



International Aerobatic Club Rules Committee

Recommendations
To The
IAC Board of Directors
For Approved Rule Changes
2019

*Submitted by:
Brian K. Howard
Chair, IAC Rules Committee
November 2018*

INTRODUCTION

A record setting 47 rule proposals were received and evaluated by the IAC Rules Committee IAW the IAC *Policy and Procedures Manual, Section 221* following the published proposal deadline of 1 July 2018. There were actually a few more than 47 individual proposals received, but proposals which were identical in intent (one example, using radio in lieu of wing dips), and differed only in wording, were condensed into a single proposal.



Because of the large number of proposals which were originally posted for member comment, Evan Peers, the *Sports Aerobatics* editor, took the initiative to use his expertise in Google Forms to create a member comment collection form. This online form was extremely helpful to the membership as it allowed an easy way to comment on any or all of the proposals. This was not an easy project and the Rules Committee extends its thanks to Evan for this work which not only assisted this year, but will be available in the years to come.

The eight members of the Rules Committee evaluated each proposal and by majority vote determined that twenty-two (22) proposals would be recommended for adoption in the 2019 Rule Book, and three proposals conditionally recommended if indicated changes were included. The remaining twenty-two (22) proposals were not approved for further consideration by the Board.

The following pages contain the text of the approved proposals including the rationale for the proposal as provided by the original submitter. The proposed changed or added rule book text is shown in red. Ancillary comments have been added to some of the recommended proposals where the Committee believes it would help the Board to understand the rationale for approving and encouraging the codification of that particular proposal.

A list of the twenty-two proposals not approved by the Rules Committee are provided as an appendix to this report.

There are potentially other rule changes which may come about as a result of the CIVA plenary held in November of each year. Any CIVA rule changes which directly affect IAC competition will be handled in accordance with P&P Section 221.3.2.

The Rules Committee is confident that adoption of the approved proposals will improve the quality, safety, and efficiency of IAC competition and urges to Board to approve all rule change proposals as delineated in the following pages.

The new version of the IAC Official Contest Rules incorporating changes approved by the Board takes effect on 1 January 2019.

UNCONDITIONALLY APPROVED PROPOSALS

The following twenty-two (22) proposals were unconditionally recommended by the Rules Committee for Board review and possible implementation in 2019.



PROPOSAL 2019-01

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 5 – Unlimited Power
Subject: Smooth Patch Requirements



Background

Certain legacy airplanes might be capable of performing the requisite aileron or snap roll on the vertical lines to achieve the Smooth Patch, but are most definitely unable to subsequently fly away level from the figure. By changing the base figure to a hammerhead and not a simple vertical line, the proof of being able to perform vertical rolls remains intact, but the overall figure can still be flown by the lower performing airplanes.

Proposed Change

7. Category Figure Lists – Power

Unlimited

- | | | |
|---------|---|-------------------|
| (3) | Hammerhead with $\frac{3}{4}$ roll on vertical up line | 5.2.1.4 + |
| 9.1.1.3 | | |
| (6) | Hammerhead with full snap roll on vertical up line | 5.2.1.4 + 9.9.1.4 |

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 2019-06

Affected Rule(s): 7.6.6

Subject: Distribution of Judging performance Data at Nationals



Background

There is no logical reason to prevent judges at the U.S. Nationals from seeing their judging analysis data until after the contest is complete. A major benefit of the judge analysis (think of it simply as an open review of how each judge compares to the whole panel) stems from the judges being able to see how they are doing sequence by sequence, and it makes no sense whatsoever to withhold the analysis until after the event when most of the what and why detail will have been forgotten. Being out of step with the rest of the panel, discovering the probable cause and then being able to take steps to put it right is extremely important.

