

<i>Subject:</i>	Netherlands Proposal to Change Wingsuit Acrobatic Rules	Annex No. -	10.3.2
<i>Author:</i>	Ronald Overdijk, Delegate Netherlands	Agenda ref.	10.3.2
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	3

NAC The Netherlands

Concerns: Proposals rules changes wingsuit acrobatic

Proposed Rule Changes

Based on a questionnaire, used to judge interest and opinions of a large group of teams and individual wingsuit pilots there have been compiled various recommendations for rule changes at FAI level, to improve the format.

The main motivation being creating a clearer format, responding to the community feedback, and improving overall participation levels.

1. Competition Format

Though there is a definite interest in separating freestyle and compulsory, it's the belief that keeping both elements as one competition and fixing the judging to where participants feel it correctly reflects the flying will have a more positive effect.

2.1 Style Judging

It is clear that for most participants judging on style for the compulsory rounds is deemed too subjective, and rarely in line with what the competitors see and value in the flying. The style scoring was originally created to force wingsuit pilots to 'fly', as free falling without proper aerodynamic use of the wingsuit speeds up scoring on compulsory rounds. Removing the need to actually wear a wingsuit.

With a reversion to competition altitude, wingsuit pilots are now motivated to fly better to achieve more working time. Thus allowing us to fully removing Style scoring from the compulsory rounds, as that performance motivation is no longer in need of enforcement through judging.

This would create scoring for compulsory rounds that's no longer subjective, just counting docks, leading to participants feeling their hard work is reflected more in the scores.

2.2 Style

Should style not be removed as an element it is important to notice the original rules were created to promote clean flying. Lower style scores were awarded to teams having more separation horizontally and vertically, rougher docks, less 'clean' body positions (straight legs) and issues in stability.

In current rules that incorrectly seems to have translated to 'only one team member can move'. Efficiency and clean flying of the figures (per animation examples) should in our view not be punished. Flying synchronized effective moves, in the same way an FS4 team fly faster/effective due to having all team members flying at the same time, should be rewarded. Adjusting figure descriptions to reflect a switch in position, rather than a single person moving over, would help in making judges correctly scoring movement.

<i>Subject:</i>	Netherlands Proposal to Change Wingsuit Acrobatic Rules	Annex No. -	10.3.2
<i>Author:</i>	Ronald Overdijk, Delegate Netherlands	Agenda ref.	10.3.2
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	3

Punishing more active flying will result in limiting possible advances in speed and flying. Originally this was never intended in the rules, and only in the IPC wording has this resulted in this incorrect punishment for what is actually clean flying. Make sure judges also include separation, leveling and roughness of flying in the style scoring, and not just pick one element to award an arbitrary score. The overall quality should be judged.

Though it is believed style is best removed from the compulsory rounds, also to ease up on judging complexity and time, should this change not be possible, fixing the current style scoring is of highest urgency to not further lose participating teams. Over the last 3 years that's been cited as the main problem in scoring.

2.3. Style

For free rounds, making a submitted dive plan part of judging, will also allow judges to form a more clear understanding on what they are looking at.

2.4 Style Matrix

A big problem with scoring at the moment is judges not looking at all aspects making up the style. Where proximity between flyers, smoothness in docking, effective motions, and more should all be looked at, judges have been incorrectly judging only 1 element and incorrectly giving teams a low score. This has been the main issue in teams disagreeing with judging results on style. Where the style should be an overall result (displaying an average score of all elements) it now often only reflects one individual element that caught the judges attention, ignoring other important aspects. And at times also in reverse, scored team very high on style, where they were actually showcasing a lot of separation, rough docking, or not flying smooth. But by basing the score on only one element, having all other negative aspects ignored an resulting in a (to participants) undeserved high score.

We have included an example judges guide which would have the judge score each element on the chart from 0-10, then draw a circle through all dots, to see where the score is mostly avg. on. Of course this could also be based on a calculation, but we believe the matrix is not needed per se in active judging, but more a guide to teach judges to use the full spectrum of the elements that comprise style. And not picking only one element.

3. Camera Judging

Camera judging is also subject of critique, and by the majority also deemed as an element subject to be removed from compulsory scoring

With the increasing levels of competence, teams are scoring docks in under 2 seconds for various figures. This makes creative flying and/or transitions hard or even impossible without missing docks. This means cameramen for better teams would get punished on their scores, due to less opportunity for creative flying.

With the majority of teams being in the intermediate range, camera scoring is also an issue. As often

<i>Subject:</i>	Netherlands Proposal to Change Wingsuit Acrobatic Rules	Annex No. -	10.3.2
<i>Author:</i>	Ronald Overdijk, Delegate Netherlands	Agenda ref.	10.3.2
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	3

teams will have more separation, causing camera to be of lesser artistic value due to distance and movement, and in case of actions not caught on camera, punishing teams double, as they receive lower scores on docks and camera as a result.

4. Frontloop / Fruityloop

Removing the 'Frontloop' from the divepool is in our view of highest importance.

It's the only figure that doesn't 'fly'. Creating issues in diveflow, as well as discriminating in choice of wingsuit (only possible in small suits). Same as formation skydiving not having 'Backloops' in the divepool, for similar reasons. The 'Frontloop' originated in the acrobatic wingsuit competition when the possibilities in flying had not been explored as much as they have now, and transitions and rolls were not yet such an active part of every day flying, as they are today. As a result, the inclusion of the 'Frontloop' (also rarely practiced during every day flight due to its lesser appeal) is often seen as out of place. The 'Frontloop' does have its place in competitive flying, but is an element more suitable for the freestyle rounds. As the vote for style removal, it seems Russia is the main nation against removal, with the overall score from other countries being more in favor of removing.

5.1 Divepool

To create more diversity in the divepool, as well as adding in more dynamic moves. It would be a suggestion to add the figures currently outlined in the (Indoor Wingsuit) divepool to the roster. With the more dynamic moves, it would urge more dynamic flying resulting in more appeal both visually as well as flying wise for participants. The proposed added figures would be (check: www.WingsuitCompetition.com divepool listing for descriptions)

Figure L "Hand 2 Foot" - 54.5%

Figure M "Reversed Hand 2 Foot" - 54.5%

Figure N: "Half Carve" - 77.3%

Figure O: "Full Carve" - 72.7%

5.2 Divepool

To make the flying less repetitive and more dynamic, it would be a suggestion to improve the number of figures per compulsory round from 2 to 3. A decision also supported by the majority of the participants.