

AGENDA ITEM 10.4

Urgent Proposals from Championships

Revised on 16 October 2008

From Graham Hill, EAC 2008 Chief Judge:

EAC Chief Judge Proposal #1 – Point Deductions in Rolling Circles

During the Judge's Briefing, we referred to an anomaly in rule 6.8.3.6 for rolling circles. It was agreed with the Jury President that the missing rule of "not more than 2 points will be deducted if the turn is stopped" would apply and judges and team managers were advised at the Judges briefing.



This element of the rule should be added to 6.8.3.6. **Also recommended by Sub-Committee.**

EAC Chief Judge Proposal #2 – Judges Nationality - Voting

There is also a contradiction about the marks of a judge being counted if there is a vote on a hard Zero (7.1.1.9.). Judges and team managers were advised with Jury consent that all judges would vote irrespective of nationality.

Since all judges are now not "National" that the rule concerning votes on HZ s and the nationality of the judge be removed. **Also recommended by Sub-Committee.**



From Mike Heuer, EAC 2008 Jury President:

EAC Jury Proposal #1 – Judging Analysis

Section 6 states the following:

7.4.1.1. Judges evaluation by flight programme will be conducted by the International Jury using the software programme approved by CIVA (see Section 8.8). The Chief Judge will receive a complete analysis of all Judges from the International Jury.

The software programme in use was ACRO written by Nick Buckenham. ACRO produces excellent judging analysis reports for the overall panel and individual judges and is extremely useful for feedback and training. It produces the Rank Indexes (RI) that CIVA has adopted as our measure for the selection of future Boards of Judges at FAI Championships.

The distribution of these reports is at the discretion of the International Jury aside from the rules requirement that the Chief Judge receive the analysis.

At EAC, we did not distribute the overall or individual judging reports to the Judges or to the Teams during the competition. The Chief Judge, however, had a chance to examine the reports between flights though sometimes time was very limited. After the competition, as Jury President, I sent all of the reports out via e-mail to all Judges and Team Managers.

I strongly believe this information must be public and available for two reasons:

- (1) The Judges need and have asked for analysis of their performance so they can improve their skills. This is a tribute to their professionalism and dedication. For the first time, the analysis is quite easy to read, summarizes all information on just a few pages, and makes use of graphics and colored boxes to help in reading the data. There is no question, in my view, this improved and thorough analysis will improve the quality of judging in the future.
- (2) Teams and pilots are entitled to see how they were treated by Judges. This cannot be kept secret. Though there can be no doubt that Judges who do not perform well may not like their analysis made public in this way, it is also true that each and every contest official must be accountable for what they do. We do not wish to lose valuable volunteers but on the other hand, if it results in an improvement in our Championships, it is something we must do.

However, I would also add we do not want Teams or pilots bringing pressure to bear or trying to exert influence on our Judges during the course of a competition.

Because there is no CIVA policy on this, I would ask for the following proposal to be considered by CIVA:

Judging analysis will be provided to the Chief Judge after each flight programme. Teams will not receive the analysis until after the completion of the competition. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

EAC Jury Proposal #2 – Free Programme Paperwork

Our present rules regarding the checking of legality of Free Programmes are unsatisfactory. Two Free Programmes I know of (those of Victor Chmal and Marco Bosoni) were illegal or

incorrectly drawn. Mr. Chmal's had a repetition and the wrong K on a figure, thereby giving him points to which he was not entitled. Mr. Bosoni had an incorrect drawing on Form C, which was being used by the Judges that day and which resulted in a zero on the figure. This was subsequently protested but denied by the Jury.

Because of time constraints and lack of personnel, the organizers are always under a lot of pressure to check Free Programmes and Teams are not always prompt in submitting them to the organizers, thereby compressing the time available to do so even more. The results are mistakes slipping through that are not detected until it is too late.

Remember, the rules only require that Form B's be provided to Teams. Without a Form A to study, it is not possible for them to check Catalogue numbers and K factors. Once Programme 1 has begun, protests regarding the composition of any Free Programme is not allowed.

