

BMFA
FREE FLIGHT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING 12th September 2012

Action

Present	Mike Woodhouse	MW	Trevor Grey	TG
	Chris Strachan	CS	Ian Kaynes	IK
	John Carter	JC	Ian Lever (part time)	IL
	Phil Ball	PB	David Phipps (part time)	DP

Apologies	Peter Williams	PW
	Mike Francies	MF

Welcome MW welcomed IL, attending on behalf of SAM 35
Minutes of Accepted as a true and accurate record
28/06/12

Matters CS to contact Andy Brough and accept his offer to produce a “Timperly Box” for Nationals use CS
arising

Discussion The items on the agenda which concerned SAM 35 were brought forward to enable IL to depart on their conclusion

with SAM **SAM at 2012 Nationals**

35

It was agreed that all went well throughout the 3 days with effective communication between IL and CS (as stand –in for MW)

Problems with unplanned events appearing in the Calendar before the event

Although there were not a great number of events at issue when they appeared MW and TG had little time to make corrections before the print run of BMFA News. It was a problem of lack of understanding/communication within SAM 35 and IL accepted that there are lessons to be learned

Bowden

All agreed that the Bowden is a full BMFA event and should be handled as all other BMFA events (pre-entry and full fees).

SAM events at 2013 Nationals

IL submitted a draft list of events which raised few problems other than the inclusion of “Radio Assist Sports Flying” on all 3 days and the accompanying suggestion of possible loosely planned events on all 3 days

Nationals Fee Structure

All agreed that SAM members should make a contribution to the Nationals income which would cover their fair share of the costs. After considerable discussion of mechanisms to achieve this initial agreement was reached that all attendees should make the same contribution to the administration costs of the Nationals (Facilities, toilets, airfield licence etc) via an attendance charge structure matched to days on site. Participation in contests or any other events would have a separate charging structure which would cover prize costs, CD expenses and any other charges directly incurred by the contests themselves. These charges would differ between BMFA and SAM events and would be collected and managed separately by each. This approach was agreed in principle by all but final acceptance will depend on an examination of the actual resulting charges. MW undertook to look at the real costs and produce a draft of the proposed charges for 2013.

MW

Relationship of SAM with FFTC and other TCs

IL stated that following discussions with David Phipps and Robin Gowler the intention has been expressed that SAM should report directly to David Phipps and should have the right to attend any Technical Committee. This change has yet to be put to Council or the Executive. IL stated that he will remain as the contact with the

**Contest
Calendar**

FFTC for SAM events at any FFTC activity and will ensure that no events are planned or publicised without prior discussion with the FFTC. IL

SAM Radio Vintage Duration at the Midland Gala

It was pointed out that the BMFA Calendar includes a Vintage Power Duration event on North Luffenham on the same date as the Gala. The FFTC have not been asked about this and the site is completely unsuitable (it is highly sensitive, is shared with Paracenders and a resident radio club). IL agreed that this event must not take place and undertook to ensure that it did not happen as well as investigating how such an initiative had taken place. IL

Actions from discussion with IL

MW to produce a discussion paper on Nationals fees MW

IL to remain as contact between SAM and FFTC IL

IL to ensure that no SAM use of an FFTC booked site is to be planned or publicised without prior discussion with the FFTC through IL IL

2012 calendar

No change.

2013 Calendar

Draft V1.4c was discussed with respect to concerns at the overall number of events and the balance between popular and less popular classes. Acceptance of the calendar was voted upon

Proposed JC

Seconded CS 3 in favour 1 against

Actions required are for TG to confirm Space contact and for CS to discuss the new Southern Gala date with Dave Greaves. It was also agreed that, based on reactions to approaches earlier this year Little Rissington now appears to be a non-starter for BMFA Free Flight events. TG
CS

The calendar to now be released and Barkston dates passed to DP MW

2014 Calendar

It was agreed that a fundamental change in the Calendar should be considered for 2014 and that in 2013 a forum should be held at which changes to the Calendar will be on the agenda. This was voted upon

