

AGENDA ITEM 9.5

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, in consultation with the Bureau, determines if these matters are to be considered immediately, at the next plenary, or are to be referred to the appropriate CIVA Sub-Committee or Working Group. The proposals below were submitted by Delegates in accordance with the procedure and are provided in their entirety.

However, only those **marked in yellow will be considered at plenary.**



Proposals from the Czech Republic (AWAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code – Section 6, Part 1

Czech Proposal #1:

Use and treat the results from Known Compulsory Programme the same way as from other programmes, i.e.

- a. Final results from Known Compulsory Programme will count toward the Championships (change of par. 1.3.1.1, 1.3.1.2, 4.1.7.2)
- b. World / Continental Champion in Known Compulsory Programme is declared (change of par. 1.3.1.3, 1.3.1.4, 1.3.1.5, 1.3.1.6, 1.3.1.7)
- c. Champion and second and third placings will be awarded medals and diplomas the same way as in other programmes (change of par. 4.5.2, 4.5.3)

Rationale:

- Known Compulsory Programme is in most cases not used for restricting pilots gaining less than 60% of total possible score from continuation in the competition. Last use of this cut was in 2000 Championships in Toulouse. Anyway this role could be retained.
- Known Compulsory Programme uses significant part of the competition time schedule.

- Competitors do spend their resources (flight time, expenses, etc.) preparing for this programme. It is therefore logical to award them for their results in this programme (as in glider competitions) once this programme is evaluated by the board of judges.
- The role of Known Compulsory programme as a training up to the time limit of 10 minutes can be retained
- The role of Known Compulsory Programme as a determination of sequence of flights in the Free programme can be retained. This role is anyway reduced using par. 4.1.7.2



Proposals from Finland (from EAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1

Finland Proposal #1:

1.2.4.3. Eligibility “A”

- a) Pilots are eligible to fly in an Advanced contest providing that they have not flown in an Unlimited World or Continental Championship for powered aircraft during the year of the Advanced contest or in the preceding two years.
- b) This restriction does not, however, prevent a pilot who has not received at least 60% of the total possible points at either an Unlimited World or Continental Championship for powered aircraft from participating in an Advanced contest.
- c) A pilot who qualifies for an Advanced contest under the provisions of paragraph (b) above, must achieve a minimum of 70% of the total possible points at a World or Continental Advanced Championship before being allowed to participate in an “U” contest.

Rationale:

There are pilots, who have been participating in “U” contests for years and who might want to come back to “A” level especially now that the wider selection of eligible aircraft in “A” would make it possible for them without changing their airplane. The present rule makes it practically impossible to change category without loss of several years in competition.

On the other hand new pilots should be allowed to “try their hand” in “U” category without penalizing them unnecessarily if they need more experience in “A” category before entering “U”. The present rule forces these kinds of pilots to continue in “U” category like a rope walker or discontinue their competition activity, when they should be allowed to gain more experience in “A” and to re-enter “U” competition a few years later.

Competition statistics:

Competition	Nr of participants	Highest placing of pilot not placing in top 60%	PP of highest ranked pilot not placing in top 60%	Placing of pilot with highest PP under 50%	Determining factor
EAC 2006	40	25	59,25 %	35	Placing
WAC 2005	48	30	61,71 %	37	Placing
WAC 2003	47	29	47,95 %	27	Point percentage
EAC 2002	53	33	73,85 %	52	Placing
WAC 2001	59	36	68,75 %	46	Placing

Competition	Nr of participants	Placing of pilot to still place in top 50%	PP of lowest ranked pilot to place in top 50%	Placing of pilot with lowest PP over 70%	Determining factor
AWAC 2006	63	31	71,99 %	42	Placing
AEAC 2005	45	22	71,42 %	23	Placing
AWAC 2004	61	30	70,85 %	34	Placing
AEAC 2003	42	21	55,49 %	10	Point percentage
AWAC 2002	56	28	43,98 %	16	Point percentage



Proposals from Russia (EAC and AWAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1

Russia Proposal #1:

In case the decision of removing the bonuses for short free sequences in unlimited is accepted the maximum figures number for free program is **7**.

Rationale:

1. Most of the pilots at the several World and European Championships flew 7 figures sequences. A few flew 6 figures ones. Why we need to limit the unlimited category of pilots with lower difficulties then they choose themselves?
2. For those who can not fly 7 figures sequence there is always an option of creating a sequence with lower total K.
3. The winner is the one who can fly difficult program better then others.
4. We regard the proposal urgent so at the Plenary Meeting where will be more options to vote for on the issue.



