CIVA Safety and Expedited Proposals 2017 v5

#1: Revision to rules for the Programme-4 "Cut"

Referring to the International Jury Report from the 2017 WAC in South Africa, the Jury President suggests the following replacement wording for Rule 2.1.2.2:

> For Programme 4, if there may be insufficient time to complete the championships due to weather problems or unforeseen circumstances, the International Jury is authorised to introduce a cut, without respect to gender, of up to 50% of the eligible competitors, based on the combined standings after Programme 3. If, subsequently, time is available for more flights, competitors from the cut group may be added to Programme 4 in the order of their ranking from the combined results of Programmes 1 to 3, highest first. All flights made in Programme 4 through this mechanism will be considered valid in the final results for the contest.

This will make it possible for the Jury to authorise a complete set of results including all those actually flown in programme-4 even if not all of the 'cut' competitors are eventually able to fly.

#2: Clarification of Championship day-1 arrangements

From 2017 organisers must comply with Part-1 para 1.4.9.2:

> In the evening prior to the first day of competition flights, there will be a briefing by the Organiser for Chief Delegates or Team Managers, members of the International Jury and Judges, on flight conditions, the contest programmes, and any other problems which might arise over the interpretation of the rules. This General Briefing will take place concurrently with the first drawing of lots described in 3.2.

Clearly it is also essential that the organisers provision for accommodation, food and medical services must cover the above paragraph, entitling competitors and other team staff to be accommodated free of charge for this first official day and night of the event.

Para 1.4.4.1 should therefore be revised to:

> At World Championships, the Organiser will provide adequate accommodation and food for the duration of the event, **including the day specified for the initial General Briefing**, to all members of official teams, solo competitors, officials and other assistants for whom entry fees have been paid, on the understanding that no extra charges will be imposed for these services. In addition, airfield charges will be covered for those persons for whom entry fees have been paid.

#3: Revision to wind measurement altitudes

Proposal:
Change the level at which the wind speed and direction are measured from 500m to 300m and 600m. Taken in conjunction with the ground wind speed and direction, this will provide more precise information about the wind profile to competitors.

Change the following paragraphs:

3.6.2.3. Second row, first column of the table to 300m, 600m.
3.6.2.4. a) The main axis component of the wind at 300m or 600m …
3.6.2.4. b) … then the International Jury may decide to extend the wind main axis component limit at 300m and 600m to 14 m/sec ….
3.6.3.1. … at shorter intervals, on wind speed and direction at 300m and 600m height if required due to meteorological developments.
3.7.1.2. a) … actual wind direction and speed at 600m and the forecast trend. …

Rationale:
During the past two years we have experienced many competition days with different wind speeds and directions at different altitude levels, making it difficult for pilots to plan their flight strategy and create confusion and misunderstanding on the ground. The solution is quite simple because current technology makes it simple to provide this kind of multilevel measurement.

#4: Removal of the density altitude limitation for Advanced power

Proposal:
Change para 3.6.2.6. to: In “Y52 / I” the maximum permitted density altitude, measured at the surface, for sequences to be flown without interruption is 3,000 feet.

Rationale:
The density altitude limitation has become unnecessary at Advanced (power) because competing aircraft at continental and World championships have no engine power limitations. To allow a free break with a clear sky for a typical high performance 300hp aeroplane creates the likelihood of a tactical decision that in practice is not necessary and in reality encourages a waste of time.

#5: Rewording of Missed Slot penalty

Proposal:
Change Section 6 Part 1 para 4.3.1.1 to: A penalty of 250 points (200 points in A and Y52 / I) will be awarded to a pilot who, without reasonable cause, is not ready when their slot time

arrives **or causes an unreasonable delay between the time of the slot and the start of their programme.**

Rationale:
We have seen clear evidence this year of attempts to intentionally delay the start of a programme for personal reasons. For example at EAAC 2017 approx. an hour was lost at the start of one day because the first pilot extended his warm-up time to over 20 minutes (Extra 300), then after an aborted flight due to low cloud-base took a further 12 minutes to warm the engine again. It is understandable that good care of the aircraft and engine are necessary, but competitors should be ready with their aircraft warmed up in good time for their scheduled take-off slot.

It will therefore be useful to have the option to issue a missed slot penalty in the case of a clearly unreasonable delay between engine start-up and commencement of the programme.

#6: Reduce the number of on-site jury members to 2 or even 1 (the president of the IJ).

The remaining members should be available by phone or video messaging for conferencing in case of need. From my point of view 2 on site are enough and could also take, most of the time, decisions as a majority.

Rationale:
Most of the time the jury is idling somewhere on the airfield by following the flights. Supervision of the judge line doesn't seem to be a really necessary job as the CJ's know well their business and operate after the rules. For video session supervising one member is enough and for possible needed decisions there is plenty of time afterwards. The same applies for handed in complaints and protests. There is normally no time constraint which gives the need for immediate on-spot decisions. In addition, such a move would clearly relieve the cost structure of every event. All other businesses of the IJ can easily be handled by 2 or even one member.

Note from the president: At the FAI General Conference last week the circulated draft new Jury Handbook allowed that one or more of the International Jury members (but not the President!) need not physically be on-site, though all must be easily contactable at any time (phone, Skype etc.) and act in their full capacity as jurors when required to do so.

#7: Set the Chief Judge to scoring and reduce the number of minimum judges by one.

