



CIVA Glider Aerobatics Committee Report 2016 Agenda Item 10.4

The Glider Aerobatics Committee met on 18 July 2016 at Matkó Airfield, Hungary, before the opening of WGAC/WAGAC 2016.

In Attendance:

Manfred Echter, Chairman (GER); Madelyne Delcroix (FRA); Pekka Havbrandt (SWE);
Philippe K uchler (SUI); Jerzy Makula (POL); Jyrki Viitasaari (FIN)

After the 1 July deadline for rules proposals, the 2016 Proposals Package had been assembled by Rules Committee Chairman Matthieu Roulet and was distributed to committee members on 11 July.

This report summarizes the actions taken by the Committee on proposals applicable to Section 6, Part 2. Where proposals apply to both Parts 1 and 2, an attempt was made to harmonise the resulting rule changes as far as possible taking into account the legitimate differences between Power and Glider.

Proposals are not reproduced in full in this document. For the complete wording please refer to the Proposals Package.

Proposals rejected by the Committee are generally not included in this report, except where the Committee sees the need to state its reasons for rejection.

Manfred Echter
Chairman, Glider Aerobatics Committee
October 2016

NP2017-2

Source: FRA #2
Document: Section 6, Parts 1 and 2
Subject: Scoring System

Proposal supported unanimously

The FPS undoubtedly provides a maximum of fairness and impartiality. The results, however, are only final after all competitors have flown. Intermediate results displayed in the course of a programme may change continuously with every further competitor's scores entered into the system. This is not understandable to the broad public and makes the FPS unsuitable for public display and direct media coverage.

If we want to further publicise aerobatics and make it attractive to the media, a scoring system better suited for public display must be found.

NP2017-3

Source: FRA #3
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Cut for the last Programme

Proposal amended by the GAC

The Committee agrees in principle. The wording, however, does not accurately address the intention of the proposal.

Add new paragraph:

3.3.1.3 If there is insufficient time to fly all six Programmes due to weather or technical reasons, the International Jury is authorised to introduce a cut for the last Programme up to a maximum of 50% of the competitors, based on the combined standings up to this Programme.

The option to introduce a cut must not be limited to Programme 6 only.

NP2017-4

Source: GER #1
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Harmony Mark

Proposal

Delete the Harmony Mark for Glider sequences.

The GAC agrees that the original intention of the Harmony Mark, to assess the style of a glider performance whether it was executed harmoniously, has not been achieved. Harmony marks in practise are awarded more or less haphazardly and mostly do not reflect the actual performance. Marks which are not awarded by rational criteria are useless.

NP2017-6

Source: GER #3
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Medals for various Programmes

Proposal amended by the GAC

The GAC proposes to increase the number of medals for various Programmes from now two to three.

Medals should be awarded as follows:

- Medal for the Free Known (Programme 1)
- Medal for the Free Unknown (Programme 3)
- Medal for the combined Unknown Compulsory Programmes (Programmes 2, 4, 5 and 6)

It does not make sense to award one medal for the Free Known and Free Unknown in combination. The two programmes are not comparable in their sporting character.

Awarding three medals for the various programmes reduces the present imbalance in the relative value of the medals.

NP2017-7

Source: GER #4
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: List of Figures for Unknown Programmes

Proposal

Add Figures from Families 8.6.17 through 8.6.23 (P-Loops with half rolls on top) to the list of figures for Unknown Programmes (Appendix A).

NP2017-8

Source: GER #5
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: List of Figures for Unknown Programmes

Proposal

Family 8.6, P-Loops:

Add new remark: A.14.1.3: "No flick rolls on horizontal entry or exit lines of figures in columns 1 and 2."

NP2017-9

Source: GER #6
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Warmup Pilots

Proposal amended by the GAC

The proposal does not address the duties of the International Jury listed under paragraph 1.4.1.1. A new sub-paragraph should be added:

- f) Selecting at least one Warm-Up pilot several months prior to the event. The President of the International Jury will invite NACs to nominate qualified pilots for this duty.

