

CIVA Presidents Proposals 2017 v2

#1: Review of Part-1 Final Freestyle Regulations

At World and European (Continental) unlimited championships the judging of the Programme-5 Final Freestyle and completion of the paperwork is a lengthy process because each judge needs initially to record their marks for the 10 aspects of each flight on a separate sheet so that overall the grading of each aspect can develop on a 'relative' basis. After all flights are complete it may be necessary for a judge to upgrade or downgrade some groups of marks if any are below zero or above 10 to maintain the correct overall balance. When this is complete all the grades must be transferred to each competitor's individual marks sheet, a further time-consuming process.

An increasingly prevalent view is that the existing 10-area performance grading system with its 29 sub-elements is unnecessarily complex and that the judging process could be considerably simplified without affecting the validity of the result – indeed a simpler / better system could even provide a quicker and more relevant solution. Note that this programme is the one most advantageously staged before a public audience and a more transparent and easily understood set of judging criteria that could even lead to 'instant' output of the judges marks to a big screen would significantly improve its perception at the time and subsequently through media / video recordings.

We also frequently hear that competitors would like their selection of music to accompany their flight. At WAC this year this was accomplished without any significant technical issues, in practice the Chief Judge can quickly take-over the transmission channel to issue safety instructions to the competitor. The current Programme-5 regulations exclude assessment of the music by judges during the flight, whereas clearly a suitable soundtrack can enhance the flight provided the pilot makes good use of it.

Proposal: A Working Group of selected judges, unlimited competitors and CIVA officers should be established to review all aspects of the Final Freestyle regulations, to report back to the 2018 plenary with a revised format that will accomplish the above aims.

An example of the current Final Freestyle judging form is appended to this document

#2: Chief Judge improved option to refer HZ and other panel disagreements to the Jury

Situations can arise during post-flight video conferences where one or more judges, on finding that an HZ they have awarded / not awarded or their interpretation of some judging criteria is not shared by other judges, have refused to accept that they may be wrong and continue to defend their original grade even though the video indicates that the opposing view is more likely to be correct. In these situations the Chief Judge is permitted only to apply a Confirmed HZ in accordance with a majority vote, although it may be his opinion that the competitor will receive an inappropriate grade for the figure.

Proposal: Part-1 para 4.4.4.4.a) should be amended to give the Chief Judge broader latitude to refer such situations to the International Jury, as follows:

a) The Chief Judge may on occasions, where there is a mixture of scores and Hard Zeros for a figure, not be able to determine the validity of the Hard Zero **or other** score(s), due **either** to uncertainty in the Regulations (e.g. paperwork errors) **or to unwillingness of one or more judges to accept that their mark may be incorrect even though the video indicates the validity of an opposing view**. In such instances the Chief Judge shall tick the CHZ box and then refer the matter to the International Jury for clarification and a final decision.

#3: Clarification of KAWG and GAC Free Known figure responsibilities

The Free Known sequence system continues to provide an excellent format for pilots and judges at all our championships in both power and glider categories.

To make the very best of this style of programme construction it is crucial that CIVA publishes sensible and challenging sets of Known master figures in every category for pilots to use when constructing their Free Known sequences. The power Known figures are traditionally selected for each following year at the plenary conference in November from a range of sets approved by the Known Assessment Working Group (KAWG), while glider sets are handled by the Glider Aerobatic Committee (GAC).

Proposal: To ensure that a good range of sets of suitable figures is available to plenary for the final selection process, the following text should be published as an official statement of the authority vested by CIVA in the two bodies in charge of this process:

Submission of power and glider Free Known figure sets

The range of figures submitted by NAC's to the CIVA Known Assessment Working Group (KAWG) and the Glider Aerobatic Committee (GAC) are key elements in the process that leads to the selection of Free Known master figures for each category by attendees at the annual plenary conference. CIVA therefore requires each NAC to provide as many sets of five figures in as many categories as possible, on or by the deadline published in each year. These must be either OpenAero (.seq) or Visio Aresti (.vsd) computer files; pdf's, Word files or any other solutions are not acceptable.

The KAWG and the GAC have a broad remit that enables them not only to use the sets submitted by NAC's as the basis for their considerations, but to achieve the very best solutions they are entitled to suggest revisions to the authors of submitted sets, and also to add sets of their own design where they consider this is necessary and/or appropriate.

