

Minutes of AX Working Group Meeting 20th March 2013, Rio

1. Roll call

Uwe Schneider	GER	Delegate, Chairman
Mathijs de Bruijn	NED	Delegate
Claude Weber	LUX	Delegate
David Levin	USA	alt. Delegate
David Bareford	GBR	

Observers:

Soejima	Hiromori	Japan
Ichiyoshi	Sabu	Japan
Katsuki	Yasu	Japan
Oggioni	Paolo	Italy
Paenen	Rudi	Belgium
Van Geyte	Luc	Belgium
Sullivan	Maury	USA
Sullivan	Mark	USA
Baird	Andrew	USA
Haarhuis	Sanne	Netherlands
Czerniawski	Jerzy	Poland
Besnainou	Martine	France
Muir	Lindsay	UK
André	Marc	Switzerland
Kaslauskas	Zydrunas	Lithuania
Gegevicus	Tadas	Lithuania
Lockyer	Garry	Canada

2. Check of 2013 rules for Cat 1 events

1. Tochigi Hot Air Balloon International Championship, Tochigi, Japan

AX-WG recommends that Tochigi organisers use AXMER 2013 as basis for their rules. AX-WG will assist in solving any wording problems to adapt the AXMER to the observer and no logger scoring type of event. If no agreement can be found, organisers may use the set of rules handed in (based on AXMER 2010 and used all years since then).

Future rules for Cat 1 events will be checked by AX-WG and proposed to RSC for final approval.

3. AXMER Review

The following rules changes and definitions have been worked out and are proposed to the plenary:

- Gender Note included in the rules

1.9.3 In the rules the masculine form is used as a standard. Wherever you find the masculine form, it is implied that the the feminine form is included.

- Observer rules completed (which got lost)

2.2.2 If a flight crew and/or passenger flying in the basket, other than the appointed observer, has competed in any previous national, continental or world championship or WAG, he must be of the same nationality as the competitor.

3.10.1 Retrieve Crew shall not be within any MMA or within 100 m radius of a target except with permission and in presence of an official ~~the target official~~. Crews are not allowed to make permanent marks on an intersection (temporary marks are permitted, e.g. paper).

6.6.3 In events using Observers, it is the duty of the retrieve crew to assist the Observer to locate the marker and measure its position. The Observer may not be left unaccompanied to search for a marker.

- Use of additional Electronic Notice Board defined

5.10.2 If an Electronic Notice Board is used, the details will be announced in the General Briefing. In case of conflict between the Official and the Electronic Notice Board or failure of the availability of the internet, the information on the Official Notice Board will prevail.

- The following rule addition is proposed:

7.3.4 A RED PZ is a restricted airspace and will include an upper altitude limit which a competitor shall not fly below. Ground handling is not permitted.

7.3.5 A YELLOW PZ is a restricted area where no take-offs, landings or ground handling are permitted.

- addition of QNH in task data

8.8.2 Flight data:

i. QNH (if needed for logger scoring)

- replace Reckless flying by Dangerous flying

10.2 ~~RECKLESS~~ **DANGEROUS** FLYING

~~Reckless~~ **Dangerous** flying (e.g. any flying creating an unnecessary risk to other balloons, or people on the ground), not necessarily causing a collision, will be penalized up to disqualification from the event (GS 5.3).

- contest landing rule to refer to physical mark only

11.3 **CONTEST LANDING**

11.3.1 In tasks where a competitor is required to produce a **physical** mark (~~physical or electronic~~) but ~~elects~~ **does** not to do so, his landing will be deemed a contest landing. The scoring position for a contest landing is the final resting place of the basket. Published scoring periods and search periods apply.

- exception of CRAT introduced in scoring period

12.17.2 A competitor will only score if his marker is found or seen falling to the ground by officials or he has landed, within the set time limit (except as noted in Rule 15.9). Otherwise he will be scored by track point.

- Scoring Period rule better defined

12.17.3 A competitor who does not achieve a scoring position within the scoring period (if set) or within the search period (if no scoring period is set) will not achieve a result.

- Better wording of rule for unspecified penalties

13.2.2 Where safety is not an issue, and no competitive advantage has been gained, he ~~will normally~~ **may** receive a warning in the first instance.

Examples to be given in COH

- Proposed wording regarding distance infringements:

13.3.5 For competitors taking off too close to a goal or target, declaring a goal outside the limits specified in the TDS or otherwise abusing the set distance limits of a task, the penalty will be ~~determined by the following table based on the percent infringements. 2 task points per 0,1% infringement. Above 25% infringement the competitor will be scored in group B.~~

For Elbow, Angle and Land Run Tasks, the percent infringements will be the sum of the percent infringements of each 'leg', unless otherwise defined in the TDS.