Amend current paragraph 3.1.9 to read:

3.1.9 Warm-Up Pilots

- 3.1.9.1 The International Jury shall be responsible for selecting, several months prior to the event, at least one suitably qualified, non-competing Warm-Up pilot whose sole duty throughout the duration of the event will be to carry out demonstration sequence flights as specified in this document or required by the Chief Judge or the International Jury.
- 3.1.9.2 The International Jury shall ensure that experience and capabilities of pilots selected for this duty match the demands of the task. Thus, a suitable Warm-Up pilot must have appropriate and current aerobatic experience in the category specified, be able to provide or secure the use of a suitable glider which he/she is qualified and eligible to fly, and be ready and available to fly at any time throughout the duration of the event. The International Jury will only consider applications fulfilling these requirements.
- 3.1.9.3 Applications may carry options on final name to cater for cases where national team members are selected late. In such case the application shall mention all names of potential applicants, and all pilots in the application shall fulfil the requirements in paragraph 2. above, otherwise the whole application will be rejected.
- 3.1.9.4 The type of glider to be flown by each Warm-Up pilot should be those in typical use at the event, able to perform in skilled hands at the highest level.
- 3.1.9.5 In case of unanticipated non-availability of a selected Warm-Up pilot, the International Jury has full flexibility to select a substitute in the best interest of CIVA.

Finding Warm-Up pilots for glider events has always been extremely difficult.
The International Jury must be free to look anywhere for suitable candidates should NACs be unable to nominate duly qualified pilots.
One Warm-Up pilot is generally considered sufficient for glider championships.

NP2017-11

Source: RSA #1
Document: Section 6, Parts 1 and 2
Subject: Discontinuation of the Use of Boundary Judges

Proposal rejected unanimously

Implementation of this proposal would in effect remove the requirement to fly a sequence within the boundaries of the performance zone.

This would also remove an important element of selectivity. A pilot who flies their sequence within the box boundaries is undoubtedly better than one who cannot. The positioning mark awarded by the judges is no substitute for accurate control of boundary infringements.

Contrary to the reasoning of the proposal, the situation in glider aerobatics differs in a number of important aspects from Power.

1. Gliders fly considerably slower than aerobatic aeroplanes. It is generally no problem to fly a typical glider sequence within the box boundaries.

2. Infringements of the performance zone are handled differently. Excursions outside the box are penalised by time flown outside.
Only three boundaries are controlled. The far boundary away from the judges is not controlled. This requires only two boundary judges at a time.
3. A reliable position tracking system has been developed by the team from Poznan University, Poland. This system was tested successfully at the WGAC/WAGAC 2016 and will be fully operational by 2017.
If CIVA makes this system mandatory for Glider events, this would effectively remove the need for boundary judges. They could be kept as a fallback option, in case the position tracking system is unavailable.

NP2017-12

Source: RSA #2
Document: Section 6, Parts 1 and 2
Subject: Averages

Proposal

Revise the way we handle "A" to eliminate (or not reward) incompetence or manipulation by judges, as follows:

"A" s given where no "HZ" is involved :

That Judges be allowed two "A" s per programme thereafter a factor of one be added to the Judges RI for the programme for each subsequent "A" given.

"A"s given where "HZ" is involved :

That a judge giving an "A" should receive an average of the other judge's raw marks, before the statistical process takes place.

In addition, a factor of two should be added to the judges RI.

NP2017-13

Source: RSA #3
Document: Section 6, Parts 1 and 2
Subject: International Corps of Judges

Proposal

A judge having a score rejected as "Hi" by the scoring system for a member of their own nation will have a factor of one (1) added to their overall RI for that pilot / that sequence.

Discussion in the RC/JC showed the need to modify this proposal. A revised formula should be developed. The GAC is in favour of this solution.

NP2017-14

Source: RSA #4
Document: Section 6, Parts 1 and 2
Subject: International Judges' Code of Conduct

Proposal

a) That 4.1.2.7 (2.8.5.6 in Part 2) be replaced by the following:

CIVA Judges and Assistants, on being selected for duty on an International Judging Panel, must at all times act with true impartiality and treat all competitors on an equitable basis. Any indication that a Judge or Assistant is acting contrary to the required manner and/or is seen to be colluding with a third party in matters that could affect their impartiality may lead to expulsion from the judging line, subject to review and confirmation of such a directive by the International Jury.

- b) That all judges and assistants are required to sign a declaration when registering at the event.

NP2017-16

Source: SUI #1

Document: Section 6, Part 2

Subject: Free Unknown Programme (Glider)

Proposal

For Programme 3 (Free Unknown) paras 3.3.3.8, 3.3.3.10 and 3.3.3.11 should be amended as follows.

