

Urgent Proposals

From the WGAC Jury President –

1. Positioning K-Factor

When no electronic positioning system is available, the K-Factor for Positioning should be increased to **25** K for UNL and **20** K for ADV.

Rationale: The current K-Factor of 15 was set considering either line judges or an electronic system. Without an electronic system in use, the positioning score awarded by the judges is the only measure of the quality of positioning and it should be upgraded accordingly.

The above figures are proportional to the K-Factors used in power.

This proposal was unanimously supported by the GAC in its meeting on 16 July 2019.

2. Discrepancy between PZ and HZ

Sub-para 4.5.3.1.b) (Part 1 4.4.3.2.1.b)) must be amended to align it with sub-para 4.5.2.1.f) (Part 1: 4.4.2.1.f))

In Part 2 the reference to loops should be removed, because it is irrelevant in glider aerobatics. The second half sentence must be removed, as it contradicts sub-para 4.5.2.1.f) Rolls of more than 45° on the exit line of a rolling turn must be marked PZ and no other.

Sub-para 4.5.3.1.b) should then read:

"When rolls are superimposed on a turn (rule 4.5.1.8), the roll is finished but 90° or more of the turn still remains to be flown."

3. Accommodation for International Judges

When it comes to organising accommodation for the judges, organisers usually point to para 3.9 of the guide to championship organisation, which specifies that "rooms will normally be multiple-occupancy". This paragraph, however, explicitly refers to "participants".

On the other hand, para 16.1 only lists how many judges must be accommodated, but does not specify whether the rooms should be single or multiple.

We all agree that the job of the judges is not an easy one. Sitting at the line for many hours in any kind of weather and staying attentive all the time is demanding both physically and mentally. These persons deserve to stay by themselves overnight to get optimum rest.

Therefore, I consider it only appropriate to plan single rooms as standard for the judges.

From the WIAC Jury President –

4. Allowed figures for programmes 2, 3 and 4.

On page 19, paragraph 2.3.1.4 of Section 6 Part 1 it is mentioned that 1 figure from family 7.8.1 to 7.8.8 is allowed for Yak 52 and Intermediate. In the list of allowed unknown figures on page 63 however none of the figures (Cuban eights) is tagged for Yak 52/Intermediate.

Rationale: This must be clarified. Either remove the figure from the list of allowed figures in the table on page 19 or add the tags for Yak 52/Intermediate on page 63.

5. Paragraph 4.4.3.1 – list of elements for a mark of Hard Zero.

In letter b) it is still mentioned that rolling on axis of more than 90 degrees has to be marked as HZ. In 2019 a new rule for roll on exit heading was introduced. This rule, paragraph B.9.3.6 letter l) sub-letter ii) defines rolling on axis of more than 45 degrees as a Perception Zero. This is clearly contradictory. After a chat with the creator of the afterwards as rule adopted proposal (Nick Buckenham) one of the clear intentions was to remove the necessity of verifying this error on a video because it is in most cases impossible and leads only to long discussions. The IJ therefore concludes that para 4.4.3.1 was missed to be changed accordingly.

Rationale: Housekeeping

6. Appendix A

List of figures for Programmes 2,3 and 4: The information on page 53 regarding limitations on figures should be visible next to the figures concerned in the catalogue of unknown figures. Somebody trying to select a figure for an unknown (eg. during figure drawing) might easily miss the additional information available on page 39. Especially when there are already printed restrictions next to the figure concerned, she/he might assume that the restrictions are complete. A possible easy solution could be to add at least a reference to page 39 in the notes within the unknown catalogue.

Rationale: Avoid time consuming discussions regarding elements/figures being allowed or disallowed.

7. Submission of figures by the International Jury in case of fewer than 10 NACs

Remove the sentence “These figures must be of the average difficulty of the figures submitted by the NACs and cover Families not represented by them.” from para 2.3.1.3.

Rationale: This sentence is difficult to follow to the letter and doesn't really make sense.

From the WGAC / WAGAC Chief Judge –

As a result of experiences and discussions with the IJ, I propose to amend the following paras in Section 6, part 2 (changes in red):

8. Paragraph B.8.1.6 – Inside Lines

All lines that occur inside a figure are preceded and followed by part-loops (Figure 9). The absolute length of lines within a figure is in itself not a marking criterion. The corresponding attitude, however, must be maintained **constant** long enough to allow judges to observe the angle and determine any deviations from the prescribed plane of flight. **Varying the attitude, making the line appear curved, must be downgraded by one (1) point.**

Rationale: This aims at my so called “Bananas”. A line should be a line a not a half loop or a

big bend. The judges need to have a way to penalize this without having the need for a HZ because of wrong figure flown.

9. Paragraph B.9.10.5 – Loops

To better quantify deductions for irregularity of the radius of looping figures, the judge divides the loop into quadrants. **Any recognizable variation in the radius must be downgraded by a maximum of two (2) points per occurrence** depending on the magnitude of the variation.

Following paragraphs B.9.10.6 through B.9.10.8 contain no useful guidance for judges and should be deleted.

Rationale: There is no clear specification for the roundness of the loop and what the judge should deduct if it's a famous "egg" or "plumb". So this fills a hole in the rules.

From the EAAC Jury President and the WAC Chief Judge –

10. Standards required for video recording of championship flights

At EAAC and for different reasons to a lesser extent at WAC this year the video recordings made of competition flights to enable the judging panel to determine accurate matters of fact were not to an acceptable standard. At EAAC on at least one occasion when a review was requested the aeroplane was not even within the video window because the operator was simply unable to keep the hand-held domestic quality recorder pointed accurately at it; at WAC the video recording equipment looked 'professional' and was mounted on a chunky tripod, but friction or stick-slip in the tripod's gimbal head frequently led to jerky movements and occasional out-of-frame moments here too. Clearly if an important moment is missed by the video system this can lead to a critical inability to accurately mark a figure, and the programme and/or championship results will be adversely affected.

At 3.17 the CIVA Guide to Contest Organisation (GCO) has:

The use of video equipment through a long series of competition aerobatic flights to the standard necessary to reliably resolve matters of fact when required by the Chief Judge is a complex and demanding task. Dependence on amateur capabilities and domestic equipment can easily lead to inability to meet this requirement, with a direct and potentially damaging impact on the accuracy of championship results.

I suggest that paragraph 4.5.5.3 (Part-1) be revised as follows, and that in Part-2 this paragraph should be added to provide a similar instruction:

- 4.5.5.3. The Organiser must provide quality equipment with qualified operators to insure useful information is provided to the judges and International Jury for their decisions. **The International Jury is responsible for checking that the video operator and equipment are able to consistently meet this requirement, and if necessary to demand that the organiser provides a replacement system to ensure that the requisite standard can be reliably met throughout the event.**

Ends.