~~<= 2% — 25 Task Points, <= 5% — 50 Task Points, <= 10% — 200 Task Points
<= 25% — 500 Task Points, > 25% — 1000 Task Points~~

A competitor penalized under this rule cannot achieve a score less than Group B as a result of the distance infringement penalty.

Motion: that the **AXMER** are approved as presented

4. **Input of other WG and SC or plenary**

Multi-meeting together with ScWG resolving wording and penalties

Proposal for the introduction of a mandatory CIA RANKING LIST

The reason for this request is WADA, the international doping agency. They requested a list from that they can choose the persons to be tested, if one day they decide to test hot air balloonists.

Together with CSC chairman it was decided, that the WRL by definition is not to be used for invitation purposes, but that there is no objection to use it for the WADA request.

Proposal to make mandatory World-, Continental- and WAG Championship Test Events an integral part of the Championship sanction

Discussion in AX-WG led to the point, that World-, Continental- and WAG Championship Test Events are recommended and highly appreciated, but to make them mandatory is a high burden for the organiser which he may have difficulties to get the necessary resources for. It is felt that the mandatory event may reduce the number of potential organisers.

Proposal do reconsider and redefine FAI CAT2 events in aerostation

Regarding CAT2 Events (sporting events), AX-WG agrees that this category seems 'seldom used'. We propose to redefine CAT2 to allow CAT1 events with other regulations on invitation process, international jury and language.

Team Scoring Proposal

It was worked out, that there is a difference in **Team Scoring** and **Team Competition**.

Team scoring is a pure play with mathematics. The standard competition with it's tasks is used to produce the individual winner. From the final results the team scoring is calculated, e.g. which NAC has the best median score, and prizes are given to the best of these groups.

Team competition is another kind of competition with tasks, where a team can only score if the team members fulfil/solve certain tasks. An example is that one team member has to 'open a keyhole' dropping a mark in a small scoring area before the rest of the team members are allowed to drop on the 'team target' located at another place.

The Lithuanian approach is for team scoring and thus it is recommended to use the mathematics of calculating the best median score of a team. Creating the teams is at the discretion of the organisers.

(Synopsis of Maury Sullivan on team competition)

5. Recommendation to other WG and SC

- ScWG to give guidelines of how to calculate / apply penalty in yellow PZ in COH.
- Discussion of automatic entry at General Cat. AX Worlds for medal holders of Women and Junior Cat. AX Worlds forwarded to S&SC as sporting code is affected

6. Business for 2013/2014

- Allow the use of turning vents in flight for the purpose of orienting the basket
- Rule 8.4.7 will be investigated for situations competitors fly out of the set distance limits and reenter.

Summary of Motions to the plenary:

Motion: that the **AXMER** are approved as presented

Proposed 2013/2014 Working Group Members and Chairperson

Uwe Schneider	(GER)	delegate - Chairman
Mathijs deBruijn	(NED)	delegate
David Levin	(USA)	alt. delegate
Claude Weber	(LUX)	delegate
David Bareford	(GBR)	expert

Team Competitive Flying Proposal CIA 2013 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Primary Purpose

The primary purpose of adding Team Competition as a new category of competitive events (World Championship, Women's and Junior Championship) is to provide opportunities to expand the sport and rejuvenate interest in competition among experienced as well as less experienced competitors. It has proved to be an excellent format for mentoring new or less experienced competitive pilots.

Brief Description of Team Competition and Background Information

Team competition involves three pilots working together to achieve team goals and objectives. Using basic AXMER rules, team competition rules are modified and expanded to include tasks requiring the coordinated effort of all team members to achieve a single result.

Methods to determine team composition must be flexible but should consider the primary purpose of encouraging competitive flying at all levels of experience and skill sets. Team competitions could be designed to develop teams by:

- Country for International competitions
- Experience or some ranking method
- Mixed International with each team comprised of pilots from differing countries

As used in the US since 1995, Team Competition has been designed to encourage blending pilot composition to include no more than one "A" ranked pilot. The determination and definition of "A" ranked pilots can be determined by each organizer based on its goals and objectives. Open team competitive events may not include any restrictions on team competition.

Team competition provides the ability to rejuvenate the sport as pilots not typically in the echelon of the competitive ranks are able to compete against the best of the best more effectively in the team format.

Special Needs and Requirements

Team competition, as used in this context, requires its own scoring program capable of handling the nuances of team tasks and scoring methods. The US team scoring program, while functional, is in need of a major overhaul to bring it up to date with current sophisticated software.