Proposed JC

Seconded PB 4 in favour 1 against

All to consider content and feed input to MW and TG MW TG

Barkston Dates and Access

No problems at present

Salisbury fund moneys

DP attended and stated that as the budget holders the FFTC have the freedom to use the fund as they see fit. Following a discussion of options it was agreed that a sensible approach would be for the FFTC to write to DP requesting that Martin Dilly should be made the budget holder thus putting what is essentially a local issue into local hands. This was voted upon

Proposed JC

Seconded TG 4 in favour 0 against

Action CS CS

Crookham Appeal

Crookham's appeal has been upheld by the Competition Secretary and both the decision and process have been upheld by Council. Plugge records have already been amended. No further action to be taken other than a rule change to clarify the future situation – action TG TG

Toilets

Following a complaint about the lack of toilet facilities at the East Anglian Gala it was agreed that toilets must be available at all centralised meetings. It was agreed

that a note to this effect should be added to the CD Guidelines. The sites where action need to be taken are
 North Luffenham MW to contact Bryan Spooner about a possible arrangement with the Golf Club MW
 Sculthorpe MW to discuss with the army about possible use of a Portaloo by the Control Tower MW
 Church Fenton CS to liaise with the Northern Area CS

Nationals MW reported that the figures so far available indicate that the event will make a reasonable profit, but final figures are not yet available

Officer's Reports

Treasurer

JC reported all accounts healthy.

Council Delegate

MW presented his report on the Full Council meeting on 8th September. Report attached as Appendix A

PRO

Nothing to report

Safety Officer/Results Coordinator

Results

Nothing to report

Safety

Nothing to report.

Rules Officer

For rule changes see below. He asked for a Committee decision on resolving the draw for the CMA Trophy at the Northern Gala. He proposed that both names should appear on the Trophy and both winners should receive dinner tickets. This was voted upon

Proposed TG

Seconded CS 4 in favour 0 against

TG/PB to inform records officer

TG PB

CIAM feedback

IK reported that items now being discussed include

- Revisiting the 20 second attempt
- RDT in all classes
- Allowance of time extension in RDT
- LEDs
- F1Q energy measurement process for models without energy limiter

International Teams

F1A,B,C

MW reported that this was an excellent meeting which benefitted from there being no pre-meeting World Cup event and from a morning only flying schedule. He suggested that the Committee should consider proposing this as a template for future meetings ALL

Space

Nothing to report

F1E

Report received

FAI Competition calendar

Carry forward to next meeting

Team funding.

Considered at the Council Meeting on 8th September. See Appendix A

Team Selection

The possibility of running team trials to full FAI rules was discussed and it was agreed that this should be included in the Calendar planning forum in 2013 along with a consideration of using the Stonehenge and Equinox as the trials.

JC
MW TG

**World Cup
Events**

Stonehenge Cup 2013

MW to contact the organising team.

MW

Equinox Cup 2012

JC reported that plans are going ahead but entries are a bit slow.

JC

Rules

Rule changes for 2013

TG had prepared a statement of the proposals received and associate comments received after their circulation. This is included as Appendix B. The committee discussed each item and voted upon the action to be taken.

Item 1 RDT. Reword to clarify that the button may be pushed once only whether that action is used to extend the elapsed time to a preset DT or to directly operate the DT

Proposed PB

Seconded TG 3 in favour 1 against

Item 2 Remove electric classes from Combined Power

Proposed PB

Seconded CS 3 in favour 1 against

Item 3 Plugge Cup clarification

Proposed JC

Seconded TG 4 in favour 0 against

Item 4 Dating of trials in Calendar No rule change needed other than to check that there are no date/timing references in the rules which prevent running over the year end when this is forced by circumstances

Proposed JC

Seconded TG 4 in favour 0 against

Item 5 F1Q proposal to CIAM. We suggest to CIAM that the measurement point for “full power” should be taken as 10 seconds after motor start-up. In addition we support the proposal that motor stop should be taken as the point when prop rotation ceases.

Proposed TG

Seconded CS 4 in favour 0 against

Item 6 BMFA Electric A reduction in motor run to 15 seconds and clarification that in static testing that motor-stop should be taken as the point when prop rotation ceases.

