

## PROPOSAL 2019-02

Affected Rule(s): 2.3(k)

Subject: Glider Seat Belt Requirements



### **Background**

2.3(k) states that all aircraft competing in Advanced and Unlimited must be equipped with a dual seatbelt system with two separate anchor points. In the case of gliders, many factory-built gliders (e.g. SZD 59) that are fully capable of flying Advanced glider aerobatics, come equipped with single anchor points for 1 set of lap belts. These gliders are therefore ineligible to compete at the Advanced level. To comply with 2.3(k) would require major modification to the aircraft bedding to add a second anchor point into the airframe and modifications to the seat pan.

### **Proposed Change**

2.3(k) Dual seat belts with separate attach points and a shoulder harness are mandatory for Advanced (**power**) and Unlimited (power and glider) categories. **Gliders flying in the Advanced category must have a backup seat belt that may share an attach point with the primary seat belt.** The same equipment is strongly recommended for Primary, Sportsman, and Intermediate power categories, but is not mandatory except when IAC Technical Monitors deem them necessary for the sequence being flown in these categories.

## PROPOSAL 2019-04

Affected Rule(s): 2.6(e)

Subject: Judge Qualification for Nationals



### **Background**

The *IAC Policy & Procedure Manual*, Section 501 was edited this year to change the judge selection criteria for U.S. Nationals. In addition to the change to bring the rule book into compliance with the P&P, the proposal makes clear that experienced judges from outside the IAC who otherwise meet all the IAC currency requirements may be used on the line at Nationals for non-Team Selection flights.

### **Proposed Change**

(e) The qualification and selection of judges for IAC Championship events is governed by the procedures outlined in the *IAC Policy & Procedures Manual*, Section 501.4. In addition to the IAC judges meeting the criteria of 501.4, IAC members on the official CIVA List of Judges meeting the currency requirements of 2.6(c) and 2.6.3 may also be appointed to judge non-Team Selection flights at IAC Championship events. (See Appendix 6)

## PROPOSAL 2019-05

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 5  
Subject: Glider Smooth Patch Figures



### **Background**

Many aerobatic capable, but not purpose-built, gliders are not certified to spin, or must be specifically modified to spin, which then negates other aerobatic figures. Users of these gliders are therefore unable to obtain a Smooth Patch, even if they never intend to compete.

### **Proposed Change**

7. Category Figure Lists – Glider

Primary and Sportsman

(1) Spin (one turn) or 8.4.1.1 (humpty)

Intermediate

(1) Spin (1 ¼) or 8.4.3.1 (humpty)

## **PROPOSAL 2019-07**

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 3

Subject: Allowable Intermediate Unknown Figures



### **Background**

The referenced figures each have two  $\frac{3}{4}$  loops and three 45 lines and the lowest K figure that can be composed on one of these base figures is 26K. If rolls are placed on two of the 45 lines, a complex figure built on one of the 7.8.11 figures will be at least 31K. Reviewing the Intermediate Unknown Programs in the IAC website archive from 2012 through 2017, we observe that when one of these figures is used in an Unknown Program, the total figure K is generally 38K – 43K. This results in an Intermediate Unknown Program that is unbalanced, i.e., the one figure has very high K and all other figures are low K. A competitor's program score is highly dependent on the execution of one very high K figure, a program design that does not accomplish the goal of mentally challenging the competitors and can be viewed as unfair to competitors flying the reference airplane for the category. Deleting these figures from Appendix 3's Power Intermediate section will promote better program design.

### **Proposed Change**

Delete figures 7.8.11.3 through 7.8.16.4

## PROPOSAL 2019-10

Affected Rule(s): 2.6.3(a)

Subject: Judge Currency



### **Background**

Given the number of pilots attending any given regional contest it is becoming more difficult for Judges to meet the currency requirements of paragraph 2.6.3 (a) (also contained in Figure 2.6.1).

Participation at the twelve regional contests held so far in 2018 (as of 25 June 2018) has varied from a low of 12 pilots to a high of 37 pilots. The average number of participating pilots has been 25.

If one is both a pilot and a Judge seeking to maintain the required currency then you cannot Judge some number of those 25 pilots because you are flying in your category. Advanced and Unlimited flights are difficult to find with the average number of competitors in those two categories combined being seven.

