AGENDA ITEM #8

Recommendations for Rules Changes for the Year 2005 (Powered Aerobatics)

The CIVA Rules and Judging Sub-Committees met in Ljungbyhed, Sweden on 5 August 2004 to consider various NAC proposals for 2005. The attendance at the meeting was as follows:

Present: Mike Heuer, Alan Cassidy, Lars Frölander, John Gaillard, Robert Chomono, Osmo Jalovaara

Apologies: Jiri Kobrle, Howard Stock, Liz Cook, Philippe Jean, Steve Green, Helmut Stas

Observers: Michel Dupont, Madelyne Delcroix

The following is a summary of the proposals which are recommended for adoption at the 2004 CIVA plenary meeting in Madrid. These proposals are for Section 6 and Parts 1 and 3, CIVA Regulations (Unlimited and Advanced Categories). The Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee will report separately.

The proposals which were adopted or modified are presented below in boxes. Those not recommended by Sub-Committee will not be considered by CIVA during the plenary meeting. Explanation as to why these proposals were not recommended is provided.

CZECH REPUBLIC

The Czech Republic proposed that penalties for height infringements be limited to only one penalty per figure. More than one penalty can be given per figure in current Regulations.

Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. It was their opinion that it would be dangerous to reduce the penalties as these are meant to discourage low flying. Since there have been few low altitude penalties assessed in recent years due to their severity, the Sub-Committees felt it would be a mistake to change the rules. These Regulations are meant to promote safety and should not be diluted.

FRANCE

Proposal #1 suggested that the number of competitors at Continental Championships be increased to the same as World Championships. The competitors would be limited to 10 pilots including no more than 6 of the same gender.

Sub-Committees agreed with the proposal and recommend its adoption.

Proposal #2 pointed out an error in 1.4.2.5.(a) of CIVA Regulations, Part 3 (Advanced).

Sub-Committees agreed that this was an error and should be corrected in the next revision.

Proposal #3 asked for clarification on the meaning of 1.4.2.5. regarding marking when a pilot aborts due to deterioration in the weather conditions. The Sub-Committee agreed to change the wording in the lead paragraph as follows:

1.4.2.5. A competitor may discontinue his or her sequence in level flight at the end of a figure if, in his or her opinion, the weather conditions do not comply with the competition rules, …

Proposal #4 pointed out another error in Part 3, paragraph 2.1.2.1. The wording in the Advanced Regulations was apparently copied from Unlimited by mistake. This is a minor editorial change and the Sub-Committees agreed to the revision.

Proposal #5 suggested that opposite and unlinked rolls be permitted on the upper lines of figures 7.7.1 and 7.7.2 (square loops) in the Part 3 (Advanced) Unknown Appendix.

Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. It was their opinion that this proposal would penalize low performance aircraft in Advanced.

Proposal #6 proposed the addition of all of the Eights of Family 7 to the Advanced Unknown list of figures.

The Sub-Committees agreed with the sense of the proposal but modified it to include Families 7.23 through 7.30 except those which are "double-negative" Eights.

GREAT BRITAIN

Great Britain proposed the deletion of the table under 2.2 - Basis for Marking … The table provides no information not available elsewhere.

The Sub-Committees agreed to the proposal.

Great Britain also proposed the deletion of certain parts of the Catalogue which were made obsolete with the elimination of cross-over spins. A new paragraph 25 and new figures 24 and 25 were proposed.

The Sub-Committees agreed to the proposal.

ITALY

Proposal #1 called for a return to a random drawing of lots for all competitors and for all Programmes.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. This same proposal has been made on numerous occasions by various Delegates with good intent. While "random order" seems to offer the most fairness, the present procedure to use rank order in reverse has now been in place for several years. Its original purpose was to place closely-ranked pilots in similar weather and wind conditions. This would mean a more "level playing field" for those of similar skill and ranking in order to achieve a more objective result in the Championships.

The Sub-Committees believe this reasoning is still valid today. To take the pressure off the top pilot(s), the random draw for the top 10 pilots was introduced last year. This has been successful in those Championships held since and is not a problem to administer.

While any system has flaws, the Sub-Committees believe the present rules are workable and fair and voted to continue with no change.

Proposal #2 asked for NAC's to be given final approval over CIVA's selection of Jury members and Judges. The proposal went on to say that "subjects in conflict with national team" should be excluded.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. It was their opinion that such a proposal goes against both the sense and the wording of the General Section of Sporting Code which specifically states that Judges and Jury members are "international" officials. While every NAC, through their Delegate, can nominate people to serve as Judges or Jury members, it was also quite clear that giving Delegates a veto power over CIVA selections would seriously harm the system of "international supervision and control" as well as the judging at FAI aerobatic championships.

Indeed, CIVA has moved away from the idea that Judges, for example, were members of Teams. This flawed concept was in place for many years, by mistake, and has only recently been corrected. Sub-Committees felt it is not the time to turn the clock back on the progress we are making to achieve fair judging and honest supervision of Championship events.