Proposed PB

Seconded TG 3 in favour 1 against

Item 7 Flashing Beacons. We propose that beacons will be permitted only on models from classes F1A,B,C,P,Q and E when they are flown in events for those classes only.

Proposed TG

Seconded CS 4 in favour 0 against

Item 8 F1E Team Selection We propose that a table as used for the Free Flight Championships should be used for points selection

Proposed JC

Seconded TG 4 in favour 0 against

Item 9 Model data in results. We consider the practicalities of collecting this information to be unworkable and therefore no rule change

Proposed TG

Seconded JC 4 in favour 0 against

Item 10 Prevention of trivial flights to decide a result. We will develop wording
Proposed PB
Seconded JC 3 in favour 2 against

Item 11 Introduction of E36 Electric. We propose to announce that E36 will be
introduced at the start of 2014 and that E30 will be made obsolete at the end of 2014
Proposed PB
Seconded TG 4 in favour 0 against

Actions

TG to prepare wording for all these changes and to circulate in time for checking
before Technical Council meeting on 20th October

TG

CIAM Sub Committees (carried forward)

MW should put together a proposal for change for consideration by Technical
Council.

MW

**Free Flight
Info.**

BMFA News Access

DP explained that the Calendar is the responsibility of the Competition Secretary
(with the Technical Secretary acting on her behalf) or the Chief Executive and these
are the only people authorised to make changes. TG pointed out that when he finds
an error when checking the proofs on behalf of the FFTC there is seldom time to go
through these channels and he needs to be authorised to make corrections. This has
been highlighted by recent examples where un-agreed additions have been made to
FFTC events by persons beyond our control. DP agreed to consider.

DP

Events

Free Flight Showcase

Successfully run.

Museum

Nothing to report

FFTC

Nothing to report.

Deliverables

FFTC

It was noted that with only 2 applications for 3 places a co-option will be needed for
2013. MW to explore possibilities.

MW

Membership

Next

Dates

meetings

Wednesday 21st November 11.00 am at Chacksfield House.

FFTC 15/09/12

Critical dates for FFTC

BMFA News Copy dates December 2012 Issue (112) – deadline 10th October

Full Council January 5th Agenda deadline 8th December

Technical Council October 20th Agenda deadline September 24th

FFTC meetings 21st November

Appendix A

Council report 8th September 2012

Team Travel Funding

The proposal was passed 20 for 4 against and 1 Abstention. I explained as we agreed and stuck to the two
points.

Free Flight Nationals report

Tabled. I gave a verbal run through. I explained the SAM35 issues and actions taken for 2013. I am set up as the co-ordinator. All accepted without comment.

Crookham/Sam1066 and Plugge

A piece of AOB was tabled asking for Jo's ruling to be set aside. Jo, David and I talked through the sequence of events. Jo's ruling still stands. I explained that we will be making a rule clarification for 2013.

World Cup 2013

Both events accepted.

Team Member Changes

A point to remember for the future. Any changes we must always talk to Jo first before doing anything, we have no problems

Royal Aero Club

A travel garnet will be issued for any overseas flyer who request same to help smooth the path of boxes and kit with the airlines

Barkston dates

We need to get these in as soon as possible after our meeting this coming week

Mission Statement

The Southern Area proposal was bounced to the next Areas council.

Fees 2013

An increase of £1.00 is being proposed.

SAA

Internal politics and the SAA appears to be in meltdown.

Michael J. Woodhouse 08/09/12

Appendix B

Rule change Proposals for 2013

The following are those proposals received as of 5.09.12 with brief (edited from initial list) comments, additional comments, and actual rule changes/introductions intended by the FFTC. Final comments by 5.10.12 in writing to the FFTC Secretary, Chris Strachan, 56 Way Lane, Waterbeach, Cambridge, CB25 9NQ; or via e-mail at : chris.strachan@btinternet.com

1	RDT - Clarify once off only use
----------	--

Raised by John Cooper:

There have been a few discussions recently re the legality of some of the RDT systems in use within the UK (primarily re F1A electronic models)...

Whilst many timers only allow RDT there are now some that contain more functions... Extend DT ,Trim Altering...

