAC
NP2021-15		4	Separation of Advanced and Unlimited events	RC / Bureau
NP2021-16		5	Ambiant air temperature limitation	RC
NP2021-17	SAF	1	Accommodation of judges for judges briefing	RC / JC / GAC /
NP2021-18		2	CIVA scoring software stability	RC / JC / GAC / Bureau
NP2021-19	SPA ¹	1	Remove Gender Distinction in Power Unl	RC / Bureau
NP2021-20		2	45° up rotations in Unknown figures	RC / JC
NP2021-21		3	8-point roll at bottom of loop in Unknown fig.	RC / JC
NP2021-22		4	Roll combinations in Unknown figures	RC / JC
NP2021-23		5	45° down rotations in Unknown figures	RC / JC
NP2021-24		6	Flick rolls on exit lines in Unknown figures	RC / JC
NP2021-25		7	Unlimited number of flick rolls in Prog. 2-4	RC / JC
NP2021-26	GAC	1	New concept for Glider Unknown sequences	GAC

¹ In addition, Spain submitted a proposal to evolve the calendar of CIVA meetings from one to two per year. This proposal on CIVA governance has no connection to the CIVA Sporting Code, hence cannot be in the scope of the Committees review, subject of this document. Therefore and in order to avoid any confusion, that proposal is not included in this document. The remaining proposals have been renumbered.

Appendix 2 – Check-list on all items in the “Rule Proposals for 2021” document

In red what was discussed in the RC/JC meeting

Item	Part 1 for Plenary vote (incl. with amendments)	Rejected by RC/JC or Withdrawn	Part 2 (incl. with amendments)	Other	Comment
NP 2021-1				✓	Not Sporting Code => Working Group proposed
NP 2021-2				✓	Not Sporting Code => GCO
NP 2021-3				✓	Not Sporting Code => Working Group proposed
NP 2021-4					
NP 2021-5					
NP 2021-6	✓				
NP 2021-7	✓				
NP 2021-8	✓				
NP 2021-9		✗			Current safety & practice manoeuvres deemed sufficient (incl. inverted push to vertical)
NP 2021-10		✗			Alternating Unl and Adv World championship years important for National Team budgeting and for maintaining visibility of Adv
NP 2021-11	✓				
NP 2021-12					
NP 2021-13					
NP 2021-14					
NP 2021-15				✓	Not Sporting Code => CIVA Governance
NP 2021-16	n.a.	n.a.			Complex topic, recommending expert WG to investigate and propose workable solution for Plenary 2021
NP 2021-17	✓				
NP 2021-18	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		Withdrawn after satisfactory solution implemented (availability of previous software version)
NP 2021-19	✓				Special case – RC recommendation to reject
NP 2021-20	✓				
NP 2021-21	✓				
NP 2021-22	✓				
NP 2021-23	✓				
NP 2021-24	✓				
NP 2021-25	✓				
NP 2021-26					