In effect the current rule requires you to attend two contests each season and spend the entire contest either flying or judging. Many of our judges and pilots only attend one event per year due to geographic, fiscal or scheduling constraints. Those who attend multiple contests still find themselves “on the line” constantly to get the required number of flights. At some of our Texas contests we rotate Judge and Assistant duties to “spread the wealth” and still find ourselves not having enough to keep everyone current. This creates an additional burden for the Contest Director (CD) and Volunteer Coordinator (VC) as they attempt to balance the need to get credits for the Judges while still finding Assistants and Recorders. At multiple contests in the past two years I have been without an Assistant due to the need to scrape together enough credits to be current the next year.

Reducing the number of required flights by five will not cause a precipitous drop in judging quality and should enable us to keep more judges current and involved in our volunteer-dependent sport while simultaneously easing the workload for CDs and VCs.

To give a fighting chance to stay a current judge I recommend that paragraph 2.6.3 (a) and Figure 2.6.1 be amended as follows:

### **Proposed Change**

2.6.3 (a)...have been a grading or Chief Judge for **twenty-five (25)** flights within the previous calendar year in IAC sanctioned contests. Equally acceptable will be judging **twenty (20)** flights provided at least 5 flights were Advanced or Unlimited Free Programs.

## PROPOSAL 2019-11

Affected Rule(s): 2.6.3(c)  
Subject: Judge Recurrency



### **Background**

Under the current rule book, if Judge currency is lost the following must take place in order to regain currency...

*2.6.3(c) If a judge did not serve as a grading or Chief judge for the number of flights prescribed in 2.6.3(a), and has not either:*

*(1) Attended a sanctioned IAC “Advanced Aerobatic Judging” seminar or,*

*(2) Attended the “Practical Aerobatic Judging” session of the “Introduction to Aerobatic Judging” training within the previous two (2) calendar years,*

*Then currency may be retained by either:*

*(1) Attending a sanctioned IAC “Advanced Aerobatic Judging” seminar or,*

*(2) Attending the “Practical Aerobatic Judging” session of the “Introduction to Aerobatic Judging” training, and passing the current year IAC Revalidation and Currency (R&C) Exam.*

All of these options require attendance at a Judge’s School. This can be difficult to accomplish depending upon where one lives in relation to where and when a school is scheduled. Attendance at a Judge’s School involves sacrifice by the Judge who is attempting to regain currency. There are scheduling, travel and expenses to consider. As a non-current Judge you must find a school near you, on days when you are available and be able to afford the expenses of travelling to/from that school and lodging. This may be a lot to ask of a volunteer and may cost us quality Judges who decide the hassle outweighs the fun. It may even be impossible given the constraints most people work under.

If this training is good enough to turn a non-judge into a judge it should certainly be more than adequate to turn a judge with lapsed currency back into a current judge. By definition the non-current Judge was at one time qualified, perhaps even last year. It seems to be overkill to require them to attend a Judge’s School when what they really need is practical experience (provided by (3)) and a current/new rules refresher (provided by (4)) to get them back up to speed.

For those who have been non-current for longer and/or may prefer to attend a school options (1) and (2) are still offered.

Making these few changes would make it much easier for Judges to regain currency if it is lost and continue to effectively participate in our volunteer dependent sport while not detracting from the quality of Judging provided.

In order to make it easier for a lapsed Judge to regain currency and continue to stay active in the sport I propose the following rule change...

### **Proposed Change**

For clarity, since currency has already lapsed, change the second sub-paragraph under 2.6.3(c) to read:

“Then currency may be regained by:”

Change second sub-paragraph 2.6.3(c)(2) to read:

(2) **Attending the “Practical Aerobatic Judging” session of the “Introduction to Aerobatic Judging” training or,**

Then add the following option as 2.6.3(c)(3):

**(3) At a chapter practice day, a contest practice day, or as a non-contest activity behind the Judges Line during contest flying, the non-current Judge must award grades for a minimum of three flights, each flight composed of a minimum of nine figures, under the supervision and coaching of a current Judge. The supervising Judge shall report the satisfactory accomplishment of this requirement to IAC.**

Then, for clarity, separate the following as 2.6.3(c)(4):

(4) The non-current judge must also pass the current year IAC Revalidation and Currency (R&C) Exam in order to be considered current. This may be accomplished before or after the other training outlined in 2.6.3 (c).

The added text in paragraph (3) above is basically a copy and paste from paragraph 2.6.1(f) regarding qualification of new Judges. I have simply re-worded it in two places to make it more applicable to the situation (i.e., replaced “Judge Candidate” with “non-current Judge” and replaced “training” with “requirement”).

