

AGENDA ITEM 14.5

SAFETY AND EXPEDITED PROPOSALS

At the 2010 meeting of CIVA, the plenary agreed to the President's proposals to create new categories of rules proposals as follows:

- **Normal Proposals (NPs):** These are proposals submitted each year by Delegates in accordance with our normal rules process and deadlines (this year, 1 July 2011). They are to be considered by Sub-Committees and recommendations made to plenary. NPs are also proposals submitted after Championships that the President has decided should be placed in the normal rules cycle and considered by Sub-Committees.
- **Safety Proposals (SPs):** Proposals submitted which relate to safety problems and merit consideration by plenary at CIVA's next meeting.
- **Expedited Proposals (EPs):** Proposals submitted as a result of experiences at Championships and which merit discussion by plenary at CIVA's next meeting.

It is left to the CIVA President's discretion as to how a proposal is to be categorized and whether it will be considered by plenary or referred to Sub-Committee.

Deadline for submission of SPs and EPs was 15 October 2011. Those proposals are as follows and come from contest officials and Delegates.

SAFETY PROPOSALS

(Referred to Plenary)

SP # 1:

Source: Germany

Document: Section 6, Part 2

Subject: List of Figures for Unknown Programmes

Figure selection for the Unknown Programmes showed a tendency by Advanced teams to deliberately choose figures with the potential to exceed the operating limits of some of the competing gliders.

Under rule 4.3.3.3 CIVA is requested to re-approve the list of unknown figures prior to World Championships, if necessary.

The following changes should be made to the list of Advanced figures in section 9 for the contest season 2012:

1. Delete figures 8.13.2 and 8.14.2.
2. Delete the optional roll symbol in the top of figure 8.33.1.
3. Delete figures 8.46.1 and 8.46.4.
4. Delete the full aileron roll 45° down (9.1.4.4).

CIVA President's Note: Referred to plenary.

SP # 2:

Source: Germany
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Rough Flying

There was a tendency by some judges to reward rough flying with high scores.

This is against the character of glider aerobatics. The judging criteria in section 6 specify clearly that this style must not be encouraged by the judges.

In future judges' seminars for glider competitions, rules 6.7.1.7, 6.7.1.16, 6.8.20.3 and 6.8.21.2 should be specifically discussed.

CIVA President's Note: This SP does not propose any rules changes but the JSC would be directed to discuss the rules referred to above to avoid rewarding rough flying..

EXPEDITED PROPOSALS

(Referred to Plenary)

EP #1:

Source: Canada
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Free Unknowns

- 4.3.4.6. c) At least 12 hours before the commencement of each Programme, each competitor will notify the Organiser which of the *alternative proposals* he/she will fly.

Change the *blue* text to “... *proposed sequences* ...”

Rationale: “... alternative proposals ...” left over from previous year’s rules.

CIVA President’s Note: Referred to plenary.

EP # 2:

Source: Canada
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Free Unknowns

- 4.3.4.4.
Clarify the definition of a “simple figure”, and emphasize how they are to be used.

Existing Rule:

“Sequences for Programme 2 or 3 are to be composed using the 10 figures submitted by the Aero Clubs and additional figures from Section 9, *solely to aid in composition*. These additional *linking* figures must be simple, but may contain repetitions despite rule 4.3.4.1.”

Change/alter:

Sequences for Programme 2 or 3 are to be composed using the 10 figures submitted by the Aero Clubs and additional figures from Section 9, *solely to aid in composition*. These additional *linking* figures must be simple (*e.g. less than 15 ‘K’*), but may contain repetitions despite rule 4.3.4.1.

Rationale:

- At the EAAC in Dubnica, one sequence had a 1.6.1 as figure #1 – not a linking figure.
- Another sequence had 4 linking figures, one of which was above 25K – could have been a legal figure for NAC submission.
- And yet another had an illegal figure not allowed in any category, with a total ‘K’ of approximately 40.

Clearly, there is misunderstanding regarding the rules for composing the Free Unknown sequence.