Rationale:
It surfaced on this competition the question why the CJ is set to non-scoring. Our CJ's are all experienced judges and their knowledge could be very welcome to be used in the regular scoring. I also noted that Nick as a CJ on this comp gave a mark to every figure anyway. So the information was actually available. I myself do it also quite often. One could argue that

the work load for the CJ in a scoring configuration would be too high. I don't believe so, if there are good assistants. In addition, again, this could relieve the cost structure of every event by reducing to an even number of judges (6) plus a scoring CJ.

#8: Rework the judging criteria for rolling turns. This item should be forwarded to the Rules Committee.

Rationale:
It clearly showed in this competition again that the judging of rolling turns is a very difficult and discussion provoking task. The main problem is the remaining roll at the end of the turn. For clarification: If the judge sees a remaining roll of 45 degrees or more the mark for the figure is 0.0. If the judge sees more than 90 degrees of rolling on axis, then the mark for the figure is Hard Zero. Exactly this part was on many video sessions a big discussion point. The main issue is that such an error can't be checked, proven or even validated on the video, this despite being a HZ and therefore eligible to be checked by video!

#9: Clarify pilot options regarding the unexpected presence of an obstacle in the box

Section 6 para 1.2.8.5 covers the interruption of a competition flight due to danger of collision with conflicting air traffic or a bird, though it may not be clear that this would be allowed before or following take-off and/or prior to commencement of the sequence when airborne. At EAAC a balloon flew close to and possibly even through the box and the pilot performing was unsure about his options to break the flight, clearly for safety reasons.

It would therefore be helpful to revise the wording of paragraph 1.2.8.5 thus –

Any competitor required to **delay the commencement of or** interrupt a competition flight due to danger of collision with conflicting air traffic or a bird, should be treated in the same manner as if a mechanical defect (paragraph 3.11) had taken place. If the pilot is required to orbit to avoid any such hazard, the Chief Judge will allow additional time if required.

#10: Electronic Pilot Aids

Add new sub-para 3.6.1.3 c) to Section 6 Part 2:

If electronic device(s) are installed in a glider the use of which may be considered unfair under the above rules, the competitor must declare this to the International Jury before the start of the contest. The device(s) must be made unusable for the duration of the contest. This must be verified by the Technical Commission.

Rationale:
Modern on-board computers designed for cross-country gliding are highly capable devices which could be used in a number of ways including to aid the pilot in aerobatics. It can be

expected that such computers will also be installed in aerobatic gliders. It would be unreasonable, however, to ask competitors to remove the computer before an aerobatic competition. On the other hand it is impossible to determine or verify what software is installed and how it could be used. Therefore, we must be sure that such devices are made unusable for the duration of an aerobatic contest.

#11: Revision to Section 6 Part 1 – Programme 1 versatility requirements

The FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1, rule 2.2.1.8 presents the versatility requirements for the construction of Programme 1 – The Free Known Programme. The versatility shown for Family 2 has been found to be in error as a result of a UK proposal approved at the 2012 CIVA Plenary to Family 2. That proposal added rows 2.2.7 and 2.3.6 to Catalogue Family 2, but through an unintentional oversight at that time rule 2.2.1.8 was never revisited and modified accordingly.

There is no logic to allowing Family 2.2.3.x and 2.2.4.x to satisfy versatility, but not allowing Family 2.2.7.x. Nor is there any logic to allowing 2.3.2.x and 2.3.3.x, but not 2.3.8.x.

To correct this unintentional oversight, it is therefore urgently proposed that the Family 2 versatility under rule 2.2.1.8 be corrected for 2018 as follows:

Family	Yak-52, Intermediate, Advanced	Unlimited
2	At least one from either 2.1.2 to 2.1.3, or 2.2.2 to 2.2.7, or 2.3.2 to 2.3.6, or 2.4.2 to 2.4.8	2.2.3 to 2.2.7, or 2.3.2 to 2.3.6, or 2.4.2 to 2.4.8

#12: Addition of a maximum operating temperature paragraph to Section 6

At recent championships there have been occasions when the local temperature has risen above 35°C and the possibility of unusually high personal fatigue and the consequent degradation of safety margins has been unavoidable. Clearly there are other important factors in such situations, e.g. the humidity, whether a competing aircraft has been left in the sun and whether the competitor can prepare beforehand in a cooler place. This item has been a late addition to this document, and more research is certainly required.

The bureau proposes that the Rules and Glider Aerobatic committees conduct further enquiries into this subject with the aim of presenting a viable solution to the bureau within the next 60 days. If such a solution can be found and approved this will be incorporated into CIVA's sporting codes, and delegates and organisers informed accordingly; if not then further work will be undertaken and the result proposed to the 2018 plenary.

#13: Make giving the reason for <u>all</u> zeros (0.0, PZ and HZ) mandatory

Rationale:
Currently a judge is only obliged to state a reason for HZ's and PZ's on his score sheet. However the reason for a numeric zero (0.0) has actually the same importance to be stated, mainly because of paragraph 4.4.6.2 in Section 6 Part 1 (similarly 4.5.6.2 in Part 2). This rule had to be applied quite often during this competition [EAAC], also on rolling turns by the way. Not having a written reason on the score sheet of the judge who has given a numeric zero (0.0) makes it difficult to apply 4.4.6.2 (or 4.5.6.2) on a fair and transparent basis, not only during a video session of the judges but also in an explanatory task to a pilot.

NHB note: For a numeric zero (0.0) the applicable reasons could be –

a. 10 or more downgrades
b. > 45° and < 90° angular error

Compiled by NHB
October 2017