## **PROPOSAL 2019-12**

Affected Rule(s): 4.14.3 and 4.6.1(i)  
Subject: Remove requirement for smoke bombs



### **Background**

4.13.3 states that "Radio shall be the sole means of controlling entry into the Aerobatic Box" and identifies procedures for radio failure. Radios should be the only method for recall. The requirement for smoke bombs is dated, and after discussing with several pilots, they agree that they would be more likely to respond to a radio call, as they are focused on things inside the cockpit, and are not looking at the judges line for possible smoke signals.

### **Proposed Change**

DELETE 4.14.3

Remove reference to smoke from 4.6.1(i)



## PROPOSAL 2019-21

Affected Rule(s): 3.8

Subject: Eligibility of H/C competitors for awards



### **Background**

H/C pilot scores should count for overall awards and regional series. If a primary competitor flying a Decathlon gets the highest percentage then they should win the grassroots award regardless if there were others in the category because that award is against every grassroots eligible plane, so therefore that competitor wasn't the only one competing for that award. The judges get judging credit for judging the flights of a single competitor in a category, so it is assumed the judging is fair for the flight judged. It makes sense, therefore, that those scores should count for awards that are awarded by percentage and not ranking. This includes grassroots, collegiate, chapter team awards, and regional series.

### **Proposed Change**

Change 3.8 (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph) to:

Should a category have only a single competitor, that pilot may be allowed to compete "Hors Concours (H/C)" Judging and processing of the grades for the H/C pilot will be conducted normally, but that pilot will not be eligible for any medals or trophies. **The results will, however, be counted toward eligibility for special awards at the contest (e.g., Grassroots) and point totals for regional or collegiate awards.**

## PROPOSAL 2019-27

Affected Rule(s): 2.6.2(c)  
Subject: National Judges Candidate Significant Experience  
Proposer: Weston Liu



### **Background**

The requirement for flights graded has the purpose of setting a minimum level of demonstrated competency for observing and calculating competitor errors at Advanced and Unlimited competition speed. We can assert that competitors in the Advanced and Unlimited categories have their powers of observation operating at the desired level of competency.

We have a National Judge shortage in multiple IAC regions. We also have been wrestling for some time with the issue of the Advanced and Unlimited competitors who are Regional Judges having no opportunities to satisfy the current requirement that they grade 25 Advanced or Unlimited flights. IAC is asking that they attend one or more contests as a non-flying Judge. Our Judge-competitors are not doing this. Currently, if a Judge-competitor does not move to National Judge status before they move to Advanced or Unlimited competition, they remain a Regional Judge forever. We can assert that our most experienced members will not become National Judges. This is detrimental to IAC.

The proposed rules change will have a positive impact on IAC contests, and maintain the high level of competency expected of National Judges.

### **Proposed Change**

Change the text of 2.6.2, "New Candidates For National Judge", paragraph (c) under Practical Training, to:

- (c) Achieving the practical experience described below:
- 1) Performing as a Regional Judge in at least three (3) contests for no less than 80 flights, within the current or previous two contest years. Twenty five (25) of the flights graded shall be Advanced or Unlimited. This requirement shall be waived if the Regional Judge has competed in the Unlimited or Advanced categories in the current or previous contest year. All of the requirements of this paragraph shall be waived if the Regional Judge has graded 250 flights or more since their certification, as reported by the IAC database.
  - 2) Serving as the Assistant to a Chief Judge for a minimum of ten (10) flights, within the current or previous two contest years.

## PROPOSAL 2019-29

Affected Rule(s): 5.8.1

Subject: Increase Presentation K across the board



### **Background**

Presentation K values are too low. The entire Presentation score for the program is generally less than a single figure. Curiously, the glider programs have much higher K values than the Power categories. It would be best if these were standardized. We should also review the K values for Presentation in use by CIVA. It could be best if they matched. The numbers I gave are simply suggestions.

### **Proposed Change**

Rule 5.8.1: Change Presentation K in each category to be roughly the same as the average figure K.

Primary: **5K**

Sportsman: **10K**

Intermediate: **15K**

Advanced: **25K**

Unlimited: **40K.**

Follow up elsewhere as needed, such as section 6.2.

## PROPOSAL 2019-33

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 5

Subject: Remove effect of minority HZ in Star Award calculation



### **Background**

A competitor deserves a Star award when all the scores are 5.0 or better, but currently if one of the scores is an HZ the program does not allow for the Star. Minority HZs can happen for reasons that have nothing to do with the competitor's flight, such as the case when the assistant calls the wrong figure. There is no value in denying the Star Award in this case.

### **Proposed Change**

Appendix 5 section 5 item (a). Change: “A minimum raw grade of five (5.0) or higher must be awarded on each figure....”

To: A minimum raw grade of five (5.0) or higher after computer processing must be awarded on each figure....”