CIVA President’s Note: Referred to plenary.

EP # 3:

Source: WGAC/WAGAC Jury President
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Team Medals

Team medals it should be clearly stated in the rules what is the minimum complete team to award team medals; as the rules are now it is only stated the minimum number of participating countries to have a valid championship but nothing about the minimum number of complete teams, i.e. if there is only 2 complete teams they can receive the gold and silver medals.

CIVA President’s Note: Referred to plenary.

EP # 4:

Source: WAC Jury President
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Wind Arrows

It has become apparent that the inclusion of moveable “arrows” in the requirement for marking of the aerobatic box serves no positive purpose. All pilots take off with a firm plan of action which reflects the currently published official wind direction. Nobody gets airborne without this information and a suitable plan. The need to change these box markings when the direction of the official wind changes puts an un-necessary logistical burden on the

organiser and can lead to delay if done correctly or even to confusion if overlooked. I propose that the requirement for these arrows be removed from CIVA Regulations.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to plenary.

EP # 5:

Source: EAAC Chief Judge
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Communication radios

A number of 'Sencor' personal mobile radios were distributed to key administrative staff to facilitate communications around the aerodrome, in my case between the judging line and the Contest Director, flag marshal etc.. These tiny radios are moderately effective over short distances but struggle at much over 1km or when physical obstructions intervene. On many occasions I was unable to contact the CD or he me unless he was at 1st floor level near the tower; when the afternoon NW judging location was in use communication was impossible and mobile telephone the only workable solution. I suggest that a more professional standard of PMR is required for this safety critical duty, such as the Motorola-GP340 series, and that domestic walkie-talkies like the Sencor be avoided as they are simply not adequate for this duty. Section 6 should also reflect the importance of this safety-critical requirement.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to plenary.

EP # 6:

Source: EAAC Chief Judge
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Video recording and review equipment

As discussed in the Chief Judge's Report, the equipment at EAAC 2011 was simply not adequate to provide the clarity required to determine matters of fact on all the occasions demanded.

To quote from the Report:

I strongly recommend that CIVA take advice from a suitable professional in this regime and re-write 5.1.6.3 to define the minimum standard of tripod, camera and replay equipment that is acceptable for championship use.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to plenary.

EP # 7:

Source: France

Document: Section 6, Part 1

Subject: Fair and Equal Treatment

In chapter 1, add a rule that says:

"Fairness and equal treatment shall be ensured by all stakeholders in all CIVA activities and competitions, from registration to final results"

In chapter 1 or 4 (where it fits best), add a rule that says:

"The organizers shall ensure that in the seven days prior to the competition, all teams/pilots are given fair access to practice on the competition site (depending on site availability) -- i.e. no preferential treatment / discrimination shall take place. To be considered, teams wishing to practice on the competition site shall give notice to the organizers by a deadline to be announced in the competition Bulletins."

CIVA President's Note: Referred to plenary.

NORMAL PROPOSALS

(Referred to Sub-Committees)

NP #1:

Source: Germany
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Programme Q

Delete Programme Q and shorten the contest by two days.

Affected rules: 1.2.1.1 a), 1.2.1.2 a), 1.3.1.1 a) ... and others.

Background:

Since many years pilots competing on international championships wonder why we fly Programme Q as in most cases it does not score towards the final results.

Others ask why we do have a Q as it does not work like a Qualification itself but only in combination of results from Programme 1, which is labeled “Free” but not “Q-Free” or something alike.

Some ask, why we have a Q at all in times of decreasing number of competitors. And, reflecting the safety issue, in at least European or World Championships; what in quality and skills might top a pilot flying at such event. Do we have to check him/her for safe flying? Many people suffer from those long lasting events and ask, “We can’t we do faster, shorter in time.”

Explanations

Obsolete text is struck out, modified or new text is underlined ... if applicable.

Rule 1.2.1.1 a)

World Championships will be held every two years and will not last longer than ~~7 to 12~~ 5 to 10 days from opening to closing ceremonies.

