

## IAC Year 2002 Approved Rule Changes

All proposed rules, except 02-22 (which was removed from consideration by the Rules Committee prior to the Board vote), were passed by the IAC Board of Directors at their November meeting. These rules, along with other clarifications and editorial changes, will appear in the 2002 edition of the *IAC Official Contest Rules* book due for publication by the beginning of February 2002. Comments and questions may be directed to Brian Howard, Chairman, Rules Committee, at: BK@NewAttAero.com.

No.	Submitter	Synopsis	Old Rule	New Proposed Rule	Submitter's Rationale																		
02-2	H. Tolson B. Vidrine G. Frick	Provides bonus points for Unlimited Power Free programs with less than 15 figures.	None.	<p>6.2.2 (new) For Unlimited Power Free programs only, a bonus score will be added to the total score before penalties, for each figure less than 15 that goes to make up a total sequence. Bonus points will be calculated using the percentages in the following table and added to the competitor's final score automatically by the computer scoring system.</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;"><u># Of Figures</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Bonus Pts. %</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">14</td><td style="text-align: center;">0.5</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">13</td><td style="text-align: center;">1.5</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">12</td><td style="text-align: center;">3.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">11</td><td style="text-align: center;">5.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">10</td><td style="text-align: center;">7.5</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">9</td><td style="text-align: center;">10.5</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">8</td><td style="text-align: center;">14.0</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">7</td><td style="text-align: center;">18.0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	<u># Of Figures</u>	<u>Bonus Pts. %</u>	14	0.5	13	1.5	12	3.0	11	5.0	10	7.5	9	10.5	8	14.0	7	18.0	This proposed new rule will make contests more interesting to watch and more challenging to the competitors. It will also reward pilots who compose more interesting and fast paced sequences, who by doing so under the current rules get no reward for taking the risk of making much more costly mistakes.
<u># Of Figures</u>	<u>Bonus Pts. %</u>																						
14	0.5																						
13	1.5																						
12	3.0																						
11	5.0																						
10	7.5																						
9	10.5																						
8	14.0																						
7	18.0																						
02-3	Parker-Lauck	Allow relatives of competitors to record and assist on the judging line.	2.6 ....Relatives of competitors may not judge, assist, or record in categories wherein their relatives are competing.	2.6 ....Relatives of competitors may not judge in categories wherein their relatives are competing.	At many contests, especially smaller ones, the only available people who can fulfill necessary volunteer duties are relatives of the competitors. It is understood why a relative should not be a scoring judge, because it would be very difficult to be impartial, and unintentional bias is possible. However, Assistant Judges and Recorders would only be able to alter scores if it were done in an intentional, cheating, and malicious manner. We owe our hard working volunteers more credit than suspecting that they would do something so unethical.																		

## IAC Year 2002 Approved Rule Changes

All proposed rules, except 02-22 (which was removed from consideration by the Rules Committee prior to the Board vote), were passed by the IAC Board of Directors at their November meeting. These rules, along with other clarifications and editorial changes, will appear in the 2002 edition of the *IAC Official Contest Rules* book due for publication by the beginning of February 2002. Comments and questions may be directed to Brian Howard, Chairman, Rules Committee, at: BK@NewAttAero.com.

