

BMFA
FREE FLIGHT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING 18th September 2013

Action

Present	Mike Woodhouse MW	Phil Ball PB	
	Chris Strachan CS	Trevor Grey TG	
	John Carter JC	Dave Phipps (part time) DP	
	Stuart Darmon SD		
Absent	Ian Lever		
Apologies	Ian Kaynes IK		
	Nigel Bathe NB		
Minutes of 16.06.13	Accepted		
Matters Arising	None		
Contest Calendar	<p><u>2013 Calendar</u> Version V1f remains current.</p> <p><u>2014 Calendar</u> TG presented an outline calendar giving dates and events. The following points were agreed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both team selection events to be held at Sculthorpe • A meeting to be set up with David Phipps (DP), the Grantham club and the RAFMG Motor Club to discuss <u>Barkston</u> dates. MW to speak to DP, PB to attend meeting. MW PB • CS to investigate the possibility of a return to Little Rissington for the Southern Gala CS • The situation for the Northern Gala due to the change of status of Church Fenton is still unknown • PB will to co-ordinate the Trials and Midland Gala PB • PB proposed talking to all Gala organisers on the mix of classes at their events – there was no seconder. • In spite of low entries the Equinox Cup will be run in 2014 but may be moved to Sculthorpe • TG to fix Plugge events on current basis (3 events , 2 competitors) • It was noted that the calendar as planned has no date clashes with Council meetings TG • 1/2A and F1J to be separated as in Rules below <p>TG to action final calendar once further information is available TG</p>		
SAM 35 Relationship	SAM 35 will be invited to discuss their presence at the 2014 Nationals as soon as initial arrangements are in place. MW		
Nationals 2013	<p><u>2013</u> MW reported that the latest figures show a positive balance of £1155. It was suggested that £200 should be donated to the RAF Benevolent Fund and £200 to Roy Wright</p> <p>Proposed JC Seconded TG In favour 5 Abstention 1 JC to action JC</p>		

2014

Following on from the discussion at the previous FFTC meeting the points made were

- Agreed that MW will not be required as part of the 2014 organisation
- Firstly we need to confirm that D P will take on the co-ordinating role for all preparations before the event. MW to set up a meeting with DP. MW
- PB suggested that the CDs should attend the FFTC pre-planning meetings and be prepared for having full responsibility on their day. PB
- It was agreed that support for the CD on each day should be provided by 2 FFTC members who, if they fly, will ensure that one of them remains available to the CD at all times
- MW will write up the process and procedures as it has been up to and including 2013 MW

Officer's Reports

Treasurer

JC reported that all accounts are OK. He will talk to DP about why the Nationals account is separate from the Contest account. JC

It is clear that the 2015 World Championships in Mongolia will be costly to attend and we need to bid for more support from the Central Team Travel Fund. JC

Council Delegate

TG reported that we had given our apologies for having no representation at the Full Council meeting on 8th September. His director's report was submitted and he will send a copy to all members. TG

The apparent anomalies in the original Central Team Travel Fund papers have now been resolved by the issue of a new version and corrected list of events.

PRO

Nothing to report.

Results Officer

No problems and the trophy list is complete up to date

Safety Officer

Nothing to report

Rules Officer

Nothing else to report other than items covered by Rules below

International Teams

Report F1A,B,C 2013

MW stated that his team manager report is complete. He noted that the three teams achieved 99.4% of full house yet did not receive a single trophy. All flyers did well but it was an extremely high scoring event. Peter Tribe did a good job as assistant team manager. Biggest problem was with the organisers and dealing with late clearance of crops.

Progress report F1E 2013

Nothing to report

Team selection 2013

First meeting completed OK. Second meeting due 21st/22nd at Sculthorpe. PB

Team Managers 2014

Advertisement has gone out. SD

Stonehenge Cup 2013

2014

Proposal has been submitted. Concerns raised at Council about site not yet being booked just reflect the normal situation at this time of year.

**Equinox
Cup**

2013

All underway. Entries are low so far (10 A, 9 B, 3 C and 2Q) and none from overseas.

2014

Proposal has been submitted.

