



AGENDA ITEM 8.5

URGENT PROPOSALS FROM CHAMPIONSHIPS

CIVA adopted a procedure at its plenary meeting in 2003 to permit Delegates to submit “urgent” proposals within 10 days of the completion of a Championships. These proposals are to be considered at the plenary meeting of CIVA if deemed of sufficient urgency or which address important safety issues which require CIVA’s immediate attention.

The President of CIVA will determine if these matters are to be considered immediately, at the next plenary, or are to be referred to the appropriate CIVA Sub-Committee. The proposals below were submitted by Delegates in accordance with the procedure:

Proposals from Germany (WGAC 2005)

A. Sporting Code, Section 6

Para 1.2.1.1 d) Add to the current text:

Not later than two weeks after the deadline for preliminary entries, the interested national aero clubs must be informed in detail of any specific customs and administrative procedures which have to be followed when bringing aircraft into the country for participation in the championship.

Rationale:

At this WGAC, all participants who brought their gliders to Russia had to follow highly complicated and time-consuming customs procedures. The organiser had not given any useful information on this subject, so much effort and time was wasted hassling with the Russian bureaucracy.

B. CIVA Regulations, Part 2

1. Para 1.4.5 Performance Zone

Add to current para 1.4.5.3:

The line judges must have 2-way radio contact to the Chief Judge's position. Two discrete frequencies will be used for diagonally opposite corners.

Whenever a pilot flies outside the limits of the performance zone, the line judge concerned will transmit to the Chief Judge's assistant in real time the beginning and end of the excursion.

Add to current para 1.4.5.5:

All the markers must be clearly visible from the minimum altitude at any point in the performance zone.



New para 1.4.5.7:

The line judges will use a separate form for each competitor to record the time flown outside the performance zone. Each infringement is recorded separately, indicating on which line it occurred. The total time out will also be recorded.

The four completed forms are filed together with the pilot's score sheets for later checking and reference in case of complaints or protests.

Rationale:

At this WGAC, the organisers used mobile telephones for the line judges to relay the out times to the chief judge's assistant. There were numerous instances, where one line judge reported out times on a specific line whilst the opposite corner did not report anything. There was no way for the chief judge to ascertain whether this was due to no out time recorded by this particular line judge or a failure of communications.

Some of the markers were hidden behind trees and pilots complained that they were not visible from lower altitudes.

After programme 4, it took the members of the international jury over three hours to sort out the totally inadequate records of one line judge and to determine the correct penalties for infringements of the performance zone.

2. Appendix 4 Code of Practice for the Chief Judge

Add to para 11.4:

After each programme, the Chief Judge will inform the judges on those instances where the "HZI" box was checked for them. For this purpose, the Chief Judge's assistant logs the pilot and figure concerned whenever an HZ was either overruled or the judge missed an HZ given by the majority.

Rationale:

Judges complained that there was no quick way to find out the instances and reasons when they were given HZI points.

Manfred Echter
Alternate Delegate, Glider Aerobatics
Germany

NOTE: These proposals are not deemed "urgent" and are referred to the CIVA Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee for further consideration.



Proposals from Poland (WGAC 2005)

Contents:

- A. GENERAL: Rules Making Procedure**
- B. C.I.V.A. REGULATIONS, Part Two:**
 - I. Coefficients and Bonus System**
 - II. Infringements of the Performance Zone**
- C. APPENDIX 1 to CIVA Reg. Part Two:**
 - I. Flick Rolls**

A. GENERAL: Rules Making Procedure (Trial Period of Amendments)

Each Amendment to the Rules should have temporal status for one calendar year.

The change remains valid (permanent) after one year of test, if there is no objection to it. If the practice shows that amendment is not valuable, previous text of the Rules becomes obligatory again. After each year of experience CIVA considers the sense of introducing last amendments into the Rules as obligatory status.

Reason: It is easy to observe, that many (too many!) amendments introduced to the Rules each year (esp. for gliders) missed their required purpose.

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.

B. C.I.V.A. REGULATIONS – Part Two: Events for Glider Aircraft

I.