#4: Clarification of Organiser responsibility to check Free Unknown sequences

Although Section 6 part 1 para 2.2.1.10.a) and part 2 para 2.2.1.11.a) make clear that it is the Organiser's responsibility to check every competitor's Free Known sequence prior to

acceptance, the responsibility for checking submitted Free Unknown sequences currently resides with the International Jury. The IJ however has a continuous overall responsibility to oversee all aspects of the whole event, and it follows that the validation and approval of Free Known and Free Unknown sequences at an event would be better assigned to the Contest Organiser – with oversight by the International Jury of course.

Proposal: Part 1 para 2.3.1.5 should be revised as follows:

2.3.1.5. The Contest Organiser shall provide copies of the list of figures to all competing NACs, and each NAC may submit to the ~~International Jury~~ **Contest Organiser** a maximum of two sequences, composed ~~of using~~ these figures, for each Programme. The contest Organiser will determine the deadline for submitting proposed sequences, **and is responsible for checking all such sequences for validity**. Computer files must be submitted ~~and must~~ containing complete pages of all five Forms: A, B, C, R and L. Acceptable file formats and responsibility of submitting NACs in terms of up-to-date software are as described in rule 2.2.1.9.a).

And in part 2 para 2.3.1.5 should be added:

2.3.1.5. The Contest Organiser shall be responsible for receiving and checking all submitted Free Unknown sequences for validity.

#5: Addition of 'Check Lists' to Section 6 (all parts)

It has become evident that some organisers are not applying some or all of the instructions mandated in Section 6 Parts 1 and 2 at their events, and that the additional information provided by the CIVA Guide to Contest Organisation (the GCO) is being ignored when establishing their management structures and guidelines. This is leading to key items being poorly handled or even absent, and competitors and/or the International Jury have had no option but to take such issues into their own hands to reach an acceptable solution.

Clearly when a bid is made to organise a CIVA championship it is essential that the prospective organiser has a good knowledge of all relevant instructions and regulatory documents, including but not limited to the relevant Section 6 part, the GCO and the FAI Organiser Agreement (OA) that becomes the defining legal document for the event.

Proposal: To simplify the recognition of all key aspects of the organiser's duties, Check Lists should be included as an appendix to each Section 6 part to identify all essential and critical items and processes that the organiser must manage successfully in the execution of the event. These check lists will be created by senior CIVA officers and experienced organisers for review and approval by the bureau, and will be included as added appendices to each Section 6 part by March 31st 2018. Note that these will not include new instructions; their purpose is solely to collate existing key items of information and their paragraph references in an easily digested format.

#6: Add 'electric' power to Section 6 part 1 para 1.2.3.1

Although it is not yet feasible to fly a championship style aerobatic sequence driven solely by battery-electric power, this will undoubtedly become possible in the next few years and CIVA should therefore at least encourage designers in this field by adding acceptance of electric engine power into our regulations.

Proposal: Section 6 part 1 para 1.2.3.1 should be revised to become:

1.2.3.1 World and Continental Championships are ~~at present~~ open to piston-engine **and electric powered** aircraft only.

#7: Revision to the "Average" mark calculation

A judge is entitled to request that an average mark should be provided by the scoring system if for any reason they are unable to give the mark themselves – for example if they are momentarily distracted or physically incapacitated, or are technically unable to assess the situation and deliver a fair and honest mark for the figure. On such occasions they may record an "AV" on their marking sheet and the FairPlay System will insert a statistically fitted mark that exactly matches the judges' marking style. This provides a perfect solution for the judge, with no possibility of a negative influence on their Ranking Index (RI).

However the system is wide open to abuse; to escape the responsibility of determining the correct mark when the situation is momentarily difficult to resolve (perhaps the judge is unsure whether an HZ should be given) it is simple to award an AV and thereby avoid any risk of being wrong. Chief Judges do see this from time to time, and nothing can be done.

