Free Flight Technical Meeting April16 2010

Report by Ian Kaynes, Chairman Free Flight Subcommittee

Present:

Ian Kaynes	UK	FFSC Chairman
Richard Barlow	CAN	observer
George Batiuk	USA	FFSC member
Cenny Breeman	BEL	FFSC member
Martin Dilly	NZL	delegate
Cesare Gianni	ITA	FFSC member
Ivan Horejsi	CZE	FFSC member
Daniel Iele	ARG	FFSC member, delegate
Wilhelm Kamp	AUT	delegate
Andras Ree	HUN	FFSC member
Jari Valo	FIN	delegate
Gerhard Wobbeking	GER	CIAM 2nd VP
Mihail Zanciu	ROU	delegate

Note: FFSC= Free Flight Subcommittee, FFTM = Free Flight Technical Meeting

Volume ABR

Agenda Page 6

d) A.10 Sanction fees **Bureau**

The meeting unanimously supported the fee structure proposed in the Treasurer's report (WCh 500, CCh 300, internationals 70, open nationals 40)

Page 11

a) B.2.5 World Cup **France**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

Page 12

d) B.2.8 (Events Category) **France**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

Page 15

l) B.9 Free Flight B.9.1 **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

Page 18

r) B.16.15 Processing of FF Model aircraft – include F1E **F1 Subcommittee**

Note that this became B.17.15 in the 2010 edition of Sporting Code

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

s) B.16.15 Processing of FF Model aircraft – delete "minimum" **F1 Subcommittee**

Note that this became B.17.15 in the 2010 edition of Sporting Code.

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

t) B.17 Processing of model aircraft B.17.11 – FOR F1 **Bureau**

Reviewed for the inclusion of F1:

Rejected by FFSC - 5 in favour, 11 against

Rejected by FFTM – unanimous

Page 21 Free Flight

F1A

a) 3.1.12 Launching **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

F1H

b) 3.H.12 Launching **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

F1J

c) 3.J.5 Definition of an unsuccessful attempt **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC – 16 in favour, 1 against

Supported by FFTM - unanimous.

d) 3.J.11 Launching **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

Page 22

F1P

e) 3.P.2 Characteristics **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

f) 3.P.5 Definition of an unsuccessful attempt **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

F1Q

g) 3.Q.1. Definition **Germany**

The Technical Meeting proposed the combination of this proposal with proposal (j) 3.Q.2 to include both changes in 3.Q.1. Revised wording to be:

"Model aircraft which is powered by (an) electric motor(s) and in which lift is generated by aerodynamic forces acting on surfaces remaining fixed in flight, except for changes of camber or incidence. **Models with variable area (e.g. folding wings) are not permitted.**"

Supported by FFSC – 10 in favour, 2 against

Supported by FFTM - unanimous.

h) 3.Q.2 Characteristics **F1 Subcommittee**

Number of models. Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

i) 3.Q.2. Characteristics **Germany**

The Technical Meeting discussed the drawbacks of limiting battery weight and also considered specifying the mass of the motor as a fraction of model weight. The conclusion reached was that an energy limiter would provide a better solution to limiting the performance of the class. The possibility of having a specific energy limiter for F1Q will be investigated by the Subcommittee.

Rejected by FFSC – unanimous.

FFTM - Refer to Subcommittee.

Page 23

j) 3.Q.2. Characteristics **Germany**

Technical Meeting advocated combining with proposal (g) 3.Q.1 (unanimous). Supported by FFSC – 14 in favour, 2 against

k) 3.Q.7. Duration of Flights **Germany**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

l) 3.Q.8 Classification **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

Page 24

F1 NEW CLASSES

m) F1S - Restricted technology glider **UK**

Page 25

n) F1T - Restricted technology extensible motors **UK**

o) F1U - Restricted technology piston motors **UK**

Technical Meeting was opposed to the idea of combined flying of classes with different towline/rubber /motor run requirements. The Subcommittee should investigate the possibility of restricted technology classes with definitions compatible with existing F1A/B/C parameters, as a possible alternate or entry level class. The lack of newcomers to the sport was noted by the FFTM and should be discussed by the FFSC.

Proposals rejected by FFSC - 2 in favour, 13 against

FFTM – refer to Subcommittee.

Page 26

F1 ANNEXES

p) Annex 1 Rules for World Cup events **UK**

Rejected by FFSC - 4 in favour, 11 against

Not considered by FFTM after action of rules for these classes.

q) Annex 2B 3.A2B.4 Timing a flight **F1 Subcommittee**

The Technical Meeting proposed a modified wording to ensure that timekeepers stand up before obstacles become significant:

"Timekeepers should stand up for timing **before** obstacles or presons might onstruct the view of low flying models."

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

r) 3.A2.4.3. Annex 2 Launching Area **France**

The Technical Meeting opposed the proposal from questions of upwind and downwind extent to the area. It noted that the existing restrictions should be strictly enforced.

Rejected by FFSC - 4 in favour, 11 against. Rejected by FFTM – unanimous.

s) Annex 2 3.A2.4.5 Equipment **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

Page 27

t) Annex 2 3.A2.6 Timekeeping **F1 Subcommittee**

Supported by FFSC and FFTM - unanimous.

F1D

u) 3.4.7. Steering **France**

Rejected by Technical Meeting (unanimous) since already covered in terms of intent of steering and the contact with the model.

Supported by FFSC – 14 in favour 2 against

Championships Bids

Italy and Romania presented details of their bids for 2012 Championships.

Extra Item – discus launch

An additional item was discussed in the Technical Meeting as a possible limitation to prevent discus launch of models apart from F1N. This had not been submitted as a proposal to Plenary and so is not subject to Plenary voting. Voting in the Technical Meeting served to indicate support for the principle as a future proposal. It was supported by FFTM with 11 in favour, 1 against.

The change considered was:

Add new sentence at end of present definition in 1.3.1 Category F1 – Free Flight of volume ABR

"Unless specifically stated in the rules for a class, free flight models must be launched with at least one hand holding the fuselage of the model."

Add new sentence at end of present text of 3.N.8 in volume F1:

The model may be held by any part of the model during launch (The requirement of ABR 1.3.1 to hold the fuselage does not apply to F1N).

Reasons:

1) Clarification.

To specify the current launching method as a requirement in order to discourage development of discus launch for classes other than the existing application to hand launch gliders F1N.

Discus launching by holding one wing tip has produced considerable height launches for both free flight and radio control hand launch gliders. Considerable effort would be required to apply the same techniques to other classes such as F1B and F1E but if successful such a development would add considerable performance. For F1B this could represent more than one minute in still-air duration with consequent problems in terms of distance flown and needing addition flyoff rounds. For F1E the flyoff is usually held from a point near the bottom of the hill to help reach a conclusion from short flight times. The addition of 20 or 30 metre launch altitude would significantly increase flight times in the flyoff.

The technique has already become established for F1N without any detriment to the flying of these indoor models and so it is proposed to allow the continued use of discus launch.

2) Safety

The flat field free flight events are flown from starting positions 10m apart and each competitor must launch within 5m of his pole. If models with 2m span were being rotated at arm length there would be a potential clash with flyers or timekeepers at adjacent poles. A similar situation applies to F1E models which are flown from a line with competitors often closely spaced at the best part of the line. These considerations do not apply to F1N which has smaller models flown without any restriction on starting position.