1.2.4.1.c/ Free Programme/ Coefficient and Bonus System

Proposal: Above mentioned point 1.2.4.1.c, „Bonus System” should be **WITHDRAWN**.

Reason: Experience of last years shows that the Bonus System Rule in Glider Aerobatics is a “Dead Rule”. No one competitor performs more then 10 figures in Free Programme as to receive “bonus” of 6.5% to scoring. We have better just to limit the number of figures to say ten (10) or, maybe eleven (11).

System of Bonus 1.5%, 3.5%, 6,5% introduces into composing of free programmes an element of “tactical hazard” not required in our sport at all. Also the figures of “bonuses” are chosen arbitrary.



II. a

2.3.2.1.a/ Infringements of the Performance Zone

Proposal: To completely withdraw the presence of the line judges and box penalty points.

(The words four in para 2.1.4.2/a and para 2.1.4.3 should be withdrawn)

The time of excursion outside the box boundary will not be registered and penalized, but the Judge may deduct 0.5 to 1.0 from the mark for each figure badly visible due to unreasonably long distance from the Judges Line (see Appendix 1: “Optimal Placements of Figures”)

Reason: figures performed within the Performance Zone on the top of the box but close to the Judges Line are difficult (or impossible) to evaluate. Gliders, not as power aircraft, have limited possibility to perform Figures optimally placed to the Judges’ (spectators’) point of view. The main idea is to perform the programme in such a position to make it as much attractive as possible to the Judges (spectators) and to fly the particular figures in such a position to make the most important figure elements easy to evaluate.

II. b

2.3.2.1.a/ Infringements of the Performance Zone

Proposal: Every excursion outside of three boundaries of the performance zone (plus 50m tolerance) will be separately registered. The time of excursion will be determined by the two Line Judges located along the Panel of Judges on upwind and downwind corners.

(The words four in para 2.1.4.2/a and para 2.1.4.3 should be withdrawn)

The time of excursion outside the rear boundary will not be registered and penalized but the Judge may deduct 0.5 to 1.0 from the mark for each figure badly visible due to unreasonably long distance from the Judges Line (see Appendix 1: “Optimal Placements of Figures”)

Reason : figures performed within the Performance Zone on the top of the box but close to the Judges Line are difficult (or impossible) to evaluate. Gliders, not as power aircraft, have limited possibility to perform Figures optimally placed to the Judges point of view. Pilots beginning their programmes on the top (1200m) of the Box avoid to fly closely to the rear line, which is optimal placement for judging, because of crossing boundary threat.

NOTE: These proposals are not deemed “urgent” and are referred to the CIVA Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee for further consideration.



Proposals from Russia

Proposal #1

Once again we propose that the International Jury check the availability of appropriate medals and diplomas at the beginning of the World and European Championships in accordance with the FAI Sporting Code and CIVA Regulations.

Proposal #2

In case of repeated Q program flight, pilot is allowed to re-fly only Q program and safety figures, not training if he had an opportunity to fly for 10 min the first time.

Proposal #3

Warm-up pilots shall not pay Entry Fee.

Elena Klimovich
CIVA Delegate
Russia

NOTE: These proposals are referred to plenary.

Proposal from Finland

Re: Permitted AWAC Aircraft

When CIVA in its 2003 meeting adopted a new ruling regarding permitted AWAC aircraft, the **Ultimate 10-300S** was not included on the list, where it had been already for several years.

This aircraft is a biplane built 1988 with a 300 hp/2700 rpm engine and registered for the sake of less rigorous maintenance rules as “experimental” as all other aerobatic airplanes in Finland. Currently its engine is limited by the governor for noise reduction reasons to max. 2500 rpm. This reduces **the maximum power** available by about 7% to **280 hp**.

The spirit of the CIVA ruling requiring experimental aircraft with 6-cylinder engines to produce a current bench test was clearly meant to apply to new unknown aircraft designs



entering the contests. Sending this engine to USA for a test bench run would cost an unreasonable amount of money, probably more than 10.000 euros.