As far as I can see these systems break the first sentence of the BMFA rule, the operative word in that sentence being 'MAY' - i.e. they definitely CAN carry data from competitor to the model hence breach the word MAY within the rules. In effect any model that has such a system fitted and plugged in breaks the rules and cannot currently be legally flown in a UK FF contest - even though the competitor has no intention of abusing it by using anything other than the RDT function on a contest flight...

BMFA FF Rule 3.1.1: a: i

A flight where there is no physical or any other connection that may carry data between the competitor and the model after the flight has commenced. This prohibits the use of transmissions of any type to the model in flight for the purposes of controlling any of its functions, except as noted below.

The use of transmissions to the model is permitted for DT in all classes and for motor stop in IC and Electric classes only. All such transmissions are only permitted for once-off, irreversible actions.

Clarification of rule currently under discussion by FFTC.**Additional Comments:****From Stuart Darmon:**

I agree entirely with John that a proactive attitude is needed to developments in RC in free flight. This is not a luddite attitude, nor does it necessarily involve banning things, but simply stating clearly what is and is not legal. Not only does this prevent protests, wrangling and subsequent muttering by whichever side loses, it also addresses the perception, true or false, that expensive purchased aeroplanes are damaging the domestic contest scene. As there are currently very few models in this country capable of, for instance, in-flight trim uploads, the most equitable solution would in fact be to ban models capable of receiving such transmissions, rather than prohibiting the transmissions being sent, as is currently the case. In a sense, of course, our sport relies on trust (and for the record, I trust pretty much everyone in it) but it's important that the rules are clear and robust. Why else would the rulebook contain a lengthy entry requiring circle towhooks not just to be locked, but physically removed from BMFA gliders on 75m. lines? If you don't trust me not to do a 360 degree turn 75 metres above everyone's heads, why trust me not to push a button in my jacket pocket? Whatever is decided, though, is less important than stating it clearly and unambiguously as the nightmare scenario is the growth of a grey area as RC inroads further into FF.

From Mark Croome:

The controller should be handed to the timekeeper who will return it to the flyer on request to terminate the flight.

From Gavin Manion:

Th The use of RC functions other than DT.

There seems to be a consistent theme in the responses I have seen towards this

	<p>question that we need a proactive approach. The increasing use of electronics/telemetry in FF needs to have clear bounds set now and not after an occurrence takes place (e.g. RDT to get a re-fly).</p> <p>My views about RC and it's use with FF models are pretty "fundamentalist" ; Once you've transmitted and the plane has responded then the plane isn't free flight anymore – stop the watch. Doesn't mean you can't have RDT, just that you can't use it tactically to gain advantage e.g. you can see a spinning DT'd glider better than a flying one.</p> <p>Also I believe that (real time) telemetry from the model to enable tactical decision making (e.g." I must be circling in lift so I'll launch", or perhaps even "my team mates F1b says it's in good air so I'll follow!") is not within the spirit of what we do.</p> <p>A few possibilities in the offing maybe?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Won't unlatch unless the altimeter allows? b) Detects the glider launch energy (accelerometer) and selects from a recipe table the best launch configuration? (not closed loop) c) Detects the motor torque and adjusts the VIT/AR to suit? (yes I know clever people did it with bent wire 40 years ago). d) Gyro to auto cut a motor if the plane is off pattern? e) Pitot to enable bunt at a given airspeed? (not closed loop) f) GPS to enable autopilot back upwind after max? g) Real time GPS telemetry to confirm that the model is still flying? How can the timekeeper argue? <p>Let your imagination loose 'cos somebody will!</p> <p>I appreciate that my views may not be in the mainstream but we must consider now what is, or is going to be, possible and <u>set out now what is legal and what is not.</u></p>
	<p>Proposed Change: <i>A minor rewording to prevent the use of multiple transmissions, particularly with reference to 'extending' DT times set before flight.</i></p>
2	<p>Remove Electric Classes from Combined Power</p>
	<p>Raised by FFTC in response to following correspondance.</p> <p>From Steve Barnes: I am writing to reiterate the depth of feeling ,amongst power flyers, against the inclusion of electric models in the above competitions... Electric should be a STAND ALONE class... Whilst on the subject of rules may i suggest that you also consider that in vintage and classic competitions you split up rubber and power as you have with glider as a similar inbalance is evident here as well.You do not combine differant modes of power in modern classes so why in these?</p>