I would propose the following:

Require that all Free Programmes be drawn using CIVA-approved software. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

As of today, CIVA only recognizes the Aresti programme by Alan Cassidy, however, Olan should be approved as well. While no software is perfect, this may cut down on errors with the added benefit of providing better quality drawings to the Judges. There are always a few Forms submitted by pilots which are difficult to read. Therefore, I propose to CIVA:

Require that a Form B be submitted that includes a table of Catalogue numbers and K-factors. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

Olan be approved by CIVA as official sequence drawing software. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

This is already a part of the Aresti programme's functions and is promised for Olan if we make this a rule. This Form B would be separate from the Form B's held by Judges so as to not reduce the size of the sequence drawing.

We must improve the rules here. Pilots receiving points to which they are not entitled is just not satisfactory given the narrow gap in points between top pilots. Our present system actually is an incentive for pilots to submit illegal Frees -- if they do not get caught, they get extra points. If they are caught, they just change it. It is also a pity when pilots lose points when Forms are incorrectly drawn.

EAC Jury Proposal #3 – Order of Flight

One of the major controversies of EAC which resulted in a meeting with Team Managers was the Jury's interpretation of CIVA rule 4.1.7.2. This rule is as follows:

4.1.7.2. In Programmes 1, 2, and 3, the competitors will be divided into three equal groups. If the number of competitors is not a complete multiple of three, the highest ranking group will be enlarged to include the excess pilots. The groups will be based on provisional accumulated overall results after the previous programmes. The results of Programme Q will only be used with respect to Programme 1. The order of flight in each group will be determined by drawing of lots as described in paragraph 4.1.7.1. The flight order of the groups will be the reverse of their rank. (The flights start with the group of the lowest scores). Notwithstanding this rule, if there is a shortage of time to complete the last remaining programme, flying can be reversed with the top ranking group flying first. The lower ranking groups would fly only if time so permits. The drawing of lots may be made by a CIVA-approved random programme, if one is available, under the supervision of the International Jury.

Because of weather problems, EAC incurred many delays. The Jury took the decision to invoke that last part of 4.1.7.2 which permits flying the highest ranking pilots first "... if there is a shortage of time to complete the last remaining programme ..."

It was clear the "last remaining programme" was going to be the 1st Unknown as we were running out of time. It was not clear from the forecast if we were going to be able to fly everyone in the programme.

Further, 4.1.7.2 also states that the "lower ranking groups would fly only if time so permits". My interpretation of this was if we never got to the lowest ranking pilots due to lack of time, the flight programme would still be valid.

The Team Managers objected to this interpretation. The Jury decided to go ahead with normal flight order in order to maintain a bit of peace and harmony on the airfield, though I stand by my original interpretation of the rule.

The Jury interpretation of this rule is further reinforced by a reading of the original Italian Proposal #1 made at the CIVA plenary in 2005 as follows (note that rule number references are no longer valid because of our re-organization of the regulations the subsequent year). It was to be valid for both Advanced and Unlimited:

1.1.7.2. For Programmes 1, 2 and 3 the competitors will be divided into 3 equal groups. The groups will be based on the provisional accumulated overall results after the previous programmes. The results of Programme Q will only be used with respect to Programme 1. The order of flight in each group will be determined by drawing of lots as described in paragraph 1.1.7.1. The flight order between groups is reversed to their rank. (The flights start with the group of the lowest rank). Nevertheless, for the last expected programme in case of time shortage, the flight

can start with the top-ranking group. The lowest ranking group would fly only if the time left permits it.

The wording of the proposal is different than the rule that appears in Section 6. The word "expected" is used in the original proposal and does not appear in the rule. This should be changed if there is to be no doubt as to what is to occur. This what CIVA agreed at plenary (see page 6 of the 2005 Minutes). In addition, the Italian proposal calls for the last "group" of pilots to be cut.

I believed this proposal to be a good one at the time and still do today. Indeed, if CIVA did not believe that putting the best ranking pilots first and then flying as many of the pilots as we could in the remaining time was not a good idea, why would it have been agreed? There would be no sense in altering the order of flight to finish a flight programme if this was not the intent of the proposal agreed by CIVA.

I propose the following:

The wording of 4.1.7.2 is changed to reflect the adoption by CIVA of the 2005 Italian Proposal #1. Referred to plenary by Sub-Committee.