Rule 1.2.1.2 a)

Continental Championships may be held in years when there are no World Championships and in principle should not last longer than ~~7~~ 5 days.

Rule 1.3.1.1. a)

delete first line!

In consequence review 1.3.1.1 (b), ... (c) ... and every rule dealing with the Q.

New rules

Establish mandatory qualification systems within each NAC to ensure sufficient flying skills. Asking for certain results-level either at the Nationals or an at equivalent contest.

Make the Free the first programme flown. Set time-limit for Free to 12 Minutes. Allow Training within this time. Allow training of own unknown figure only.

Rationale:

The Q is not really a qualification programme but at 50% only, as it works in combination with the Free only. So at least the wording is more than understandable.

But more important: What do we need a “Qualification” for?

Is it for keeping the field of competitors short, as every year we have dozens of more entries, are we usually facing fields of 75 pilots or more? If so, then better let us limit the field to e.g. 60 pilots, a number of which we know we can handle. ... What will happen if we have 80 or more entries and all pilots score more than 60%?

Is it for safety reasons, to filter out pilots not capable flying the programmes?

... How could such a pilots appear on an international contest? Don't we have qualification routines set formulated and controlled by each NAC? Don't we accept entries from NACs only? Aren't the NACs responsible for the pilots' quality and flying skills? We have qualification criteria for our Judges, so we should have some for the pilots as well. And those have to be applied in their home-countries, but not after travel-expenses of many thousands of Dollars or Euros.

! ... Still Chief-Judge has the right and responsibility to call a pilot flying unsafe „land, land, land!“ So where is the difference from doing so in Q or Free?

Is it for preheating our Judges who are the proven best in the world? Each and every one of “The Seven” has or should have seen and judged at least one (better more) contest of the appropriate level in the specific year or the year before. If we try to balance judging behaviour in the beginning of the contest, we can use training-flights and use a mandatory part within, which could be the Known Compulsory.

What is the advantage we gain, deleting the Q?

- Contests are shorter than before. Everybody has to file his holidays to make participation, qualification, training possible. Not only pilots but our limited resources of Judges, Jury-Members, and Technical Specialists face the same problem. Don't forget, not only our Athletes are Amateurs, at least partly, they and the staff as well are employees.
- We save a whole lot of money on the organiser's side having two days less to support. Beyond the surface of what competitors see (the entry fee) is there are a lot of costs and people who do not bring any money to the competition. On an international contest but cost; those are easily 30 persons.

- National Aero Clubs more and more face the complex situation to separate the various contests. Providing an appropriate time gap between all national and international events when planning their Nationals. In almost every member-state we have Unlimited and Advanced Teams and it's almost impossible to manage an appropriate time block containing trainings, Nationals, International, ...

What could be an alternative?

- We can mandatory include the first flown program, Known Compulsory?, into the results, counting towards the final results.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Rules Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 2:

Source: Germany

Document: Section 6, Part 1

Subject: Mandatory Cuts

Affected rules: 4.3.1.1 (d), 4.1.7.2 and 4.1.7.3 ... may be more.

Background

The proposal reflects the unhappy and in many eyes unfair situation coming up when applying the (mandatory) 25%- or (optional) 50%-cut in Programme 3.

Argumentation using phrases like, "Everybody knows about this rule and the risk implied, and if somebody doesn't want to take it he/she might stay home" is short-sighted. It leads to decreasing number of pilots in the major championships; which is just the opposite of what we try to reach.

Both party's interests, athletes and organisers, must be reflected and taken into account. The following proposal covers both.

Explanations

Obsolete text is struck out, modified or new text is underlined.

Rule 4.1.7.2 to be modified introducing division into four groups instead of three (historic) for Programme 3 mirroring the uncomfortable 25%-cut in the past.

Numbering of the groups is for clarification only as we experienced irritation in this concern. Rule 4.1.7.3 to be modified introducing variations for Programme 2 and 3 (" .. starting with group 1"). Second modification in this rule is to mirror the optional 50%-cut in the old rule.