From Peter Tolhurst:

From my perspective, I can't see any significant disparity between i.c and electric power results if combined power is meant to be a handicap comp. At area meetings, given the distance between flying sites, there is always the potential for better conditions at one area than the others, and I suggest that most people accept it as a fact of competition life... I still consider 15 seconds to be an appropriate time, and having watched electric and i.c power models being trimmed at Beaulieu & Chobham, believe that the height achieved during the motor run is very similar. If there is sufficient critical mass, it would be preferable to fly BMFA Electric as a separate competition, but not only at the Nats please.

From David Limbert:

The motor runs for Electric models in Combined comps. are too long and the situation is getting farcical. Their performance is now approaching that of SLOP models, and yet they have a completely disproportionate motor run allowed ...

From Dennis Davitt:

I have seen mention in FFN that the FFTC unanimously agreed to propose splitting electric from Combined power... The FFTC did a very good job in grouping up classes, to keep entries up, and keep "minority" classes going... Electric has done very well in Combined Power, but electric isn't outstripping the engine models, it is competitive. So why change ?

Also, the FFTC view (to separate) seems to be inconsistent with an earlier ruling, when I requested separating Vintage Rubber from Vintage Power, where Power does substantially outstrip Rubber...

From Allan Brown:

I see from the results of the first two Area comps that a trend is presenting... Electric powered models are so different and not easily matched with IC types because of a completely differing type of power source. They are also subject to rapid development of motors and batteries. In view of the popularity and the parity of the IC models performance...

From Peter Tolhurst:

The FFTC proposes to remove electric powered models from Combined Power. Please note that in 2012 there are seven Combined Power competitions, and ensure that in 2013 there are a similar number of BMFA Electric competitions.

From Peter Watson:

It has become apparent from this year's, and last year's, contest results, that BMFA Electric models have a significant advantage in Combined Power contests... The BMFA Electric rules allow the use of VIT, and AR, and keep the full run. If I use them in an IC engined model, I am restricted to a 7 second run.

I note from the Contest Calendar that there is only 1 event this year for BMFA Power. (The Nationals, where BMFA Electric is a separate event). I am assuming that this has been done to accommodate BMFA Electric at all these other events... I can live with that, simply because it keeps the entry numbers up, and I suspect the time will come when almost everything will end up as combined classes as the numbers dwindle. However, for this to work in a fair and amicable way, I feel that BMFA Electric must operate under rules much closer to, or ideally the same as those covering IC engine models.

From Mick Lester:

I believe on principle, Electric models cannot and should not compete with power models or any other class or model, current and future rules aside, Electric models currently climb with a far longer motor run at not inconsiderable speed giving the advantage of being able to pick air on the ground and climb in it, giving a big advantage over a power model, particularly in fly offs, also gaining effectively, a free 10 seconds of climb over a power model...