Russia Proposal #2:

4.2.2.6. Permitted Breaks

- a) 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). The competitor is then allowed to readjust height without penalty to commence the second part.
- b) The pilot may choose where to take this break without stating so in advance, and such break need not be marked on Forms B or C. However, second or subsequent breaks will be penalized in accordance with paragraph 5.2.5. When an interruption occurs along the y-axis, the competitor must resume his or her flight in the same direction of flight.
- c) If the cloud base subsequently rises to the higher figure in the table, pilots may no longer interrupt their flights without penalty.

With due warning, i.e. at least 10 minutes in advance, pilots will be advised by the Contest Director (or his staff), following advice to him from the International Jury, when they are to fly with / without interruption when the meteo conditions have changed.

Note: even though an interruption may be allowed without penalty by the International Jury, there is no obligation for pilots to interrupt their flight.

Rationale:

Pilots need to have time to readjust their plan for the flight both then the interruption becomes allowed and not allowed.

Russia Proposal #3:

4.3.4.1. For the Unknown Compulsory Programmes, figures will be chosen from Section 9. A maximum of 10 figures may be submitted. A representative of every National Aero Club which has a pilot (or pilots) competing may submit one figure, unless there are more than 10 Aero Clubs participating. In this case, the procedure to determine which Aero Clubs will submit figures will be as in paragraph 4.3.4.2. Repetition of any **submitted** figure with the same catalogue number **in one programme** is not allowed. The intent of this regulation is that in Programme 3, the sequence will be different from that in Programme 2, composed with the new figures submitted by Aero Clubs for Programme 3.

Rationale:

Correcting to the previous edition's meaning and making possible repetition of the catalog numbers for the linking figures which is frequently the case.



Russia Proposal #4:

6.8.22.3. The pauses will be of identical duration and the degree of rotation correct between each pause: 180 degrees, 90 degrees, or 45 degrees. Each pause of a hesitation roll must be clearly recognizable in every case, but it is especially important that in poor visibility or at high altitude, the competitor pauses long enough to make them recognizable to the Judges. If a pause is not recognizable to a judge, the figure is graded a ~~soft zero (0.0)~~ **hard zero (HZ)**.

Rationale:

Was corrected at the AWAC

Russia Proposal #5:

FPS:

1. There should be a clarification of the priorities in determination of Super-Families:
 - If there are both a snap and a spin on one figure, which Super-Family number it is (probably not likely in advanced or Yak 52 category but still...)?
 - If there is a snap on a Stall turn, which Super-Family number it is (possible)? In our opinion it should be 04.
 2. If all the judges (or most of the judges) give 0.0 for a figure it should remain 0.0, not an FPS score after normalization (the same as HZ). Reasoning – in this case you need negative score to be given by a judge for correct changing of the score.
 3. Implement progressive interval the way it was done in TBLP. Reasoning is exactly the same as presented by Rudy Penteadó. Removing this principle allows abrupt changes in the results when a next pilot's scores are added to the system.
-

Russia Proposal #6:

The Franco Battistoni Trophy is not in the CIVA Regulations. It must be corrected.

Russia Proposal #7:

1.3.1.6. Champions and Winners "U"

b) The male and female World Champions will be the male and female competitors who gain the highest total number of points each in Programmes 1, 2 and 3. Programme 4 will be a separate competition programme with its own gold, silver and bronze medals. In the event that Programmes Q, 1, 2, and 3 are not completed, World Champions will be named in



Programme 1 and 2 as well as Overall Champions and World Champion Teams. In the event that only Programme 1 is completed, the results for Programme Q will be used retrospectively to declare **Overall World Champion**, male and female overall World Champions and World Champion Teams.

Russia Proposal #8:

1.6.3.2. and 1.6.3.3. must be valid for both World and **Continental** Championships

Russia Proposal #9:

Aerobatic box must be clearly marked according to 4.7. The markers must be visible from any working height.

The marking must be done prior to the beginning of the competitions and the photo pictures of the aerobatic box made along both axes from the height of 500 and 1000 m must be distributed among the Jury members and Team representatives so everybody can check the correctness of the box geometry and familiarize with the references.