Proposed Change

7.6.6 [DELETE]

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 2019-08

Affected Rule(s): 6.2

Subject: Maximum Number of Figures in Free Program



Background

The design of free programs has been adjusted several times over the years following the CIVA rules for the Free program. The original concept was to create a shorter program in regard to time in an effort to be able to conduct a World/Continental event in less time. With the recent rewrite of the IAC P&P regarding Known programs and base aircraft stating S-2B for Advanced and "legacy aircraft" such as S-1S and other planes that populate the members fleet, it follows that the Free must also allow for these same aircraft. Reverting to the Free design criteria required before the CIVA adjustment is required as well.

Proposed Change

| POWER FIGURE AND K LIMITS <i>Table 6.2.1</i> | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| FREE CATEGORY | MAX # OF FIGURES | MAXIMUM SEQUENCE K | PRESENTATION K-FACTOR | MAXIMUM PROGRAM K |
| Sportsman | 12 | <i>Same as current Known</i> | 6 | <i>Same as current Known</i> |
| Intermediate | 15 | 190 | 8 | 198 |
| Advanced | 15 | 300 | 12 | 312 |
| Unlimited | 15 | 420 | 26 | 446 |

PROPOSAL 2019-09

Affected Rule(s): 8.6 Presentation, Section 8.6.1 Grading
Subject: Presentation Criteria



Background

The current rulebook text essentially provides no guidance for how a Judge is to evaluate a competitor's presentation of a flight program. The text states "The exact method used to determine the Presentation grade is left to the individual judge." Field observation indicates that no two Judges use the same criteria. Some Judges use the "tick" method that was officially sanctioned some years ago. Some Judges pick a grade value based on whether a competitor "looked" better than the first competitor of the category flying. This situation is unfair to both competitors and Judges. The current Presentation grade adds no value to ranking the competitors.

Providing specific guidance on criteria for identifying competitor performance that earns score downgrades will make the Presentation grade a more effective component of ranking the competitors.

Proposed Change

FROM: "The Presentation grade is based on the judge's overall impression of the sequence and has a possible range from 10.0 to 0.0 in 0.5 increments. The exact method used to determine the Presentation grade is left to the individual judge using the guidance provided in the paragraphs below. More important than the particular methodology chosen is the consistent application of that methodology to every pilot flying the program."

TO: "The Presentation grade is based on the judge's overall impression of the sequence and has a possible range from 10.0 to 0.0 in 0.5 increments. Each competitor is expected to demonstrate mastery of the elements of the flight program, the structure of the flight program, energy available for each figure, the wind in the box, and weather factors such as clouds, to the greatest extent practical. Individual Judges should note each occurrence of a competitor mis-placing a figure, mis-managing energy, mis-managing the tempo of a flight program, and not generally placing the flight program in the best orientation to the Judges. When a Judge observes a figure flown with one of these issues, a downgrade should be made to the Presentation grade for the flight."

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 2019-13

Affected Rule(s): 2.8? 4.8.2? Chapter 7?
Subject: Require scores to be written in ink



Background

Scores written in pencil can be erased and changed. I have seen scoresheets where an attempt to change a score in pencil (with an inadequate eraser) rendered the scoresheet unreadable. Recorders who make an error on the scoresheet with pencil are more likely to take time to try to erase and re-write, which wastes valuable time during a competition flight, and could cause them to miss recording other scores and comments from the judge. We are taught in Judges School to have the recorders make a line through any mis-written scores and have the judge initial the changes. I don't see this requirement anywhere in the rule book.

Proposed Change

New Rule Text (Location TBD): **Scores must be written legibly in ink on the official scoresheet (Form A). Any errors should be lined through, with the corrected score initialled by the grading judge.**

PROPOSAL 2019-14

Affected Rule(s): 4.11.3 and 4.17
Subject: Advanced Power Low Altitude Limits



Background

At the current time a LOW-LOW (disqualification) call for Intermediate is set at <1,000' and a LOW-LOW call for Advanced is set at <328'. This is too great of a step from Intermediate to Advanced for pilots moving up to the Advanced level.

