

The multiple reasons for the whole class re-write appear at the end of this document.

6.9 CLASS F4H – R/C STAND-OFF SCALE MODEL AIRCRAFT (PROVISIONAL)

6.9.1 General Characteristics

The General Characteristics of the model shall be the same as Class F4C. (Para 6.3 refers), with the exception of para 6.3.10 (Final Scoring) which is as shown below at para 6.9.7..

6.9.2 Eligibility

No model which has previously been placed in the top three in a Continental or World Championship F4C competition, including repaints and rebuilds, will be permitted in F4H The requirement for the competitor to have constructed his own model (rule 6.1.9.4.e) is not applicable to Stand-Off Scale, however the surface finish (colour and markings) on the model must have been applied by the competitor.

6.9.3 Declaration

The competitor must complete and sign the Declaration Form at ANNEX 6E.1 certifying that he has applied the surface finish (colour and markings) to the model. The declaration also includes a questionnaire which is used by the Static Judges to assess how much the competitor contributed to the Scale Accuracy. If an incorrect declaration is subsequently revealed, the competitor may be disqualified from the contest. The competitor may also use photographs or sample material in support of the declaration.

6.9.4 Static Judging

Three Static Judges shall be appointed. The final static score shall be the average of the individual judge's marks.

All static judging is carried out at a distance of 5 metres. This is measured from the centre line of the model to the judges seating position.

Each of the following items will be awarded a mark out of 10 by each Judge in increments of half a mark.

6.9.4.1 Scale Accuracy.

This an assessment of the outline accuracy of the model compared with the prototype as seen from three aspects (side, front and top plan), judged by comparison with the documentation presented.

6.9.4.2 Originality of Model Design & Construction

This is an assessment of the extent to which the scale accuracy of the model is due to the effort of the competitor. Maximum marks will be awarded to a model which is designed and constructed in its entirety by the competitor. A model which is built from a kit will score less, dependent upon the extent of prefabrication. An ARTF model will score zero (unless evidence is presented of extensive modification by the competitor).

6.9.4.3 Colour and Markings Accuracy

This is an assessment of the accuracy of the colour and markings of the model by comparison with the documentation presented.

6.9.4.4 Colour and Markings complexity

This is a subjective assessment of the difficulty in reproducing and applying the finish and markings to the model.

cont/...

6.9.4.5 Realism

This is a subjective assessment of how well the model captures the character of the prototype as illustrated by the documentation; taking into account the surface finish, weathering and any detail that is noticeable at 5m.

6.9.5 Static judging K - Factors

Scale Accuracy –

Side View	K = 15
Front View	K = 15
Upper Plan View	K = 15
Originality of model Design & Construction	K = 15
Colour and Markings Accuracy	K = 15
Colour and Markings Complexity	K = 5
Realism	K = 20
Total K = 100	

6.9.6 Documentation

The documentation requirement is the minimum considered necessary to fully assess the outline from 3 aspects, the colour, the markings and the realism. As with all scale aeroplanes static judging, good photographs are the prime means of judging scale accuracy. Photographs and reproductions should be of a reasonable size, (approximate A5 minimum) and presented on separate sheets or as a montage no larger than A2. A book with page markers is not acceptable.

There are no prescribed penalties for missing or inadequate documentation, but judges can only award marks on the basis of the documentation available. Poor documentation will be reflected in reduced scores and any item of static judging for which there is no documentation will result in a Zero score for that item.

6.9.6.1 Photographic evidence:

At least three photographs or printed reproductions of the prototype, one or more of which must show the actual subject aircraft being modelled. Ideally these must show the entire aeroplane and show the three aspects; side view; front view and top plan view (the underneath plan view will not be judged). There is no requirement for close up or detail photographs, but additional photographs can be used to support the three aspects if the outline needs clarification.

6.9.6.2 Drawings:

Drawings are only required and will only be used by the judge if the photographic evidence for any of the outline views is inadequate. If used, drawings must conform to the requirements of rule 6.1.9.4(b). (Cautionary note - if the competitor is in any doubt on this subject, then drawings should be supplied)

6.9.6.3 Proof of colour and markings:

This may be in the form of colour chips or original paint samples, colour photographs (which may be the same photos supplied for outline), or colour illustrations published in books, magazines or on kit boxes. Published descriptions are also acceptable when accompanied by examples of similar colours used on other aircraft types. Authenticated colour chips will not be a requirement for proof of colour.

6.9.7 Final Scoring

One third of the marks are available for Static, two thirds for Flight.

Normally three rounds will be flown and the final score will be the sum of the best two flight scores and the static score. If one round is flown the flight score will be doubled, if two rounds are flown, both flight scores will be used.

6.9.8 Flying Schedule

The Flying Schedule shall be the same as F4C (Paragraph 6.3. refers with the exception of paragraph 6.3.10)

Reasons: Errors within the existing rules are as follows:-

1. Paragraph 6.9.1 – States; “Model aircraft specification: See rule 6.1.1”
*Rule 6.1.1 (page 9) is the “Definition of Scale Model Aircraft” and states;
“A scale model aircraft shall be a reproduction of a heavier than air, fixed wing, man-carrying aircraft. The aim of a scale contest is to recreate the accurate appearance and realism of the full size aircraft as best appropriate to each model aircraft class. This shall apply equally to static judging and flight performance.”*
Comment: The current F4H rules do not comply with the last sentence of this rule, because the maximum marks which can be awarded for static judging (with three judges and using the K-factors in para 6.9.4) are 1,350 and the maximum marks for flight judging (with 3 judges using the K factors in para 6.3.6) are 3,000. This is in fact a ratio of 0.45 : 1
2. Paragraph 6.9.2 Documentation – there is no sub-para 2 between sub paras 1 and 3.
Sub para 2 originally specified the drawing requirements but was removed as a result of a badly written proposal submitted by the Sub-Committee to the 2011 CIAM plenary.
Comment: Drawings are not specified as a Documentation requirement. Does this mean that drawings are not required.
(Note: Drawings were used by the judges at the last F4H competition in Spain)
3. Paragraph 6.9.3 states that; *“The competitor is required to fill in the relevant parts of the Competitors Declaration (Annex 6.E) to declare that the complete colour scheme and markings are applied to the surface of the model by the competitor. No other declaration is required.”*
Comment: This is in conflict with the Declaration Form (Annex 6.E) which has two additional sections (related to flight) which are applicable to F4H.
4. Paragraph 6.9.4 , Item 4. - Requires the judges to assess “Craftsmanship on colour and markings only”.
Comment: It is not possible to assess how the colour and markings are applied from a distance of 5 metres, ie it is not possible to determine if the model is painted, or covered in heatshrink film, or whether the markings are painted or transfers or vinyl stickers. Therefore the judge cannot make a fair assessment of the craftsmanship.
5. Paragraph 6.9.4, Item 5 - Requires the judge to assess “Scale Details”, which according to the Note at the end of the paragraph is limited to surface details and engine details.
Comment: It is not possible to judge surface and engine details from a distance of 5 metres. Many models have fully enclosed engines with little or no engine details visible, therefore this rule discriminates against these models.
6. The F4H rules also have several other serious omissions, eg there are no rules for the Competition programme, the number of static judges, the final scoring (see item 1 above), the organisation of the event and no Static Judges Guide and these aspects cannot be assumed to be the same as F4C.
7. Using the current K factors, 44.4% of the total static score is to be awarded on the basis of rules which are either impossible to judge or unfair.

---oOo---