Rationale:

To assure the correctness of the box geometry and let pilots an opportunity familiarize with the references especially when the training prior to the competitions is not allowed.

Russia Proposal #10:

Minimum number of Judges at the World and Continental Championships is 7, maximum is 10.

Rationale:

1. FPS is based on statistic principles. The more judges the better it works.
 2. If the number of judges is low the weight of a judge mistake is high. If 2 or 3 judges make mistake, which is not so rare a case when the figures are complicated, the weight of a mistake is very high and will distort the results. If the number of judges is 8 to 10 the mistake will be regarded as a mistake.
 3. Correct results have a priority over financial problems of feeding a few more people.
 4. Decision of making a number of judges lower was made with violation of normal proposal submission procedure, was not discussed at any subcommittee meeting and a year before was not accepted by CIVA when submitted.
-



Russia Proposal #11:

The main criteria of Judges' performance is RI as it shows the real quality of a Judge perception of the competition flights.

Russia Proposal #12:

Remove:

5.1.1.3. Where the majority decision of the Panel of Judges is required, in a case of disagreement about the penalisation of the flight of a competitor, the Judge of the same country as the competitor shall abstain from voting. In case the required simple majority could not be rise from a vote within the Board of Judges, the Chief Judge shall have a casting vote.

Rationale:

This does not make sense if we are talking about International Judges and anonymity principle.



Proposals from USA (AWAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1

USA Proposal #1:

Move 4.2.2.1 (Operating hours) to after 4.2.3.1 (Conduct of Competition Flight) where it is more appropriate, and renumber the paragraphs in 4.2.3.

Add a note that the Organizers will post the next pilot number to fly on a board. This will be posted on the flight line and very visible to pilots. It will also be posted at a location within the close vicinity of the pilot house or score room if these are not in close proximity to the flight line.

Rationale:

Self-explanatory.



USA Proposal #2:

Add a 30 point penalty for improper or incomplete signaling. If a rule is present, a penalty must also be present.

4.2.6.2 Signaling

a) A competitor must signal the start and finish of each programme, and any interruption, by distinctly dipping the wing more than 45 degrees but less than 135 degrees and returning to level three times in succession and in the same direction. The program is deemed to start upon return to wings level after the third wing dip and is deemed to finish upon reaching wings level after the third wing dip.

b) A 30 point penalty will be assessed for improper or incomplete signaling.

USA Proposal #3:

Assess a penalty of 200/250 (Advanced/Unlimited) points to a competitor who is not ready when their slot time arrives. Upon notification from the event organizer or representative, the pilot will be ready to start their engine.

Add the following 5.3.1.1 and re-number section 5.3.1 as follows:

5.3.1 Downgrades

5.3.1.1 A penalty of 200/250 (Advanced/Unlimited) points will be assessed a pilot who is not ready when their slot time arrives.



Proposals from the President of the International Jury (AWAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1

Jury President Proposal #1:

A situation and subsequent protest at the 2006 AWAC highlighted the fact that the current FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1, is not clear on what action a competitor may take to restart the sequence following a programme interruption. The ambiguity in the current regulations resulted in the Chief Judge assessing an “insertion penalty” for an improper



restart following a programme interruption, the competitor complaining, and the International Jury subsequently upholding the complaint.

The proposed change makes two changes:

- (1) Adds the specific case where a program interruption is initiated by the competitor by dipping the wings three times;
- (2) Specifically defines three locations where the competitor may restart the sequence following an interruption. Those locations are: (a) with the figure immediately preceding the point of interruption; (b) with the figure in which the interruption occurred; and (c) with the figure immediately following the point of interruption.

EXAMPLES:

- (1) Interruption taken between figures #3 and #4
Programme may restart with either figure #3 or #4
- (2) Interruption taken within figure #3
Programme may restart with either figure #3 or #4

Should the pilot restart the programme at any other location, a second interruption penalty would be assessed.

This proposed change would eliminate any ambiguity for both pilots and judges on the proper procedure for restarting a sequence following a programme interruption.