The current bottom of the box for Advanced was lowered from 800' to 656' to match CIVA rules for international competitions. Although Advanced pilots who qualify to compete at the international level may be skilled enough to have a lower limit of 656', first time or newer Advanced pilots may not have attained this skill set as they move to the Advanced level.

The increased risk is not offset by any significant rewards for the pilots or the IAC in general.

Proposed Change

Change 4.11.3, "Power Height Limitations" lower limits in Advanced from 656' to **800' AGL**.

Change Table 4.17.1, "Penalties – Power" as follows:

LOW ALTITUDE INFRINGEMENT

1 – 200' Low (P-S-I-A)

LOW LOW ALTITUDE INFRINGEMENT

>200' (P-S-I-A)

PROPOSAL 2019-18

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 3 - Unlimited
Subject: Removal of Family 8.8



Background

The development of the complex figures found in this family were to facilitate the design of Unlimited Free Programs with only 6-9 figures. Their use in an Unknown produces a very high K and they are very performance robbing for the legacy aircraft that we want to fly this category.

Proposed Change

Delete Family 8.8 figures

PROPOSAL 2019-20

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 3 -Unlimited
Subject: Family 8.6 Restrictions



Background

The Unlimited category has felt the hard effect of category creep. The P loop figures with rolls up are quite performance limiting for legacy aircraft we desire to be able to fly Unlimited

Proposed Change

Remove the wording: "...when preceded by a vertical roll exceeding 3 stops or more than 360 deg of rotation." From the Note (2) on page A3-47, Family 8.6.

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 (2nd 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 2019-22

Affected Rule(s): 4.19.5

Subject: Optional Break



Background

As written, 4.19.5(c) gives a free first interruption, regardless of the reason, when the optional break is in effect. This is clearly not the intent of the optional break and unfairly penalizes other competitors who happen to make the same mistake later in the sequence after the optional break has been used. The fairest procedure is to award a Free break only if the break is clearly voluntary and not the result of a major error that forces a break to cope with a post-HZ problem.

Proposed Change

4.19.5(c) The Chief Judge will record all interruptions during a pilot's sequence on the *Chief Judge's Penalty Form*. The first interruption observed will be considered the optional break and not penalized **if clearly voluntary and not the result of major error (e.g., wrong figure, wrong direction, wrong attitude), in which case the normal interruption penalty will apply.**

PROPOSAL 2019-25

Affected Rule(s): 3.14

Subject: Non-Competition Flying During Contests



Background

I believe allowing non-competition flying for Primary and Sportsman category competitors will encourage greater participation in these categories. Primary and Sportsman participants who live nearby would be allowed to fly to and from the contest avoiding hotel bills and nights away from family. Additionally, these more recreationally oriented pilots could enjoy sightseeing flights in the local area (which they may have traveled quite a distance to reach), would be able to fly with each other or with non-competitor passengers, and otherwise enjoy having the use of their airplanes over the course of the Contest period.

The intent of this rule appears to be preventing competitors getting additional practice. What harm comes from allowing Primary and Sportsman competitors to gain additional practice time outside of the Contest airspace if they choose? If the intent of the existing rule is primarily to prevent competitors in Intermediate and above from practicing the Unknown sequence, there is obviously no reason to apply it to Primary and Sportsman competitors as they do not fly Unknowns.

Proposed Change

3.14 All flying not directly related to the contest is prohibited after a time designated by the Contest Director. If not otherwise designated, the prohibition begins immediately following the initial contest briefing. **This rule does not apply to Primary and Sportsman Category competitors.**

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 2019-30

Affected Rule(s): 5.8

Subject: Increase Presentation K For No Boundary Judges



Background

It has been 5 years since the boundary judge / Presentation K proposal was considered. It's time to open the discussion again.