Rule 1.3.1.1(d) this change is the proposal's core. Both the others are tools to make it work only.

Rule 4.1.7.2

Old wording:

In Programmes 1, 2 and 3, the competitors are divided into three equal groups.

Change to:

In Programmes 1 and 2, the competitors are divided into three equal groups. In Programme 3, the competitors are divided in 4 equal groups. 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 groups will be numbered 1 to 3 resp. 1 to 4. Group 1 with lowest, and 3 resp. 4 with highest ranking pilots. If the number of competitors is not a complete multiple of three resp. four, the highest ranking group (3 resp. 4) will be enlarged to include the excess pilots.

Rule 4.1.7.3

Old wording:

The order of flight in each group will be determined by drawing of lots as described in paragraph 4.1.7.1. Flying order may be changed so that the lowest-ranking group flies last.

Change to:

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 in principle normally will be the reverse of their rank: starting with group 1 (in Programme 2) resp. group 2 (in Programme 3). In Programme 3, group 1 will fly last. Notwithstanding this rule, if there is a shortage of time to complete programme 2 or 3, the flying order may be changed so that in programme 2 the lowest-ranking group flies last and in programme 3 the two lower-ranking groups fly last, with lowest ranking (group 1) in the end.

In the event that time is too short to finish the full competition, Programme 2 or 3 may declared (no further change).

Rule 1.3.1.1 (d)

New wording:

For programme 3, ~~a mandatory cut of 25% of the remaining competitors, without respect to gender, will be introduced on the basis of the combined results of completed Programmes that will count in the overall results.~~ If there is insufficient time to complete the championships due to weather problems or unforeseen circumstances, the International Jury is authorised to ~~introduce an additional cut of the competitors, without respect to gender, up~~

~~to a maximum of 50%, based on the combined standings before Programme 3~~ change order of flights to flying groups in order 3, 4, 2, 1.

Rationale

- Since years we always discover the unhappy and in many eyes unfair situation when pilots facing the 25%-cut or even 50%-cut for Programme 3. The more, if doing such cutting the field to insure finishing the contest by providing sufficient number of flights, and at the same time take one or two days off, going to beach or climbing the mountains.
- This is an unbearable fate for every pilot bringing his aircraft (sometimes almost around the world) and on his own risk to a championship, spending an incredible huge amount of money for transportation or ferry-flying.
- In addition in our sport we usually have only one international competition a year to take part in.
- This proposal, though a bit verbose, in principle avoids the little and many times discussed word „mandatory“ in first line of rule 1.3.1.1.(d) only. It combines both: Fairness towards the athletes and demonstrating best will to let everybody fly as many as possible and on the other hand sharing interests of organiser and CIVA to complete a valid championship. If weather is fine, we've had a wonderful championship with as many as possible flights, using all days available. Why not? Everybody is there only for serving the contest, so let's do it, let's work! If weather is poor or other adverse circumstances occur, organiser and Jury in Programme 3 still have the option to start the flights with group 3, swapping group 2 to between group 4 and 1.

The proposal offers to every pilot entering the contest a fair chance, to have as many flights as possible and on the other hand still provides useful tools for organisers and Jury ensuring to bring a contest to a successful end, even in case of poor weather situation or any adverse circumstances.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Rules Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 3:

Source: WGAC/WAGAC Jury President
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Tow Planes

Change Para 4.1.3.2. by the following sentence:

The availability of at least **three** towing aircraft in service **plus** one standby aircraft must be guaranteed, except if the total number of competitors in both Unlimited and Advanced is less than 45 pilots. The performance of towing aircraft must meet the requirements of take-off sequence as shown under 4.2.3.1.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 4:

Source: WGAC/WAGAC Jury President
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Line Judges

Add new rules:

Team members are not allowed to approach the lines judges at less than 20 m and in any case are not allowed to communicate with the Line Judges.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 5:

Source: WGAC/WAGAC Jury President
Document: Section 6, Part 2
Subject: Paperwork

Paper work at the judging line should be separate and put in annexes.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 6:

Source: EAAC Chief Judge

Document: Section 6, Part 1

Subject: Line length between rolls and half-loops

One area of HZ dissent at several post-flight discussions related to the permitted length of line between a roll and half-loop, more specifically the point at which a line ceases to cause a downgrade and should instead lead to a HZ plus insertion because the judge has seen two separate manoeuvres. Where the line is short 6.8.8.2 & 3 provide advice on the downgrade, but I can find no instruction to determine when such a line is deemed to separate the roll from the looping segment sufficiently to require a HZ and insertion to be given. As such issues can quite clearly be reviewed by video it would seem sensible to apply a fixed time to determine this point; in my view anything beyond two seconds (at 120kt this represents 200ft) is unacceptable, and I suggest the JSC considers this for clarification and inclusion in para 6.8.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Judging Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 7:

Source: EAAC Chief Judge

Document: Section 6, Part 1

Subject: Line length between unlinked roll elements

This was also an issue and is similar to proposal above (EP #10), though if hesitation rolls are involved then the process may be affected by the pilots style of hesitation. Paragraphs 6.8.21.4 c) & d) require the hesitation between the roll elements to be a 'brief but perceptible pause' or a 'minimal ... brief check' but clear instruction is required to separate what is acceptable and should be downgraded from what is not. Again I would suggest a pause significantly longer than the preceding hesitations should be downgraded, but at two seconds the judge may conclude that the pilot has forgotten the element and an HZ plus insertion is appropriate.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Judging Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 8:

Source: Italy
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Mandatory Cuts

Proposed changes are shown in **bold**:

1.3.1.1

- d) For Programme 3, a mandatory cut of 25% of the remaining competitors, without respect to gender, will be introduced on the basis of the combined results of completed Programmes that will count in the overall results. If there is insufficient time to complete the championships due to weather problems or unforeseen circumstances, the International Jury is authorised to introduce an additional cut of the competitors, without respect to gender, up to a maximum of 50%, based on the combined standings before Programme 3. **“if time is permitting and the giving priority to the first 75% of competitors, the organizer, in accordance with International Jury, has the right to cancel this 25% cut and give the right to all the pilot to fly Programme 3”.**

CIVA President’s Note: Referred to Rules Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 9:

Source: Switzerland
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: Sequence of Flights (Drawings of lots) 4.1.7.

It is proposed to eliminate the subdivision of the pilot field into three equal groups, based on ranking of the pilots after the first qualification flight or preceding flight. Instead of that it is proposed to determine the sequence of flight for Programmes 1, 2 and 3 by an automatic drawing of lot, including all qualified pilots, without taking into account their ranking in the preceding programme. The number of pilots to be included in the drawing of lots of each programme will be done as previously defined in paragraph 1.3.1.1.

Therefore paragraph 4.1.7 needs to be changed:

4.1.7.1 The sequence of flights for Programmes Q, 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Championships will be determined by lot to be arranged by the Contest Director or his Assistant, in the presence of a representative of the International Jury. For Programme Q each competitor will draw his or her own lot. In the event a competitor is not present to draw his or her own lot, a member of

that competitor's team may do so. For Programmes 1, 2 and 3, the drawing of lots will be made automatically by a CIVA-approved programme, under the supervision of the International Jury.

4.1.7.2 Suppressed

4.1.7.3 Suppressed

4.2.1.4 The sequence of flights may be altered by the International Jury if special circumstances require, e.g. when two closely-drawn pilots are to fly the same aircraft. In such a case, there must be a minimum of two flights or 15 minutes between engine shut-off and the next start-up on the same aeroplane. If this time period causes a gap in the continuity of flying, the Starter shall inform the Chief Judge accordingly.

Rationale:

Pilots flying in the third and second group seem to be getting lower marks in general because of the low quality label associated with these groups. In the reverse, it is observed that even not so great looking flights get relatively high marks when flown by pilots belonging to the first group.