Current Wording

- 5.2.5.1. A competitor will be given penalty points, in accordance with the appropriate tariff, if he or she interrupts his or her programme:
- a) in order to make a change of attitude or direction between two figures (more than 90°);
 - b) in order to lose or regain height;

Proposed Wording

- 5.2.5.1. A competitor will be given penalty points, in accordance with the appropriate tariff, if he or she interrupts his or her programme:
- a) by dipping the wing three (3) times immediately one after the other;

b) in order to make a change of attitude or direction between two figures (more than 90°);

c) in order to lose or regain height;

5.2.5.2. Following a programme interruption, the competitor must restart his or her programme with the figure:

a) immediately preceding the point of interruption;

b) in which the interruption occurred;

c) immediately following the point of interruption

In no case, shall a figure which had already received a score (even if zero) prior to a programme interruption outlined in 5.2.5.1. be rescored.

5.2.5.3. Should the competitor restart his or her programme at any point other than provide for in 5.2.5.2, the competitor will be given additional penalty points, in accordance with the appropriate tariff.

5.2.5.4. [insert current paragraph 5.2.5.2.]

Jury President Proposal #2:

A new section to be added as follows:

5.2.7 Failure to Appear

In the event a competitor fails to appear at his or her designated take-off time, the pilot will lose the slot and not be permitted to fly that flight programme. A zero for the programme will result. The International Jury may waive this rule if special circumstances require it.

Rationale:

It is imperative that competitions move along at a fast pace and in accordance with the directions of the Chief Judge and Flight Director. If pilots fail to appear or are engaging in delaying tactics in order to gain advantage, they must be severely penalized.

The history of our Championships have shown on many occasions that every minute and hour that is well utilized during good weather can make the difference as to whether a competition is completed. In addition, we cannot tolerate intentional delays which may result in advantages to pilots/teams final standings.

Jury President Proposal #3

The following sentence to be added to 4.1.7.1:

If available, the drawing of lots can be made by a CIVA approved random program under the supervision of the International Jury.

Rationale:

With competitors now divided into three groups (based on rank order) for the purposes of establishing order of flight, there is simply insufficient time to gather everyone together to have random drawings by pilots after each flight programme. The computer can accomplish this task with the push of a button. ACMS already has this feature and it has been used at glider contests for years. AWAC 2006 used this feature with the permission of Team Managers and the International Jury but it should be a permanent section of our rules.



Proposals from the Chief Judge (EAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 2

Rule Reference	Current	Proposed Change	Rationale
6.8.22.3 Hesitation Rolls	“...Each pause of a hesitation roll must be clearly recognisable in every case, but it is especially important that in poor visibility or at high altitude, the competitor pauses long enough to make them recognisable to the Judges. If a pause is not recognisable to a judge the figure is graded a soft zero .”	“...Each pause of a hesitation roll must be clearly recognisable in every case, but it is especially important that in poor visibility or at high altitude, the competitor pauses long enough to make them recognisable to the Judges. If a pause is not recognisable to a judge the figure is graded a hard zero .”	The absence of a hesitation is a matter of fact. A judge should HZ a figure with a missing hesitation.



<p>8.8.7 statistic</p>	<p>JPI Overall Judging Performance Index Explanation of how system works</p>	<p>Delete whole section including: 8.8.7.1 8.8.7.2 8.8.7.3</p>	<p>JPI statistic should be discontinued. Ranking Index is a better measure of judging performance. See detailed analysis of EAC 2006 judging for rationale.</p>
<p>8.8 Judging Performance Indices</p>	<p>8.8.2 Low Scoring Index 8.8.2.1 The Low Scoring Index measures how many times a judge grades a figure significantly lower than the consensus view of the judges.</p>	<p>Modify description to include: Two LSI figures are calculated for each judge. LSI - Soft Zero: in cases when 0.0 marks awarded by a particular judge were found to be significantly too low. LSI – Non Zero: in cases when non zero marks awarded by a particular judge were found to be significantly too low. Mathematical definitions need to be written for each case and the rules edited accordingly.</p>	<p>Change is needed to separate low marks associated with soft zeros from other instances where non zero marks were given. Soft zeros (usually where judges believed a figure did not snap, spin or slide) account for many of the low scoring anomalies. A distinction is needed between cases that involve soft zeros and those that do not so that the meaning of the LSI can be interpreted appropriately.</p>