Proposed Change

Add text under 5.8 to read:

“Presentation coefficients are dependent on whether all Aerobatic Box Boundaries are guarded by Boundary Judges. If all box boundaries are not guarded, then the Presentation Coefficients will be increased as defined in Tables 5.8.1 (Power) and 5.8.2 (Glider), respectively.”

| <u>Category</u> | <u>Judges</u> | <u>No Judges</u> |
|--------------------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Sportsman | 6 | 15 |
| Intermediate | 8 | 20 |
| Advanced | 12 | 30 |
| Unlimited Known/Unknown | 20 | 50 |
| Unlimited Free | 26 | 56 |
| | | |
| Glider Intermediate | 15 | 30 |
| Glider Unlimited Known/Unknown | 20 | 40 |
| Glider Unlimited Free | 35 | 45 |

Also amend tables 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 to reference tables 5.8.1 and 5.8.2 for the appropriate presentation K factors.

PROPOSAL 2019-32

Affected Rule(s): 4.16(b)

Subject: Allow signaling in upright level flight



Background

If a competitor takes a break before an inverted figure that requires high energy it is a challenge to wag back in on a descending inverted line, push level, and pick up the sequence where it was left off. As an Unlimited pilot I can do this, but I see Intermediate and Advanced pilots struggle when the situation comes up. I don't think wing wags should be a skill test.

Proposed Change

In 4.16(b), delete "If the first figure following the wing dips begins in inverted flight, the wing dips must be performed in inverted flight and the competitor must change the flight attitude from upright to inverted only by a half roll prior to the first wing dip."

Replace with "If the first figure following the wing dips begins in inverted flight, the wing dips may be performed in either inverted or upright flight. If performed in upright flight the competitor may change from upright to inverted by a half roll following the wing wags."

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....”

CONDITIONALLY APPROVED PROPOSALS

The following three (3) proposals were approved only on the conditional that the changes indicated in red are adopted. Without those changes, these three proposals are NOT approved by the Rules Committee for implementation in 2019.



PROPOSAL 2019-15

Affected Rule(s): Appendix 3 - Intermediate
Subject: Remove Certain Family 8 Figures



Background

These figures, while possible, are very restrictive to the base aircraft in this category.

Proposed Change

Remove 8.6.5.1 and 8.6.7.2 ~~and 8.7.5.1~~ from allowable figures.

Majority Position Comment

Great care must be taken in removing figures from the Intermediate Unknown catalog as designing an interesting and challenging sequence becomes that much harder than it already is with the limited number of figures from which to choose.

In regards to Figure 8.7.5.1, with the note restricting the use of rolling elements to one out of a possible three, there is no reason that the Intermediate baseline airplane, Decathlon 150, would have any issues. The loop is a loop, either with a preceding roll or a roll at the top, and if the roll on the 45 down is used, there is plenty of energy available.

PROPOSAL 2019-27

Affected Rule(s): 2.6.2(c)

Subject: National Judges Candidate Significant Experience



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 if 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.

Majority Position Comment

The RC was in general agreement with this proposal, except for this line: “This requirement shall be waived if the Regional Judge has competed in the Unlimited or Advanced categories

in the current or previous contest year.” While having competed at the higher levels will generally (though not necessarily always) provide the ability to spot errors and even gauge the magnitude of those errors, but in no way guarantees the ability to assign a numeric mark to what has been observed, or the knowledge of the rules governing aspects of judging not directly related to geometry. Simply put, being a competitor does not automatically qualify an individual to be a judge.

PROPOSAL 2019-40

Affected Rule(s): 5.5 and 6.2
Subject: Category Uncreep



Background

We have reached the point at many regional contests where there is barely enough participation for viability. This rule proposal turns back the clock to when there was more than double the participation in the sport. It returns category sequence requirements to those that allowed more affordable aircraft to be competitive at the middle and upper levels of competition.

Proposed Change

Section 5.5.6 Unlimited Unknowns, Unlimited Power

Change the second sentence to, “The total K-factor shall not exceed 336.”

[NOTE: was 400K; 336K is 80% of the Unlimited free 420K.]