Ultimate 10-300S has participated in two AWAC's and one AEAC. It is a known aircraft type with a good performance for Advanced category but definitely not better than that of the high performance monoplanes like CAP 231, Extra 300 and the 360 hp Sukhoi currently permitted in Advanced. When CIVA expanded the number of permitted Advanced aircraft with the above mentioned ones not anymore sufficient for Unlimited category, it would be rather counterproductive to exclude this plane due to the changed rules that now prevents it to take part in International competition without a bench test.

I therefore respectfully ask the CIVA to reconsider this proposal in all fairness and to give the permit to compete with this Ultimate 10-300S without a bench test.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposed amendment.

Osmo Jalovaara
Delegate of Finland

Picture of the engine plate available on request

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.

Proposal from USA

At the last 2 World Championships (and possibly at others before), there have not been enough women's teams to have a team competition. The USA proposes that in the event there are not 3 or more teams of 3 or more men or women, that the number of pilots required to constitute a team be reduced to 2. At the WAC in Spain, this would have allowed for 4 women's teams (US, Russia, France, and Italy).

We propose a new rule be added and numbered 1.2.4.1.a.3 and to read as follows:

"In the event that fewer than 3 Teams comprised of 3 or more male or female pilots, the number of pilots required to constitute a Team will be reduced to 2. The requirements in section 1.2.3.1 still apply."

Women's participation is shrinking it appears, and this seems like a good idea to continue to encourage the few that are still around.

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.



Proposal of France (WGAC 2005)

To change the way of the order of flight for Programmes 4 and 5 (Glider).

Rationale: With reverse order of flight an advantage is given to the leading pilots and the less experienced pilots have to demonstrate first the Unknown programmes. And it is not fair to have always the same pilots flying first or last which is a (dis)advantage in the Unknown.

This reproach made some years ago to this formula was for organizational reason, but with reverse order we also have to wait for the results to prepare the sheets for the next programme.

Proposal: For Programmes 4 and 5, we propose to come back to the former system of 3 groups with a drawing of lots inside the groups, with group 1 flying first.

Reverse flying order is kept for the 6th programme.

NOTE: This proposal is not deemed “urgent” and is referred to the CIVA Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee for further consideration.

Proposals of the Chief Judge, WAC 2005

Please refer to the WAC 2005 Chief Judge’s Report for the full text of rationale for these proposals.

Proposal #1

That CIVA continue to develop the JPI system, but until such time as the system is perfected and considered to reflect accurately the performance of the judges, that the results not be published or issued to the judges themselves in order to avoid them modifying their behaviour with the intention to improve such ratings.

That until such time that the JPI is perfected, the CIVA Bureau will select the panel of judges prior to the contest to a maximum of ten and a minimum of seven, thus eliminating the use of JPIs in the Q Programme where more than ten judges are present.

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.



Proposal #2

That standardised procedures be adopted and enforced to ensure that judges are not attempting to follow the sequence themselves from the paperwork and in addition preference be given in the case of too many judges offering their services to those judging teams providing their own experienced writers.

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.

Proposal #3

That the regulation be changed to indicate that a “Soft Zero” be given if no slide backwards is detected.

Proposal #4

That the regulation be reworded to make it compulsory for the International Jury to change the flight order in order to avoid pilots flying the same aircraft being flown consecutively, the wording suggested is as follows:

“The sequence of flights must be altered by the International Jury to ensure at least two flights between competitors flying the same aircraft, the International Jury should ensure in this process that competitors remains within the same grouping when a random draw has taken place, no discussion will be entered into concerning this process.”

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.

Proposal #5

That an additional paragraph be added under the Sporting Code – Air Safety to read as follows:

“Any competitor required to break-off a competition flight due to danger of collision with unauthorised air traffic or a bird strike, would be treated in the same manner as if a mechanical defect had taken place with regards to a re-flight as applicable. If required to orbit to avoid any such hazard the Chief Judge will allow additional time if required.”

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.