	<p>From Tony Shepherd: I am very aware of the current mutterings and moanings about the presence of BMFA Electric models in the Combined Power class and in particular the perceived disparity in performance when compared to i/c powered models... I've communicated with the electric flyers on the FFTC and tend to agree that electric power would be best served if it can stand alone, if only to avoid the aforementioned disquiet. The level of participation, after something of a surge two or three years ago, seems to have plateaued out. I am unsure if the advent of Combined Power helped the cause or not - certainly the electric fliers have enjoyed some success but i/c fliers had no interest in building anything electric as they already had their i/c models available to compete with in the combined class... When the Electric Sub-committee met last year we discussed the motor run and my personal recommendation was for 15 secs and I still think that that is about right to allow the simple electric model to compete on a par with the top i/c models - remember, it's a handicap and in the same conditions, the best of each class should cross the line together! However, returning to my opening suggestion, I do believe that in the long term, BMFA Electric should be a stand alone class with regular contests throughout the season.</p>
	<p>Currently under discussion by FFTC.</p>
	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>From Ron Marking: As a keen electric flyer I was pleased when Combined Power included electric – it added more comps. If electric is removed then there must be a parallel electric comp every time. I note that the results reported by Peter Tolhurst show that electric does NOT have an obvious advantage – there is only a perceived one!!!</p> <p>From Mark Croome: I would prefer to see vintage and classic rubber and power separated since I have both rubber and power classics and cannot fly both which I would like to.</p> <p>From John Thompson: Another anomaly, is that Electric are permitted folding props this has an advantage and should be taken into account when fixing motor runs. To maintain entries in my view Combined events are the way to go , it will just need application to even out the handicaps. I sympathise with the FFTC in it's task on this, in that what ever they decide in the view of some it will not work, so good luck !</p>
	<p>Proposed Change: <i>To remove Electric classes from Combined Power.</i></p>
3	<p>Plugge Cup/Teams Qualifications - Clarify requirements</p>
	<p>Raised by FFTC: An anomaly in the possible interpretations of qualifying club membership occurred in 2012 - a rewording is required to remove the anomaly.</p>
	<p>Rewording being dealt with by FFTC.</p>
	<p>Proposed Change: <i>To stipulate the same requirements for Plugge events as for Team events.</i></p>
4	<p>Team Selection process - Suggested changes</p>
	<p>Raised by Timperly Flyers: The 'Trials' needs a rethink from one end to the other. In particular it is folly to start to pick next year's Teams before this year's Championships are over. Surely lessons from this year need to be considered, and published, prior to picking those interested in the next event.</p>
	<p>The FFTC considers that the current system is now working well. However a re-</p>

	ordering of the 2013 Calendar to obviate the specified problem above is already underway.
	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>From Stuart Darmon:</p> <p>The trials were plodding along minding their own business (churning out F1A & C world champions, team & individual medals, etc) until recently. The new system is more vulnerable to bad weather and venue problems, but that can be mitigated, and I'm sure is being. The bottom line is that there are about a dozen of us in F1A, 10 in B & four in C who are prepared to put up for a team place, and the better ones get in more teams .</p> <p>All the trials need to do is be fair and tend to select the 'on form' among us, while giving the rest of us continued incentive to try harder next time and not pack in . We don't need another root & branch reform, we're two dozen old farts taking it in turns to take on the world, and quite often we win medals, so there.</p>
	Proposed Change: <i>Calendar re-dating to avoid a Team Selection event before the then current Championships.</i>
5	F1Q Electric - modification of rules for non-energy limiter specification
	<p>Raised by FFTC:</p> <p>The current F1Q rules permit the use of models equipped with and without on-board energy limiters. The specification for non-energy limiter equipped models produces a disparity in allowed energy use between these and on-board energy limiter equipped models. The FFTC will produce a proposal to CIAM to correct this disparity.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The feeling among UK F1Q class fliers is that the disparity referred to above has made non-energy limiter equipped models uncompetitive. This has resulted in a decline in entries for the class in the UK, particularly at the UK based internationals. Specifically, the 2012 Stonehenge Cup received one UK entry and no entries from overseas countries. Previous years had seen 4 to 5 UK entries and overseas entries from Austria, Finland, Germany and the Netherlands. As an illustration the following comment was received from a previous World Cup winner when asked why he had not entered in 2012:</p> <p>From Klaus Salzer:</p> <p>Sorry - with those new crazy rules I have lost interest in F1Q, and will certainly not compete until more sensible rules are made.</p>
	A proposal is being prepared by the FFTC.
	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>From Ron Marking:</p> <p>This has been a problem from day 1!!! CIAM want their arses kicked!!!!</p>
	Proposed Change: <i>To modify the measurement requirements for non-energy equipped models.</i>
6	BMFA Electric - Changes to motor run and checking requirements
	<p>Raised by Peter Tolhurst:</p> <p>BMFA Electric - For 2012, the Electric Sub Committee suggested that a 15 second motor run for brushless motors would be appropriate. This was subsequently increased to 17 seconds.</p>