RUSSIA

Proposal #1 asks for 1.4.2.5. (a) and (c) to be changed to avoid situations where pilots gain an advantage in altitude/energy or positioning by skipping figures or performing incorrect figures during the re-fly of a Programme that was aborted for weather. The proposal also inserts language in (a) which makes it clear that a repeat flight may be made of Programmes 2 and 3 (Unknowns in Unlimited) if the Jury decides a re-fly is in order.

In the case of skipped or wrong figures flown in the repeated Programme, these figures would be zeroed in the first scored sequence that was originally flown before the weather abort.

The Sub-Committees agreed with the proposal and it is recommended to CIVA.

Proposal #2 called for a maximum of **8** flick rolls in Unknown Programmes (Unlimited) and no more than 5 from the same family.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. It was their view that the present maximum of 6 flick rolls and no more than 4 from the same family is sufficient.

Proposal #3 asked for the deletion of the 2 point penalty for 5 degrees of deviation on the vertical up line in the tailslide. The proposal stated that since 1 point per 5 degrees of deviation is the normal downgrade in all other figures, it should be the same for the tailslide.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. When this rule was introduced, it was and remains widely recognized that "cheating" on the up line into the tailslide is commonly practiced. The "cheat" is introduced by the pilot in order to avoid having the aircraft fall the wrong way resulting in a zero. Since the "cheat" is so commonly seen, the Sub-Committees agreed with the original logic behind the proposal for a 2 point degrade which provides for a much more severe penalty for deviation from the vertical line. In this way, pilots who fly the figure properly are rewarded for their skill and proper execution of the figure.

Proposal #4 would shift some figure errors into "soft zero" classification which are currently found in 2.4.8. Thus, these figures could not be conferenced or videos reviewed.

The Sub-Committees did not act on this proposal and recommends that no action be taken pending additional experience with the new "hard zero/soft zero" system. As the Sub-Committees met before the beginning of AWAC, that experience had not yet been realized. The Chief Judge of AWAC will have more comments on the system in his own report to CIVA.

Proposal #5 asked that wording of changes agreed by CIVA must be accepted at the plenary meeting in order for them to appear in Sporting Code and CIVA Regulations.

The Sub-Committees did not disagree with what we believe was the "principle" behind this Russian proposal. Every Delegate should expect that the proposals he or she votes upon during plenary meeting will find its way properly into the Regulations. This is the reason we meet each year and have a lengthy rules-making process.

However, for many years, we have only expected Delegates to submit their general ideas and concepts for change in the Regulations and not the exact wording. Some have provided this wording but most proposals do not include it. It is left to the Bureau and Sub-Committee members to insert these approved proposals into the Regulations in proper language that is in accordance with the wishes of CIVA. This is not an easy task.

If CIVA were to approve every word of each rule that was to be changed, a two-day plenary meeting would not be possible. Therefore, the Sub-Committees do not agree with this proposal though they understand its intent. They do not recommend its implementation. Further, we call upon any Delegate who has submitted a proposal which has been approved to bring to the President's attention any deviation from that proposal after it appears in print. Appropriate action will be taken.

SOUTH AFRICA

Proposal #1 calls for the awarding of FAI medals to winners of Programmes and/or Championships by "independent" entries. As it stands today, such pilots may only fly "hors concours". This means that their results do not appear in the Official Standings for the Championships. They fly, they are judged, but their scores do not count.

CIVA has permitted such a system of "independent" pilots for many years. Independent entries can be found at most WAC, AWAC, and EAC. It is good for organizers as it provides more entry fees and it is good for new pilots as it allows them to gain experience and exposure at FAI Championships. We have long felt that this was good for aerobatics.

However, the FAI system is built on national aero clubs (NAC's) who select pilots and teams to compete in Continental and World Championships. These NAC's provide representatives to the FAI and its various Air Sports Commissions. They also support FAI activities through their subscriptions. They are "members" of FAI and should expect membership privileges. By permitting independent entries to gain the possibility of winning FAI medals would erode the FAI structure.

Thus, the Sub-Committees were faced with three possibilities with this South African proposal: (1) to adopt it, (2) to discontinue the "independent" entries, or (3) to continue the present system.

Sub-Committees rejected the proposal and voted to keep the present system. While we believe the proposal was well intended and designed to reward superb pilot performance, the Sub-Committees recognized that FAI awards must be given to FAI member organizations and their pilots and teams.

Proposal #2 called for the addition of a Stall Turn as a "training" figure prior to the start of a programme. A hammerhead would allow a competitor to more accurately assess the wind and not compromise the safety requirements associated with these figures.

The Sub-Committees agreed to the proposal.

SWITZERLAND

Proposal #1 called for weather information to be provided every 10 minutes in case of the threat of thunderstorms or if active thunderstorms are in the vicinity of the airfield. Current regulations require a minimum of 30 minute intervals between weather observations.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. With the launching of weather balloons still widely used at Championships, it is simply not possible to be able to make such observations at such short intervals. If systems like Doppler radar are in place, it is possible. But many contests do not have the funds for such equipment nor do they always have it available. Therefore, Sub-Committees felt this was an unreasonable requirement.