Proposal #6

That the current positioning score based on the current criteria be scrapped and replaced by two separate scores as follows:

Positioning – To be determined on an objective basis



Presentation – To be determined by the appropriate criteria as currently in the regulations

Positioning (by judges)

That for the purpose of determining a positioning score the performance zone be divided into nine individual zones, far left, far centre, far right, centre left, centre-centre, centre right, near left, near centre, near right. As each figure is flown the judge would indicate to the assistant which zone the figure had been flown in or centred on as appropriate, this information being marked on a sheet provided. At the end of each flight, a quick calculation would take place whereby opposite notations in each of the nine zones be cancelled out e.g. three left centres would cancel out three right centres and a left far would cancel out a near right. The resulting remaining notations would give an indicated position of each unbalanced figure. For those not in the centre-centre zone the resulting figures should be considered as a percentage of the total figures in the sequence, e.g. if three figures remained un-cancelled outside of the centre-centre zone and the sequence had contained twelve figures, 25% were misplaced resulting in a positioning score of 7,5.

In addition to the above when no line judges are being used, those figures flown clearly outside the box would be marked on the working sheet accordingly and taken for the purposes of the previously set out calculation to the nearest zone closest to the edge of the box where the box out had occurred. An additional one point per box out or figure started out would then be deducted from the previous figure, i.e. if one box out had been noted in the previous example the score would now revert to 6,5.

The K factor for this positioning exercise would be 40K with or 50K without line judges, when line judges are utilised the additional calculation for box outs would be omitted.

Should an electronic system be available (such a system will be presented to CIVA this year) the judges would not give any scores for positioning.

Presentation

All the current criteria for the optimal placement of figures and sequence symmetry would be used to establish a score for presentation worth 20K.

NOTE: These proposals are not deemed “urgent” and are referred to the CIVA Rules and Judging Sub-Committees for further consideration.

Proposals from President of the International Jury, AEAC 2005

Contrary to the common belief, the judges are human beings and thus fallible. This table shows that the judges have a tendency to favour their own pilots. Typical total K-factors in Advanced programs are 275 (Q), 340 (Free) and 330-350 (Unknown). An average TBLP-window of a pilot is about 250 points. This gives an opportunity to a biased judge to increase by 0,5 the score of his own pilot in two thirds of figures. The same applies to downgrading of the toughest competition. As a result the judge can increase/decrease his/her personal total score by about 100 points, meaning a difference of + - 15 points in the final score in one flight with seven judges. In a contest with three flights this means a total difference of $3 \times 15 \times 2 = 90$ points. A difference of 90 points to a neutral judging can remarkably change the final results, when regularly the difference between two nearest pilots is only 10-30 points. With the present calculation method this is possible and legal but certainly against the spirit and moral of the contest and its rules.

Still a neutral treatment of the competing (foreign) team is quite possible, if the judge tries to maintain neutrality. However, a simultaneous extreme favouring of one's own pilots and a gross disfavouring of the most potential competing team is difficult to perceive as accidental. This is absolutely not acceptable at the judging line. It calls for a drastic and immediate action by the jury.

Proposal #1

Because neutrality is absolutely essential for a judge, based on this study, I propose this check to be included in the Fair Play System and also as a component in the JPI calculation.

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.

If the weather is good and the organization together with the Judging Line are efficient, it is quite possible to fly one complete flight with 40 competitors in one day. According to Part 3, paragraph 1.2.4.5 the unknown programmes must be published not less than 24 hours before the time at which the respective programme is to be flown. If there are any protests regarding the safety of the program, the whole process of choosing the figures and approving the programme can last so long that it is necessary to wait in a perfectly good flying weather, until the prescribed time has elapsed.

Proposal #2

I therefore propose that CIVA should consider the shortening of the Unknown compulsory preparation time from 24 hours to 18 hours.

NOTE: This proposal is referred to plenary.



CIVA 2005
Oberschleissheim, Germany

Proposal #1

Supports the proposal of the AEAC Jury President to reduce the time between publication of the Unknowns and when they can be flown from **24 to 18 hours**.

Proposal #2

To codify in the rules the principle that a pilot must complete his flight by the end of that flight programme if the competitor has been delayed by a technical fault. A flight will not be delayed further than the end of the programme.

MRH

27 October 2005