	<p>Electric Power has now, to coin a phrase, come of age, and the cheaply and readily available power trains are such that a 12 or 13 second motor run would be appropriate for a 150 second max. Brushed motors would be allowed an additional 5 seconds as is currently the case</p> <p>Also I would suggest that the rulebook be amended to clarify what constitutes a motor run for ground testing. I would propose that the motor run is 'until the propeller ceases to rotate'. This is how I, and other electric flyers I've spoken with, test the run; however it is not specified in the rule book.</p>
	To be considered by FFTC.
	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>From Ron Marking: As to the motor run time; in F1Q, if I use an energy limiter then the "run down time" is ignored. The same should apply if I use a watt meter, ie the time stops when power stops.</p>
	Proposed Change: <i>To reduce the motor run allowance and modify checking requirements.</i>
7	Restriction or Banning of Flashing Beacons
	<p>Raised by Timperly Flyers: At the most recent monthly meeting of the Timperley Model Flyers we discussed the implications of the 'flashing lights'... That these could be advantageous is indisputable. But are they desirable and should they be allowed?... We would suggest that the FFTC allow the use of 'flashers' for 2013 but with the stipulated, and heavily emphasised, limitation that it may well be rescinded for the following year. This is to avoid complaints about rendering equipment obsolete. This matter, and the FFTC's reaction, should also be referred to the FAI(CIAM) before it becomes a fait accompli.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>From P.Watson: ... I believe that the use of flashing LED's has the potential to cause long term discontent, and disillusionment. It is absurd to suggest that a chuck glider can be seen for several miles because it happens to be carrying a bright flashing LED. It is clearly the light that would be timed in this, and similar situations. ... It is in no way the same as using good binoculars, or fluorescent paint on the wing tips, as has been suggested to me... Timing has always been an imprecise art, but allowing the use of flashing LED's, would simply increase the chances of an unfair sporting result to a contest. I suggest that they should be banned in all BMFA contests. What the FAI does is another matter.</p>
	Under Consideration by FFTC.
	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>From Stuart Darmon: The timing of free flight models is another area where we will have to decide very soon where the line is to be drawn. For years certain individuals (not in this country, thankfully) have used tracker signals to pressure timekeepers, but since the rules specify 'sight', this is only bluster. It could be argued that since flashers are neither costly nor hard to make, they are not a problem. I agree with the Timperly Flyers that there is a 'moral' difference between reflected light from the model-which is SEEING it, and light transmitted by a beacon on the model, which is SEEING WHERE IT IS. Firstly, there are mundane practical concerns. What if the model, unseen except for its flasher, lands in a tree? More importantly, if we establish the precedent of accepting evidence that the model is still flying when we can no longer see it, what about the new timers which transmit altitude & GPS telemetry to an iPhone app? Still not admissible, but if we accept</p>

flashers, they should be. We all do what we do knowing that if we fly into a cloud a second short of a max that's tough, we man up and take it. Will it seriously improve our pastime to have every flyoff go to an appeal with a jury reviewing video evidence?

From Mark Croome:

In poor visibility the timekeeper is timing the light not the model and I dread to think what will happen when 4 models are all in the same thermal and far away. Mistaken identity all round. Also how long may a timekeeper time a model in a distant tree? They should not be acceptable.

From Ron Marking:

On a gloomy day it would be possible for a LED equipped model to land in tall tree and it would still be seen and thought to be flying!!!!. They must therefore be banned.

From John Thompson:

Some 15 or more years ago I investigated flashing lights and at that time was advised that such lights of the sufficiency that we would need , are a danger to peoples eyesight .At that time I could see no way of turning them off. If there is a danger involved a means of turning them off should be compulsory -- radio possibly (mind you if they are permitted who will be the first to return and confess that the model was stuck up a tree ?)

From Gavin Manion:

Flashing Beacons:

F1 Luddite again maybe, but consider now an obvious scenario where a flasher equipped model in poor visibility flies into a tree (or simply lands on an upslope). How long before the poor timekeeper realises that this has happened?

We time the model 'till we can't see it anymore and this simple fact has influenced some flyers over the years to build visible (i.e. fat!) models even though they may have a performance handicap over a more svelte one; it's all part of the game that we play and sometimes you just need to be plain lucky.