No.	Submitter	Synopsis	Old Rule	New Proposed Rule	Submitter's Rationale
02-4	Parker-Lauck	Allow Registrar to modify order of flight to accommodate volunteering competitors.	None.	4.5.4 (new) The order of flight may be altered by the Registrar at the request of the Contest Director if a competitor has accepted volunteer duties in a category prior to his/her flight that day of the contest.	Many times a competitor may volunteer to help fill positions in a previous category not allowing him/her the time and preparation those who do not volunteer are allowed. This gives the competitor/volunteer time to cool down, hydrate, and prepare for his/her flight. A competitor should not be penalized in any way for volunteer duties.
02-5	Parker-Lauck	Changes Unlimited Unknown figure limits.	5.5.5 The Unlimited Power Unknown must have no less than twelve (12) nor more than fourteen (14) figures.	5.5.5 The Unlimited Power Unknown must have no less than ten (10) nor more than fourteen (14) figures.	This proposal will give more design flexibility to Unlimited Unknowns and make them more interesting to fly.
02-6	Parker-Lauck	Changes Advanced Unknown figure limits.	5.5.6 The Advanced Power Unknown must have no less than six (6) nor more than twelve (12) figures.	5.5.6 The Advanced Power Unknown must have no less than ten (10) nor more than fourteen (14) figures.	This proposal will prevent Advanced Unknowns from becoming too complex and difficult by increasing the average number of figures flown.
02-10	B. Howard	Modifies tailslide grading criteria to reduce subjectivity and encourage proper execution of the figure.	8.5 Family 6 Tailslides  All the criteria of the Hammerhead apply to this figure except, of course, for the maneuver at the top of the vertical climb. At the point when the aircraft stops, it must slide backwards a visible amount (the key here is "a visible amount"). If there is no slide the grade is zero (0). The aircraft.....	8.5 Family 6 Tailslides  All the criteria of the Hammerhead apply to this figure except, of course, for the maneuver at the top of the vertical climb. At the point when the aircraft stops, it must slide backwards a minimum distance of one-half fuselage length. Because of the unique aerodynamics of gliders, a glider is required to slide only a visible amount. If there is insufficient slide for the aircraft type (glider or power), or the aircraft pivots about the tail rather than sliding backwards, the grade is zero (0). The aircraft.....	Many pilots have begun using an excessive amount of "cheat" in tailslides resulting in the aircraft pivoting about the tail as the nose flops downwards, rather than actually sliding backwards. The current rule allows too loose of an interpretation of the criteria "a visible amount" resulting in scores for tailslides which in fact, should have been zeroed as "tail pivots." The proposed change reduces the ambiguity of the language by requiring a minimum slide of one-half fuselage length slide for power aircraft. This amount is not excessive for any aircraft and will require the pilots to use less "cheat" to achieve, thereby returning the tailslide to the figure it was meant to be.

## IAC Year 2002 Approved Rule Changes

All proposed rules, except 02-22 (which was removed from consideration by the Rules Committee prior to the Board vote), were passed by the IAC Board of Directors at their November meeting. These rules, along with other clarifications and editorial changes, will appear in the 2002 edition of the *IAC Official Contest Rules* book due for publication by the beginning of February 2002. Comments and questions may be directed to Brian Howard, Chairman, Rules Committee, at: BK@NewAttAero.com.

No.	Submitter	Synopsis	Old Rule	New Proposed Rule	Submitter's Rationale
02-13	DJ Molny	Clarifies exactly how the recall signal will be briefed to the pilots.	4.6.1(i) "Hot Box" panels and recall signals.	4.6.1(i) "Hot Box" panels and recall signals. Briefing of the recall signal shall include the phrasing that will be used in the event of a recall, and the types of instructions that will be given in the event of a traffic conflict.	Competitors will respond to pre-arranged instructions more quickly, therefore this change enhances safety. Pre-arranged phrases are also easier to distinguish from other radio chatter.
02-14	DJ Molny	Deletes the "smoothness" criterion from grading normal competition flights.	7.1.2(c) The smoothness of the performance.	Delete 7.1.2(c)	"Smoothness" is a highly subjective criterion, and the Rules Book gives no guidance about how to grade for smoothness (except in the 4-Minute Free program). Deleting this rule will eliminate a source of confusion, and improve fairness and consistency. Also see proposals 02-22.
02-17	DJ Molny B. Howard	Removes the "double jeopardy" a pilot now faces when exiting a figure with errors in heading, bank, or flight path.	7.2.1  A figure is complete at the moment the aircraft returns to a wings-level, horizontal flight path. The only exceptions to this are the exit lines in <i>FAI Aerobatic Catalogue</i> Families 7.7 and 7.8 (Square Loops). Once a horizontal flight path is established at the end of a figure, the beginning of the next figure is deemed to have occurred. However, the first figure of a sequence begins at the moment the aircraft departs from wings-level, horizontal flight path.	7.2.1  The first figure of a sequence begins at the moment the aircraft departs from wings-level, horizontal flight path. A figure is complete at the moment the aircraft returns to a wings-level, horizontal flight path. The only exceptions to this are the exit lines in <i>FAI Aerobatic Catalogue</i> Families 7.7 and 7.8 (Square Loops).  If the competitor corrects any errors in exit flight path, bank angle, or heading before initiating the subsequent figure, only the first figure shall be downgraded. Failure to correct such errors shall result in a downgrade to both figures.	The current rule helps clarify when figures start and end. However, it does not state how penalties should be assessed if the aircraft is never precisely wings-level and horizontal between figures.  Example: A competitor under-rotates a snap roll by ten degrees, holds that bank angle for one second, levels the wings, and flies straight for another second before pulling to vertical for a hammerhead. Did the hammerhead begin when the rotation stopped, or when the competitor leveled the wings? The answer determines whether a 2-point downgrade would be assessed on both figures, or only the first.  The proposed change eliminates this ambiguity and provides competitors with an opportunity to fix heading and attitude problems without incurring a double penalty.