Proposal: When a judge gives an AV the scoring system should substitute a raw grade which is the numeric average of the other judges' marks (excluding AV's), with HZ's and PZ's evaluated as numeric zeros, corrected to the nearest half-mark. This would be similarly impartial to the competitor but at the same time ensure that the judge receives an unknown grade which might not be what they would wish for, certainly one with the potential to influence their RI. This will encourage judges to do their duty even though determining the correct mark may be difficult, while still providing a fair solution where the circumstances genuinely render the judge unable to provide a mark.

#8: Establish a Task Force to research the prospect for CIVA commercial aerobatic events

On several occasions this year the prospect for creating a separate stream of short events specifically conceived to showcase unlimited performances in a public-facing commercial and media-driven environment has been discussed. This would require a radically different approach to the more common solution of adapting our classic aerobatic structures and then seeking the help of an organiser willing to combine the result into their event. The envisaged flight

programmes would be created explicitly to suit this all-aerobatic public theatre, leaving CIVA's classic category-1 and 2 championship structure that has developed since 1960 unchanged.

A textbook illustration of this genre is the Red Bull Air Racing (RBAR) series where a select group of unlimited pilots and aircraft that are extremely familiar to us enjoy a commercial setting in which through good management they have achieved an outstanding level of media recognition and financial independence. Other similar ventures in recent years have accomplished a welcome but variable degree of success – the Sky Grand Prix events in South Africa have been well received, while the Jean-Louis Monet inspired FAI World Grand Prix series (no less than 26 events from 1996 to 2008) is perhaps the most successful example.

The fact is that we have a small library of documents reaching back over 25 years advocating a similar set of aims, though they have generally sought to adapt and change the classic event structure to achieve the improved media and commercial enlightenment that is so tempting. It is clear however that to have any likelihood of achieving our aims we need to start afresh and for the time being continue with our classic championships in their existing well developed style.

Proposal: I suggest that CIVA should establish a new Task Force dedicated to developing a working structure for the above public events, with the title “Media / Commercial Task Force” (MCTF). The remit for the MCTF would be to seek advice and instruction from every possible resource in order to construct a viable business plan for review by plenary in 2018.

The Strategic Planning W/G should continue in its current format with unchanged responsibility for all strategic issues relating to our classic championships. It is very likely that they will have much to consider during the next 12 to 24 months as a result of Castor Fantoba's proposal document.

Compiled by NHB
October 2017



Contest:		Form A
Pilot ID	4-minute Freestyle Programme	
		Flight No.

	Item No	Catalogue description	K	Grade
Technical Merit	1	Use of Many Different Areas of the Flight Envelope - full range of speeds and accelerations - full use of positive and negative angles of attack - flight beyond stall boundary - flying backwards	40	
	2	Exploitation of Aerodynamic Controls and Gyroscopic Forces - movement about all axes using aerodynamic controls - exploitation of engine torque effects - exploitation of propellor gyroscopic effects - wide range of attitudes and flightpaths	40	
	3	The Clarity of Execution of Individual Manoeuvre Elements - manoeuvres intended and under pilot control - starting and finishing on precise headings - precise definition of aircraft attitude at all times	40	
	4	Wide Variety of Figures Flown on Different Axes and Flightpaths - many different figures in time available - use of different axes, if clearly presented - no excessive repetition of same type of rotation	40	
Artistic Impression	5	The Pleasing and Continuous Flow of Figures - no periods of inactivity between figures - no heading/attitude corrections between figures - balanced entry and exit speeds	40	
	6	Contrasting Periods of Dynamic and Graceful Manoeuvres - High speeds, sharp attitude changes, rapid rotations - Low speed flight, slow transitions and rotations	40	
	7	Presenting Individual Figures in their Best Orientation - figures flown on well chosen axes, that aid their identification and understanding	40	
	8	Placing Individual Figures in their Optimum Position - each figure has an optimum position for best viewing - high figures not too close - low-level figures closer - Y-axis figures centred	40	
Positioning	9	Symmetry - evenly balanced left-right - imperceptible handling of head or tail winds	40	
	10	The Performance Zone - compact flight along X-axis, no excessive distance downwind - not too close, or too distant - deduction for figures obviously outside box	40	

PILOT & AIRCRAFT	
Name:	
Aircraft type & Registration	

PENALTIES	
Too low	
Disqual Low-Low	
Other	

TIMING – Chief Judge only	
Start time	:
End time	:
Duration	:

JUDGE	
Name	
Signature	
Number	