Further, to change the rules to require a minimum 6 hour break between all programmes (not just Unknowns as is currently written) for pilots. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

The "hors concours" pilots were placed at the very end and told them they would be cut if we ran out of time. This practice should remain as well. In no case should an "H/C" pilot have priority over a normal entry if time is a problem.

EAC Jury Proposal #4 – "Hors Concours" Pilots

As is the usual practice, the EAC organizers opened the competition to pilots from non-European countries. These pilots have been called "solo" or "independent" entries in the past. However, this terminology has led to some confusion. I propose:

Competitors not representing their NAC at an FAI World or Continental Championships be designated as "Hors Concours (H/C)" pilots with the exception of FAI applicants. They will pay normal entry fees and be treated as other competitors. In the event of time constraints, however, they can expect to be shifted in the order of flight or deleted from flight programmes altogether at the discretion of the International Jury. H/C pilots will appear in the final results but will not be ranked or eligible for any awards or medals. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

It should be noted that FAI Sporting Code, General Section, deals with "FAI Applicants" and "International Teams". However, these rules apply to competitors who are unable to

represent an NAC. These rules were written to permit competitors to obtain an FAI Sporting License directly from FAI if they did not have an NAC or it was in bad standing. By spelling out what an H/C pilot is, we can eliminate some confusion. The same questions come every year from both pilots and organizers.

EAC Jury Proposal #5 – Medals and Diplomas

For those present at the awards ceremony in Hradec Králové, you may have noticed that Svetlana Kapanina was recognized by the organizers as the "top placing woman". However, she was not recognized as being the "Overall Women's European Champion". Rule 1.3.1.6.(c) requires that 6 female pilots be present to declare an Overall Champion, though medals in the various places are still awarded.

Each individual flight programme should be broken down into Men's and Women's divisions and "organizer" medals presented accordingly, but this depends on how you interpret 4.5.1.2.(b).

To further complicate matters, FAI intends General Section 3.5.3.1 to mean that in order for a Championship to be valid, 4 NAC's must enter a "classification". In other words, we must have women from at least 4 countries to have a Championship in that gender. If there are less than 4 (which did not occur at EAC), then the women go into the overall standings but no women's medals or titles are presented. This rule can be waived by the Air Sports Commission concerned.

Our rules on "mixed gender" teams, which we applied this year at EAC, only apply to Teams and not to the broad gender classifications. There are actually two Championships underway at a WAC or EAC. One is for the Men's division and one for the Women's. Without adequate entries in one of these, according to General Section, the Championships in that classification cannot take place.

I do propose the following:

CIVA waive the requirements of General Section 3.5.3.1 and reduce it to 3 countries. Further, that 1.3.1.6.(c) be reduced to 5 pilots for an Overall Champion to be named in the female class. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

As a matter of note, we do present medals to all of the pilots, as well as Team Managers, of winning Teams (FAI Gold, Silver and Bronze). This is at variance with the way rule 4.5.1.2(c) is currently written. This was done on our instructions to FAI. These medals should not be given to Team Managers only and FAI has created them for the winning pilots as well. I propose the following:

Rule 4.5.1.2.(c) be changed to make it identical to the rules for World Championships. The top 3 pilots of the winning Teams (first, second, and third) be awarded FAI Medals and Diplomas in addition to the Team Manager. Also recommended by Sub-Committee.

From Canada (proposals from AWAC 2008):



Canadian Proposal # 1

Sporting Code, Section 6, Rule 1.2.4.3. a) Eligibility “A”

Pilots who have flown in **any Unlimited Championship/Contest** for powered aircraft, **in the 18 months preceding a World Advanced Aerobatic Championship** will only be allowed to fly **in the Advanced Championship** as a “hors concours” pilot.

Rationale:

Control “category creep”.

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Canadian Proposal # 2

Sporting Code, Section 6, Rule 1.4.1.6

“The International Jury may temporarily vary any rules approved by the International Aerobatics Commission (CIVA) during a contest under the following circumstances:

- a) There is **an absolute majority** agreement within the International Jury, when conducting a vote to introduce a temporary variation to the regulations, and
- b) There is **an absolute majority** agreement amongst the participating teams’ Chief Delegates, when conducting a vote to introduce a temporary variation to the regulations.