Please don't make the downwind skyline reminiscent of the approach to the port of Dover (will we need to register the flashing pattern we use so that we don't have two of us group flashing green 3 times every 5 seconds?)

Th The elephant in the room:

Look along the typical row of cars at, say, Barkston at an Area do and consider whether wholesale adoption of this form of technology is going to increase that line of cars???

We are all we've got (barring the odd under 40 year old!) so please don't alienate the many for the sake of a very few.

Let the FAI do as it will and of course we need trials rules to match them, but in general we are not Formula 1 we are club racers and we need domestic rules in keeping.

Proposed Change: *To ban the use of visual beacons.*

8 F1E Team Selection process - Clarification of scoring procedure

Raised by Ian Kaynes:

Yesterday we had an F1E contest and when I processed the results I found a problem with the 2012 FF rule book.

For F1E team selection it states that competitors are allocated points according to table

	<p>3.2.6.1.(i). However, that table was in the F1ABC team selection section and was deleted when those trials were changed to work on total time. For 2012 I propose to use the points table from the 2011 rule book.</p> <p>In future, a simple solution would be to reinstate the table in F1E section – possibly modified to be more suitable for our small entries. Alternatively it would be good to move towards using actual results in a similar way to F1ABC. We already use percentage time scoring which normalises between flights of different maxes, but the problem comes with combining the different competitions which may have different number of flights (A comp may have between 5 and 7 rounds and if the weather is bad may be stopped after at least 3 rounds have been flown). A solution could be to use the total percentage flight score divided by the number of rounds flown including flyoff. I will work out the implications of this before the next FFTC meeting.</p>
	Under consideration by FFTC.
	Proposed Change: <i>To re-introduce a suitable scoring system.</i>
9	Model data on results - to include class/type/etc
	<p>Raised by Gerry Ferer:</p> <p>That contest entry should include the model name and/or information relevant to the contest being flown. For combined contests the model type, vintage/classic, motor run, tow-line length, etc. This will make contest results more interesting, and show the range of models flown.</p> <p>A single extra column for contest entry sheets and reports headed 'Model name or Type' should do.</p>
	To be considered by FFTC.
	<p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>From Stuart Darmon: I support Gerry Ferer's proposal to specify model types in results of combined contests. I realise that this would increase the workload somewhat, but would not only be of general interest but also help to monitor the success rates pro rata of the different types. This is important in view of assessing how equitable the rules are; We currently assume that the playing field must be level if different types feature in top places, but lack the readily available data to verify this statistically (for instance one type may appear to be equally represented in the top places but may account for a disproportionately large percentage of the overall entry, and therefore actually be 'under achieving'. If in combined power the top three are an electric, an F1C and a SLOP, can we really conclude that none has an inherent advantage?</p> <p>From Ron Marking: A good idea.</p>
	Proposed Change: <i>No change?</i>
10	Hand launching - qualifying nature of flights
	<p>Raised by Phil Ball:</p> <p>To avoid hand launched flights counting I suggest we introduce a rule that insists for a flight to be legal it must comply with the relevant class rules. i.e. Gliders must be tow launched (except F1E CAT & HLG), Power models must be launched with the engine running, Rubber models must be launched with the motor wound and the propeller turning.</p> <p>REASON: Placings in important contests have been decided by hand launching models not complying with the above requirement.</p>
	Comments:

	Proposed Change: <i>To be considered by FFTC.</i>
11	Introduction of E36 Electric
	<p>Raised by Phil Ball:</p> <p>The FFTC should replace E30 with E36 in 2014. A suitable motor and speed controller should be selected and supplied by the FFTC.</p> <p>REASONS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. E36 is a better concept than E30 2. Introduction in 2014 will allow contestants to continue flying E30s whilst developing models for the new E36 class. 3. Provision for a standard motor and speed controller will effectively curb a power race and keep costs under control and should increase participation. <p>(Note a straw pole taken by me regarding a standard motor has had 100% agreement)</p>
	Comments:
	Proposed Change: <i>To be considered by FFTC.</i>

RCP2013. 8.9.12