Change (a) to: Maximum of 4 snap rolls, only 3 of which may be from the same family (9.9 or 9.10).

[NOTE: was ...maximum of 6 snap rolls, only 4...]

Section 5.5.7 Advanced Unknowns, Advanced Power

Change the second sentence to, “The total K-factor shall not exceed 240.”

[NOTE: was 275K; 240K is 80% of the advanced free 300K.]

Change the third sentence to, “A minimum of 2 and a maximum of 3, snap rolls are allowed from Family 9.9.

[NOTE: was ...maximum of 4...]

Section 5.5.8 Intermediate Unknowns, Intermediate Power

~~Add a second sentence, “The total K-factor shall not exceed 152.”~~

~~[NOTE: was 175K; 152K is 80% of the intermediate free 190K.]~~

Add a third sentence, “Figures requiring outside pushes beyond -2g are not allowed.”

Section 6.2 (Free Program) Figures and K-Factor Limits

Table 6.2.1 Power Figures and K Limits

Advanced Max # of Figures

Change to: “15”[NOTE: was 12; changes from 25K to 20K per figure.]

Unlimited Max # of Figures

Change to: “14”[NOTE: was 9; changes from 47K to 30K per figure.]

Majority Position Comment

The RC supports the changes to the Unlimited and Advanced Unknowns K's and the Free Programs (Note the conflict with 2019-08), but not the change to the Intermediate Unknown K. With a maximum K of only 152K, it is extremely hard to design Intermediate Unknowns with more than 7 or 8 figures. These short sequences will deprive the Intermediate competitors who have paid the same registration as everyone else, but will end up with considerably less flying. With a reduction to 152K, the Unknown sequences will be 7 figures or less maximum.

Appendix - Failed Proposals

The following Rule Proposals did not achieve a majority approval of the IAC Rules Committee. This appendix is provided for information only and is not subject to Board action.

PROPOSAL 2019-03

Subject: Change Signaling to Radio Primary

PROPOSAL 2019-16

Subject: Penalties for Unguarded Box Boundaries

PROPOSAL 2019-17

Subject: Presentation K for boxes with unguarded boundaries

PROPOSAL 2019-19

Subject: Make Box Boundaries Optional

PROPOSAL 2019-23

Subject: Replace the R&C Exam with focused on-line training

PROPOSAL 2019-24

Subject: Eliminate the prerequisites to take the R&C exam

PROPOSAL 2019-26

Subject: Allow B and C forms to be printed back-to-back

PROPOSAL 2019-28

Subject: Chief Judges must be trained in standard radio phraseology

PROPOSAL 2019-31

Subject: Reduce allowed number of figures in Sportsman Free to 10

PROPOSAL 2019-34

Subject: Recommend that Chief Judges review sequences with line judges

PROPOSAL 2019-35

Subject: Eliminate Practical Training Requirement

PROPOSAL 2019-36

Subject: Eliminate directionality requirements within a figure

PROPOSAL 2019-37

Subject: Clarify rationale for majority/minority HZ

PROPOSAL 2019-38

Subject: Free Program Certification

PROPOSAL 2019-39

Subject: Deduction for correcting errors

PROPOSAL 2019-41

Subject: Eliminate HZ's

PROPOSAL 2019-42

Subject: Limits to crossover Snap intensity

PROPOSAL 2019-43

Subject: Amend HZ Rule To Exclude Big Errors

PROPOSAL 2019-44

Subject: Eliminate all but snap at apex of loop from Intermediate

PROPOSAL 2019-45

Subject: Regarding 45 lines – added clarity

Note: Although disapproved as a rule change because of the multiple facets of this issue and the large potential for unintended consequences, the RC did recommend that a Working Group headed by Jim Bourke be appointed to study this issue and recommend solutions for 2020.

PROPOSAL 2019-46

Subject: Basic Rule for "Rule Change"

PROPOSAL 2019-47

Subject: Repeal H/C Rule