<p>9.20 Family 9.8. Eight- point rolls in List of Figures allowed for Programmes 2 and 3</p>	<p>9.8.3.4 Full horizontal 8 point roll</p>	<p>Remove 9.8.3.4 from the list of allowed figures for all levels (Y/A/U).</p>	<p>Full 8 point rolls do little to differentiate amongst pilots but cause real inconsistency in judging.</p>
<p>2.1.5 Composition of the Board of Judges</p>	<p>5.1.5.1 At World and Continental Championships and international competitions the International Board of Judges will be composed of:</p> <p>a) The Chief Judge: b) A maximum of 7 international Judges and 14 assistants and a minimum of 5 International Judges and 10 assistants for marking the quality of aerobatic manoeuvres and positioning if the electronic tracking instrument is not in operation.</p>	<p>5.1.5.1 At World and Continental Championships and international competitions the International Board of Judges will be composed of:</p> <p>a) The Chief Judge: b) A minimum of 7 international Judges and 14 assistants (except at YAK52 contests, where a minimum of 5 International Judges and 10 assistants may be used) for marking the quality of aerobatic manoeuvres and positioning if the electronic tracking instrument is not in operation.</p>	<p>It is important that the minimum number of judges needed for World and Continental championships does not fall below 7.</p> <p>The maximum number of judges required is a matter of cost rather than viability of the judging panel.</p>



<p>2.1.5.1 Selection of Board of Judges</p>	<p>Should there be more than 7 suitably qualified international Judges present at Championships (to include those nominated by the National Aero Clubs and those selected by CIVA if applicable) the following procedure will be used for the selection of the Board of Judges.</p> <p>a) Programme Q i) All judges who wish to be represented on the Board of Judges will judge Programme Q with no limit on number, provided that they have a qualified assistant as required in Sporting Code, (paragraph 7.5.1.1). Any judge who does not provide a qualified assistant will be excluded. JPI's derived by the International Jury after Programme Q will be used to select the panel of judges. The panel of judges will always be a minimum of 5 judges and may exceed 7 judges, however, only a maximum of 7 judges will be used at any one time.</p> <p>Etc.....</p>	<p>a) All judges who wish to be represented on the Board of Judges will judge Programme Q and 1-4 with no limit on number, provided that they have a qualified assistant as required in Sporting Code, (paragraph 7.5.1.1). Any judge who does not provide a qualified assistant will be excluded.</p> <p>b) The International Jury may exclude a judge from the Board of Judges after the completion of any programme if that judge's Judge Performance Indices significantly deteriorate from those established in previous programmes.</p> <p>c) At international competitions the same procedure will be used.</p>	<p>There is no reason why judges who have attended a competition should not be allowed and encouraged to judge all programmes. There is no cost saving to the organisers by cutting the size of the judging panel and rotating judges.</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>4.1.7.2 Drawing of lots</p>	<p>In Programme 1, 2 and 3, the competitors will be divided into three 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 order of flight in each group will be determined by drawing of lots as described in paragraph 4.1.7.1.</p>	<p>In Programme 1, 2 and 3, the competitors will be divided into three equal groups. If the number of competitors in a programme is not divisible by three, the first group will be expanded to include the excess pilots, leaving two smaller, equally sized second and third 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 order of flight in each group will be determined by drawing of lots as described in paragraph 4.1.7.1 or automatically using the ACMS software under the supervision of the International Jury.</p>	<p>This is the procedure implemented in the ACMS system and what was included in the original three group proposal.</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>4.3.4.1 Selection of Figures for Unknown Programmes</p>	<p>4.3.4.1. ...”Repetition of any figure with the same catalogue number is not allowed.”</p>	<p>4.3.4.1 ...”Repetition of any manoeuvre with the same catalogue number is not allowed within any one programme. Repetition of a complete figure from Programme 2 in Programme 3 is not allowed.”</p>	<p>Clarifies the repetition rule. Catalogue numbers can be repeated, but not a complete figure.</p> <p>For example a loop with a whole roll at the top could be flown in Programme 2. A loop with a 2 point roll could be flown in Programme 3, because although the loop is repeated, the complete figure is different because the rolling element is different in each Programme.</p> <p>This preserves variety of figures in Programme 2 and 3.</p>
<p>5.3.3.1 Figures started behind the judges</p> <p>7.3.1.3 Duties of the Chief Judge</p>	<p>5.3.3.1 A grade of “Hard Zero” (HZ) should be given if the judge considers that the figure is incorrectly flown in respect of a geometrical error, as listed below, that is clearly verifiable as a matter of fact. A grade of HZ will be given to a figure if:..... f) any figure is started behind the judges.</p> <p>7.3.1.3 “...The Chief Judge...should also confirm which figures should receive a Hard Zero because they were started behind the judges.”</p>	<p>5.3.3.1 A grade of “Hard Zero” (HZ) should be given if the judge considers that the figure is incorrectly flown in respect of a geometrical error, as listed below, that is clearly verifiable as a matter of fact. A grade of HZ will be given to a figure if: f) any figure is started behind the judges.</p> <p>7.3.1.3 “...The Chief Judge...should also decide which figures should receive a Hard Zero because they were started behind the judges.”</p>	<p>The rules need to be clarified about who makes the decision about figures flown behind the judges.</p> <p>Here, the Chief Judge has to make the decision when figures should be zeroed for being behind the judges and set the figure to a CHZ for all judges. All judges should have their marks changed to HZ before score sheets are processed so they are not penalised on the HZI if they marked the figure.</p>