Rationale:

With a 100% agreement requirement, just one dissenting vote, no longer makes a decision a majority rule but a minority control.

Canadian Proposal # 3

Sporting Code, Section 6, Rule 4.2.2.2 (a)

Add: 'A' and Y52 Density Altitude maximum 2500 (762m) - 3000 feet (914 meters)

Rule 4.2.2.6 a)

Add: The International Jury may allow flights to be made in two parts, during the performance of all Programmes other than the Final Freestyle, if the height of the cloud base is between the heights given in the table at paragraph 4.2.2.5.b), **or if the density altitude is above maximum values**. The competitor is then allowed to readjust height without penalty to commence the second part.

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Canadian Proposal # 4

Sporting Code, Section 6, Rule 4.3.4.1

Reduce the Maximum K per figure for the Advanced Category:

Programme 2 Max. K **30**

Programme 3 Max. K **35**

Rationale:

The controversy over allowable aircraft versus control of figure selection and composition of sequences continues. Perhaps introducing a reduction to Unknown figure maximum K, along with other controls, may maintain the founding intentions of the Advanced category.

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

From Russia (YAK 52 Championships):

Russian Proposal #1

In case there are less than 10 teams (countries) present at the competitions the International Jury submits the figures to the total of 10. The figures must be of the average difficulty of the figures submitted by pilots and cover the families not presented by them. Repetition of Catalogue numbers is not allowed.



Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Russian Proposal #2

Change the weather minima and flying heights for the Yak-52 competitions:

- Cloud base 1250/950 m for the flights without/with interruption
- Maximum height – 1200 m
- Minimum height – 200 m
- Penalized height – 100 – 200 m
- Disqualification height – 100 m

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Russian Proposal #3 (Unlimited Power)

Make the maximum figures number for Free Program in Unlimited 8 with total K 420.

Rationale:

1. We can see now that not many new pilots entered the competitions due to lowering the difficulty of the program.
2. The K factor for Family 2 was raised and new figures of Family 5 were introduced - that made the average K get lower. To get back to the accepted Unlimited level we need to make the total K higher or number of figures smaller.
3. A difficult Free program was accepted for the WAG-2009. Why make such a huge difference in these two events?

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA. This proposal was not recommended by Sub-Committee but will be brought to the floor at Russia's request.

Russian Proposal #4 (Unlimited Power)

In the past years lots of figures were deleted from the list allowed for Unknown programs. Safety was the main reason for deleting of figures from the list which the same teams who proposed elimination of figures or combination of figures (flicks on the bottom lines of half loops for example) successfully use in their Free programs. It leads to the situation when the same figures appear in the Unknowns year after year. We believe the Unknown programs must be technically difficult without endangering safety of pilots or airplanes. We propose to make the unknown programs of the UNLIMITED level more difficult and to enlarge the list of figures:

1. The base figures 1.1.1-1.1.4 can be used only as linking figures added to compose the sequence. The use of figures based on 1.1.1-1.1.4 is not up to the unlimited level.

2. Allow 9.1.3.5 and 9.1.3.7. Inclusion of 9.1.3.3 and 9.4.3.3 without 9.1.3.5 and 9.1.3.7 gives too few choices of their usage.

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA. This proposal was not recommended by Sub-Committee but will be brought to the floor at Russia's request.

From Madelyne Delcroix, EGAC Jury President:

EGAC Jury Proposal #1

Present rule:

4.1.8.2. ...

a) The order of flight for the groups will be:

Programme 4: I III II

Programme 5: II I III

Programme 6: III II I



This rule was made so that not always the same pilots will fly during the most active time for thermals, but the 3 groups are not too often flying the same day, but another problem occurs when you end programme 4 during a day and want to begin the programme 5 an hour later : the pilots of group II are flying first when they were flying last in the previous programme. Same situation for group III between programme 5 and 6.

It is not fair for those pilots to give them so little time to concentrate on the next unknown when pilots of group 1 always had 3 groups flying in between.