The creation of groups does not guarantee that all pilots of a group will fly under equal conditions. Fast changing meteorological conditions or mechanical incidents can affect conditions and the continuity of flights.

The random flying order and suppression of the groups should have a positive effect.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Rules Sub-Committee for consideration in 2012.

NP # 10:

Source: Switzerland
Document: Section 6, Part 1
Subject: The 60% Rule

The International Jury should not disqualify pilots solely because they have reached a score below 60% in the qualification programme or in the free programme. Of course, if a pilot gives the impression to be unsafe, then the International Jury, on the recommendation of the Chief Judge, should decide if this pilot can safely continue the competition.

Proposal:

Suppress Paragraph 1.3.1.1 c)

Rationale:

The prerogative for the International Jury, the Contest Director or the Chief Judge to disqualify a pilot is provided in paragraph 1.2.7.4 and 5.2.4.1, where a disqualification is clearly motivated by an unsafe behaviour during the flights. The disqualification of pilots considering only their scores is not respectful of their training, long term efforts and financial investment. Score is not a measure for safety.

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Rules and Judging Sub-Committees for joint consideration in 2012.

NP #11:

Source: Italy

Document: Section 6, Part 1

Subject: The 60% Rule

Proposed changes are shown in **bold**:

1.3.1.1

- c) The International Jury will disqualify from participation in Programmes 2, 3 or 4 any pilot who gains less than 60% of the total score available in the Known Compulsory Programme and less than 60% of the total score available in the Free Programme, these two results being calculated separately **“and is considered unsafe by the majority (more than 50%) of judges. Unless she/he is not considered unsafe has the right to continue the competition regardless of the scores achieved”**

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Rules and Judging Sub-Committees for joint consideration in 2012.

NP #12:

Source: CIVA President

Document: Section 6, Part 1 and 2, para 2.1.3.2 (a)

Subject: Currency Requirements for Judges

Background

Early in 2011 when Judges' selection was underway by the JSC, there was some discussion among members of the Bureau regarding the meaning of the following paragraph in Section 6:

2.1.3.2.

(a) In the year in which the championship is held or during the previous calendar year, the judge must have either judged at a national or international aerobatic championship at appropriate class or flown in that level competition as a pilot, or served as an official team trainer whose duties include critiquing appropriate level team members.

The wording under discussion was “... *appropriate class* ...”.

CIVA must establish what current judging experience is appropriate for selection to serve at FAI Aerobatic Championships. The meaning of the word “appropriate” must be more clearly defined so Judges can prepare in advance and to be sure they are current and, therefore, eligible for participation.

The types of questions that arise:

1. Is a Judge who served at an Advanced Championships (National Championships, EAAC, or WAAC) eligible for an Unlimited Championships (EAC or WAC)?
2. Is a Judge who served at a WGAC/WAGAC eligible for WAAC?

While the JSC did discuss these issues at its meeting in 2010 in Finland, there were no rules proposals made and/or written guidelines produced.

CIVA should consider inserting a table in the selection procedures which outlines acceptable currency requirements making a Judge eligible to serve at an FAI Aerobatic Championships. The table would make it easy for a Judge to determine if he/she is “current” for an FAI Aerobatic Championships, as follows:

Judge's Service in:	“Currency” Appropriate for Selection to:
National Championships (Advanced Power)	EAAC, WAAC, WAGAC, WGAC
National Championships (Unlimited Power)	EAC, WAC, WAGAC, WGAC, WAAC, EAAC
National Championships (Glider Advanced)	WAGAC



CIVA 2011
Kraków, Poland

National Championships (Glider Unlimited)	WGAC, WAGAC, WAAC, EAAC
WGAC	WAAC, EAAC
WAAC or EAAC	WAC
WAAC, WAC, EAAC, or EAC	WGAC or WAGAC

CIVA President's Note: Referred to Rules and Judging Sub-Committees for joint consideration in 2012.

Version 1.2
MRH
17 October 2011