<p>7.2.4 Treatment of Hard Zeros.</p>	<p>7.2.4 Hard Zeros – Fact not Perception.</p> <p>The Chief Judge will examine the reasons given by the scoring judges for the award of a Hard Zero. If the scoring judge has made a mistake and quoted a reason which is actually a matter of perception (e.g. “No Flick”), the Chief Judge will instruct that the scoring judge change his grade to Soft Zero.</p>	<p>7.2.4 Hard Zeros – Fact not Perception.</p> <p>The Chief Judge will examine the reasons given by the scoring judges for the award of a Hard Zero. If the scoring judge has made a mistake and quoted a reason which is actually a matter of perception (e.g. “No Flick”), the Chief Judge will instruct that the scoring judge change his grade to Soft Zero.</p> <p>In cases where the scoring judges award a mixture of Hard and Soft Zeros for a particular figure, the Chief Judge will review the reasons each judge gave for awarding a zero and will decide if each of the zero marks should be defined as Hard Zeros or Soft Zeros and will instruct the scoring judges to change their zero designations accordingly.</p>	<p>This change is needed to give the Chief Judge the responsibility and right to review the designation of Hard and Soft Zeros so that the scoring judges’ grades are treated in the fairest and most appropriate way in each situation.</p> <p>For instance, in a situation where a rolling element is over rotated by 90 degrees, the judges may have given a combination of soft and hard zeros.</p> <p>The Chief Judge will review the reasons each judge gave for zeroing the figure and then decide if all of the zeros should be set to Hard Zero, all to Soft Zero, or that a mixture should remain.</p>
--	--	--	--



Proposals from the Contest Director (AWAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1

AWAC Contest Director Proposal #1:

There must be rule changes regarding preliminary entry fees. To keep pilots obliged to come to the Contest once they make a preliminary commitment to do so, they should pay a non-refundable deposit to be submitted with the preliminary entry form.

AWAC Contest Director Proposal #2:

It must be clearly stated in the rules that pilot having his/her spot in the queue and called for the flight must be ready for take-off in a specific period of time. Without specific penalties, compliance cannot be enforced.



Proposals from Sweden (AWAC 2006 and EAC 2006)

FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1

During this year it was with the shortest possible time that AWAC 2006 was completed due to weather. At EAC 2006 the Q and free took more than a week to complete. Earlier years have had the same problem, the most important programs (the Unknowns) have been put more in the background in favour for the Q-flight. The causes have been mainly due to weather and inefficient organisations.

The proposal includes the following changes.

Sweden Proposal #1

1. **Inspection on site 3 month before** by the CIVA's contest organisation to guide the organiser to optimise the contest.
2. **Selection of judges;**
 - a. Minimum 7 judges for World and Continental championships, YAC-WAC with 5 judges.
 - b. All judges on the approved list can apply.
 - c. Nomination made by the judging subcommittee the build on previous result and opinion/analyse from chief judging team.
 - d. Allow 2 new judges out of 7.



- e. CIVA Bureau approves.
3. The judges will start on the first day with discussions about new rules. The main part of day one with warm-up flights to get the judges ready and the contest organisation to work smoothly. Efficient debriefing with judges after day one.
 4. Late afternoon on day one General briefing and opening ceremony.
 5. Day two **Q-flight the result counts** to the overall result.
 6. **Skip the free program.**
 7. **Three unknown programs**, with the second and third unknown possibilities for contest organisation in cooperation with the jury to cut in the start list.
 8. **Judges debriefing after efficient analysis** of result (as Steve Green did at EAC 2006).