Proposed change:

a) The order of flight for the groups will be:

Programme 4: I II III

Programme 5: I II III

Programme 6: II I III (III flies if time is available)

or

Programme 4: I II III

Programme 5: the order of flight is decided by the IJ according to the given situation with the vote of the CD and CJ

Programme 6: II I III (III flies if time is available)

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

EGAC Jury Proposal #2

Actual rule:

4.1.8.2. ...

b) Nevertheless, for the last expected programme in case of time shortage, the order of flight of the groups will be as for Programme 6.

There is no provision if meteorological situation deteriorates DURING a programme which was nor “expected” to be the last.

Proposed change:

add

c) In case of deterioration of the meteorological conditions, the IJ in conjunction with the CD and the CJ can decide to cut the 3rd or even the 2nd group in order to validate the sequence already begun. To be validated all the pilots of the 1st or the 1st and the 2nd group should have flown.

| |
|--|
| Referred to plenary by President of CIVA. |
|--|

EGAC Jury Proposal #3

Present rule:

4.2.6.6. In order to avoid any delay in the progress of the contest, the flight will be repeated at the end of the current programme even if this is prior to the decision of the International Jury. In the case of an illness or of a technical defect, the latest moment a competitor can fly depends on Regulation 5.1.3.4 and 2.3.2.

What is the relation with 5.1.3.4 and 2.3.2 ?

Proposed change:

add after “current programme” : “or at the end of the group if possible”

| |
|--|
| Referred to plenary by President of CIVA. |
|--|

EDITORIAL CORRECTIONS

4.3.5. Coefficients for the Programmes

| Programmes 1 | 1 | 2, 4, and 5 | 3 | 6 |
|------------------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Total coefficient of figures | max 190K | max 190K min 175K | max 230 (233)K | max 200K min 180K |
| Positioning | 35/15K | 35/15K | 50/15K | 35/15K |
| Harmony | 10K | 10K | 20K | 20K |

5.1.4.4. (Coefficient for placement)

| | Electronic instrument | Conventional method |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Compulsory programmes | K = 35 | K = 10 to be 15 |
| Free programmes | K = 50 | K = 20 |

From Hungary (EGAC 2008):

Hungarian Proposal # 1

1.4.1. The International Jury (Sporting Code 6 Part Two)

1.4.1.5. When the International Jury is taking a decision which concerns the team or a competitor of the same aero club as a member of the International Jury that member of the Jury shall **NOT** abstain from voting.

Rationale:

According to the Sporting Code Section 6 Part Two 1.4.1.3. At least three members of the International Jury must be available to hear appeals or protests submitted by competitors. It means the minimum required Jury members are the maximum available Jury members as well.



Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Hungarian Proposal # 2

1.4.1. The International Jury (Sporting Code 6 Part Two)

1.4.1.4. Any decision taken by the International Jury by majority vote is final *exception of dealing with protests, where 100% agreement is required.*

Rationale:

The reason is the same as proposal No. 1. The Jury can vary any rules approved by the CIVA as it is under the Sporting Code 6 Part Two para 1.4.1.6.

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Hungarian Proposal #3

2.2 Procedures when hearing a protest (International Jury Members Handbook)

The following is a suggested outline of the procedures for handling a protest

b) at the last sentence: When satisfied, the Jury President shall call a Jury Meeting within 24 hours of receiving the protest (GS5.5.1) *and the protest should be treated in another 24 hours or before with a decision if it is regarding to the competitor's or team's scoring results.*

Rationale:

The Jury shall treat and decide on the protest regarding to the scoring result as soon as it is possible to avoid any further problem when they are using the 1.4.1.6. procedure by Sporting Code 6 Part Two.

Referred to plenary by President of CIVA.

Hungarian Proposal # 4

4.2.2.4. Wind speed and direction measurement (Sporting Code 6 Part Two)

at the second sentence: This must be include average wind speed and wind direction on the ground and in the performance zone at 700m and 1200m. *If the wind speed is close to the limit the Contest Director should provides the wind speed and direction at every 200m up to 1200m in every half an hour.*



**CIVA 2008
Salzburg, Austria**

Rationale:

It was realized several times that the wind speed and direction were out of limit at other heights then 700m and 1200m when they were measured by balloon ascent.

| |
|--|
| Referred to plenary by President of CIVA. |
|--|

Document Revised on 16 October 2008