Proposal #2 requested that flying not be resumed until the wind speed has stabilized for at least 60 minutes after a box direction change has been introduced.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. Contest organizers are under considerable pressure to complete any Championships on schedule. History is replete with examples of Championships where all Programmes were not flown, the contest was incomplete, or partial Programmes were performed. The duration of contests has also been reduced over the years to reduce the financial pressures on organizers as well as for the convenience of participants. The Sub-Committees are of the view that any rules proposal must take this burden into account. The Sub-Committees believe that this proposal would remove far too much good flying weather from the contest schedule and voted to reject it.

Proposal #3 suggested new rules for the preparation of the order of flight (start list) to accommodate pilots who were flying the same aircraft.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. The International Jury is responsible for the modification of the start list to accommodate pilots who are sharing aircraft. While there were problems at WAC last year with this, at AWAC in Sweden it was done without problem and considerable sharing of aircraft was taking place at this Championships. It should also be remembered that the decisions of the International Jury are final and cannot be protested. Rather than introduce new and complicated rules, the Sub-Committees believed this should remain in the hands of the International Jury to provide the most flexibility and simplicity.

Proposal #4 called for the criteria for judging spins to be changed. The proposal suggested that, "Once the spin is initiated, the rotation should be constant and the attitude of the aircraft should not change till stopping, thereafter the attitude should go to 90 degrees down, wings level."

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. It was their view that the performance of such a spin is aerodynamically impossible.

Proposal #5 called for the removal of restrictions on engines for Advanced aircraft.

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. It was their view that we should not change the rules before we have a chance to try them. Engine restrictions are reasonable and needed to preserve the Advanced category from the cost and performance creep which characterizes Unlimited. The lifting of such restrictions may have the opposite effect of what the Swiss predict, a reduction in competitors who no longer feel they have a chance to be competitive in this category.

Proposal #6 suggested that FAI Continental or World Aerobatic Championships not be held in countries "which are at war".

The Sub-Committees rejected the proposal. In today's world, "war" may be difficult to define and depending on this definition, competitions like WAC 2003 in the USA may not have been possible if such a rule was introduced. This might also include any country which is a part of a coalition of forces anywhere in the world fighting terrorism, for example. Such a rule is not practical or possible, in our view, and would seriously restrict venues available for competitions.

JURY RECOMMENDATIONS

At the CIVA meeting in 2003, AEAC Jury President Jiri Kobrle had proposed a reduction in the interruption penalty points in Advanced from 150 to 100 points. This proposal was inadvertently omitted for consideration by Sub-Committees this year.

Therefore, this proposal is presented to plenary in 2004 for decision. Our apologies to Mr. Kobrle for this error.

OTHER PROPOSALS

In accordance with CIVA's decision to accept "safety related" proposals up to 10 days after the completion of a Championships, attached are proposals from France and Italy.

These proposals were not considered by Sub-Committees but are presented to the plenary for decision. They appear below as received from the CIVA Delegates of France and Italy.

It should be pointed out that the French proposal was received outside of the 10 day limit but we include it here for your consideration as the French believe it to be a safety issue. It will be up to CIVA to decide if it will be accepted for discussion.

From: robert chomono [bob.chomono@wanadoo.fr]
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2004 7:56 AM
To: Michael R. Heuer
Subject: Proposal regarding safety problem

Dear Mike,

We would like to submit this issue that arose during trainings in France two month ago.

Added note to Appendix 3 - Part 1 - Unlimited - page 51 (proposal agreed last November).

..."On vertical down lines, opposite aileron rolls may be added as long as the total extent of rotation does not exceed 450 degrees nor the number of stops exceeds 4".

Our opinion:

This total extent of rotation (450 degrees - 4 stops) might be unsafe if it is not perform high.

Very powerful aircraft can easily regain altitude before performing these rotations on vertical down lines.

Furthermore, on vertical up lines, very powerful engines give an advantage as well to perform 540 degrees - 5 stops.

Our proposal:

Mainly for safety reasons, it would be reasonable to withdraw this rule.

I look forward to seeing you in Madrid.

My best,

Robert

From: Maurizio Costa [zampagialla@tiscali.it]
Sent: Monday, August 23, 2004 6:18 AM
To: Micheal R. Heuer; Michael R. Heuer
Subject: Fw: [civa-delegates] CIVA Nominations and Proposals

Dear Mike

Concerning the problem regards to Unknown figures at AWAC, I propose to change the note at page 57 of REGULATION FOR CONDUCT OF INTERNATIONAL AEROBATIC EVENTS - PART THREE FOR POWER AIRCRAFT (ADVANCED CATEGORY) as follows:

-Flick rolls are also excluded from vertical down lines of figures 8.43 and 8.44 after a roll in the loop.

Rationale: during the roll in the loop, the speed may increase and the flick roll in the down lines could be dangerous.

best regards

Maurizio Costa

Italy CIVA delegate