## IAC Year 2002 Approved Rule Changes

All proposed rules, except 02-22 (which was removed from consideration by the Rules Committee prior to the Board vote), were passed by the IAC Board of Directors at their November meeting. These rules, along with other clarifications and editorial changes, will appear in the 2002 edition of the *IAC Official Contest Rules* book due for publication by the beginning of February 2002. Comments and questions may be directed to Brian Howard, Chairman, Rules Committee, at: BK@NewAttAero.com.

No.	Submitter	Synopsis	Old Rule	New Proposed Rule	Submitter's Rationale
02-18	DJ Molny	Allows a third Sportsman flight without a supplementary rule change.	5.1.4 (b) A second or third Basic Known flight may be scheduled without request for supplemental rules.	5.1.4 (b) A second or third Primary Known flight, or a third Sportsman flight, may be scheduled without request for supplemental rules.	Many chapters prefer to fly all categories an equal number of times. Contest organizers should have discretion in this matter, as it does not impact safety or the integrity of the contest proceedings. Nor does this matter warrant the attention of the IAC Sanctions Director and IAC President as would be required for a supplementary rule under Section 3.5.
02-20	B. Howard R. Dorsey	Deletes references to the "Basic" category and creates a new entry level category called "Primary."	5.7 and numerous supporting rules.	Changes all instances of "Basic" to "Primary" and creates a new sequence consisting of:  1) Loop 2) Wingover 3) Half-Cuban 8 4) Slow Roll 5) 180-degree turn	The Primary category serves two purposes: (1) provide the starting point for new competitors intending to climb the contest ladder; and (2) provide a "permanent" home for a class of aircraft not normally attracted to competition (e.g., warbirds). The category is designed to attract new competitors by being more interesting to fly than the old Basic, yet require only basic aerobatic skills and minimal aircraft capabilities to successfully complete. This change will allow the Sportsman category to remain challenging for the competitors with more experience, and remove the perceived prejudice some competitors feel flying a "Basic" category. This will help preclude competitors from starting right out in Sportsman with insufficient skills. The category does not include a spin, allowing some aircraft types (e.g., the Stearman) which are officially placarded against intentional spins, to compete, thus further encouraging new competitors. Up to three Primary category flights would be allowed at a contest without need for a supplemental rule.



## IAC Year 2002 Approved Rule Changes

All proposed rules, except 02-22 (which was removed from consideration by the Rules Committee prior to the Board vote), where passed by the IAC Board of Directors at their November meeting. These rules, along with other clarifications and editorial changes, will appear in the 2002 edition of the *IAC Official Contest Rules* book due for publication by the beginning of February 2002. Comments and questions may be directed to Brian Howard, Chairman, Rules Committee, at: BK@NewAttAero.com.

No.	Submitter	Synopsis	Old Rule	New Proposed Rule	Submitter's Rationale
02-22	R. Dorsey	Changes "Positioning" to "Presentation" and adds the criteria of rhythm and artistic balance.	8.6 Positioning	<p>8.6 Presentation</p> <p>Competitors should perform their sequence within the confines of the aerobatic box, balanced about the center of the X axis and at an optimal distance from the judges. It is not required, however, to use all the available airspace vertically or horizontally on the X or Y axis. Like gymnastics or figure skating, aerobatics is a performing art as well as an athletic sport. Judges, therefore, should base the Presentation grade on the overall presentation of the sequence including the judge's impression of the artistry displayed in the flight and the balanced use of the aerobatic box. The pilot should offer the judges, as much as possible within the confines of the sequence structure, a rhythmic, ballet-like performance. Considering this, a rough and overly aggressive presentation will receive a lower Presentation score than a smooth and flowing one. Certain figures which are rhythmic in nature, such as Point Rolls, must give an impression of controlled and even rhythm. In the case of Free Programs, credit in the Presentation score can be given for an artfully designed sequence. As a judge, it is important that you apply the same presentation criteria in a consistent manner to every pilot flying the program. The range of possible scores is from 10 to 0 in .5 increments.</p>	Aerobatics is a performing art as well as an athletic sport. So much emphasis has been given to the geometric aspects of judging that artistic presentation has been lost. Providing guidance to judges and increasing the K for artistic presentation will promote smoother and more graceful flying with attendant safety benefits.