3.3.3.8 The IJ will select seven (7) figures from the list of figures selected under 3.3.3.1. These figures will not appear on the list of figures available for construction of Unknown Compulsory sequences. The sum K of the seven figures should be between 170 and 190 ("AG" 130 to 150). Competing NACs will be given the list of figures not later than 24 hours before the deadline published by the Organiser for submission of the Free Unknown sequences. **Each NAC may submit sequences composed of these figures for Programme 3.** Either one or two (2) additional figures must be added. The K-factor of additional figures will be set at 5K each for two figures or 10K for a single figure.

3.3.3.10 NACs must submit computer files containing complete pages of all five Forms A, B, C, R and L as described in rule 3.3.2.9 The responsibility for accuracy and conformance of the forms lies with the NACs.

3.3.3.11 Publication and Selection of Free Unknown sequences.

- a) All proposed sequences received by the deadline must be checked, and corrected if necessary by the International Jury. Sequences will be identified by letters.
- b) The International Jury shall publish all sequences received from the NACs not later than 24 hours before the start of Programme 3.
- c) At least 12 hours before the scheduled start of Programme 3, each competitor will notify the Organiser which of the proposed sequences they will fly.
- d) Prior to the flight order and paperwork being issued to the judging line Team Managers or individual competitors as appropriate shall verify the correctness of the allocation of selected sequence per pilot; this verification shall be recorded by the Organiser.
- e) At least 1 hour before the start of Programme 3, the Organiser shall provide each NAC with a list of the Free Unknowns chosen by each competing pilot.

NP2017-17

Source: SUI #2
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Replacement of «Interruption» by «Insertion»

Proposal

Amend paras 2.6.3.1 through 2.6.3.4 to read as follows:

2.6.3.1 Each **insertion** will be penalised by 70 points. An **insertion is any manoeuvre involving a direction change of more than 90° that is not designated in the flight programme (exception: manoeuvres covered by 2.6.3.2). These can be:**

- a) A **manoeuvre** to return to the performance zone.
- b) **Any manoeuvre which is not part of the current sequence** (e.g. full circles).

2.6.3.2 If a pilot is compelled to change his direction after a mistake or after an abandoned figure in order to resume the predetermined direction and/or orientation and has already received a Hard Zero mark for that figure, no penalty points for an **insertion** will be subtracted, provided the correction of direction or orientation does not comprise more than a heading change of 180° or attitude change of one half roll or half loop.

2.6.3.3 **In glider aerobatics there are NO interruptions or breaks with wing rocking before and after.** Wing rocking indicates the final conclusion of the sequence.

2.6.3.4 **Interrupting a sequence** in order to gain altitude by thermalling leads to disqualification for that programme

NP2017-18

Source: SUI #3
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Electronic Tracking System

Proposal

Amend para 2.2.3.1 to read:

2.2.3.1 If an electronic tracking system is used, the position of the aircraft will be tracked by the instrument and performance zone boundary infringements (including the 50 m buffer zone according to 2.6.2.1.a)) recorded. **A member of the International Jury or a neutral person assigned by the IJ must be present at the recording station to monitor the operation of the system.**

NP2017-20

Source: USA #1
Document: Section 6, Parts 1 and 2
Subject: Addition of Family 8.8 Figures to Appendix A

Proposal rejected unanimously

Currently there are no Humpties vertically down (Families 8.4.1 - 8.4.4 columns 3 and 4) in Appendix A to Part 2. These figures carry a risk of excessive G and are potentially unsafe for Glider Unknown sequences.

The same would be true of Double Humpties (Family 8.8).

Judge Selection Procedure for Glider Events

The GAC also discussed the reasons why we have too few International Judges for glider events and why there are no new judges forthcoming from the glider side.

To make it perfectly clear, the following proposal only concerns glider events:

Allow on a trial basis for the next two years that the Chief Judge may select the members of his board of judges himself.

Furthermore, allow a maximum of two judges per NAC, even with the minimum panel of seven judges.

In any case the selection must be ratified by the Bureau of CIVA (Part 2, para 1.4.2.5)

Rationale:

1. We trust the Chief Judge, elected by CIVA, to have the knowledge and experience to select a qualified board of judges.
2. The present way of selecting judges has created a "private party" of about ten judges whom we have seen for years at nearly every glider event.
3. There are quite some new judges willing to come to international events. But they are frustrated by the present selection procedure which gives them practically no chance to be among the minimum seven judges. Few organisers in recent years were willing to support more than the minimum and it is unrealistic to expect judges to come at their own expense.