JC

Rules

The rule change process for 2014 has now been completed and the full documentation is attached as Appendix A. The numbers below refer thereto:

1 1/2A and F1J

That we go to separate classes with 3 flights for 1/2A and 5 flights for F1J

Proposed CS Seconded TG

In favour 4 Against 1 Abstention 1

That both classes are always flown on the same meeting

Proposed JC Seconded CS

In favour 3 Against 1 Abstention 2

Allocation of trophies – That both are given at the Nationals, Quickstart for 1/2A and Hales for F1J

Proposed JC Seconded PB

In favour 5 Against Abstention 1

2 Ball races in SLOP

That we do not permit ball races in SLOP (i.e. No change)

Proposed PB Seconded JC

In favour 5 Against Abstention 1

3 Ideas on combining classes

No vote needed

4 Timing of engine runs

That we leave the rule unchanged

Proposed JC Seconded PB

In favour 4 Against 1 Abstention 1

5 Revision to number of flights in HLG/CLG

That we leave the rules unchanged

Proposed TG Seconded CS

In favour 3 Against 1 Abstention 2

6 E36

That this class be included in the Rule Book

Proposed TG Seconded CS

In favour 3 Against 1 Abstention 2

7 Retro classes for F1A, B and C (revised by proposer to F1A only)

That we adopt this change

Proposed SD Seconded TG

In favour 2 Against 3 Abstention 1

8 Modification of Team Selection rule 3.2.4.1

Addendum item 8

That we adopt the following changes

(a) remove “in the following year”

(b) change 10 to 7 rounds

(c) no change

(d) change start times at each meeting to 9am on the first day and 8am on the second day

(f) change “1 hour before sunset” to 2 hours

In addition remove reference to “following year”

Also in addition add length of rounds as specified in the current guidelines.

Proposed JC Seconded MW
 In favour 6 Against 0 Abstention 0

9 To consider “Motorised Retrieval”

That we take no change as already covered in CD Guidelines

Proposed TG Seconded JC
 In favour 5 Against 0 Abstention 1

10 Bladder tanks for SLOP

That no change be made

Proposed CS Seconded SD
 In favour 5 Against 0 Abstention 1

11 Fly-off Schedules to be announced in advance

That no change be made

Proposed TG Seconded JC
 In favour 5 Against 0 Abstention 1

11(error duplicate) Reduce Vintage Power runs

That no change be made

Proposed CS Seconded JC
 In favour 5 Against 0 Abstention 1

12 Keep F1A rules in line with FAI change to RDT

That this be implemented

Proposed TG Seconded PB
 In favour 5 Against 0 Abstention 1

13 Keep F1Q in line with FAI energy limiter change

Proposed TG Seconded CS
 In favour 5 Against 0 Abstention 1

Action as appropriate on all the above items to be taken by TG TG

PR on **BMFA**
BMFA and Controller for FFTC input to BMFA website to be defined SD TG
FFTC **FFTC**
websites Nothing to report
Free Flight/Radio future
 TG paper to be considered as basis for input to Forum CS

Events **A future event**
 No event currently planned for 2014

2014 **FFTC Membership**
 Co-options to be finalised. SD stated that he is prepared to be co-opted but feels that the Committee might do better to seek a person with more experience in I T. MW to pursue the possible co-option of Martin Dilly for 2014 MW

AOB **Museum**
 Jim Wright is still working on this and may consider Scampton
Nomination
 IK to be nominated to CIAM CS
RAFMA Trophies
 MW still pursuing. MW
 Forum Paper
 MW to contact Martin Dilly re a presentation at the Forum of the FFTC philosophy

**Next
meetings**

Dates

Wednesday 4th December 11.00 am at Chacksfield House.

FFTC 20/09/13

Critical dates for FFTC

BMFA News Copy dates Dec 2013 Issue– 3rd October 2013 (estimated)
Full Council 11th January Agenda deadline 9th December
Technical Council 1st November Agenda deadline 23rd September
FFTC meetings 4th December

Appendix A

Rule change Proposals for 2014

The following are those proposals received as of 31.07.13 with comments and resulting rule changes/introductions thinking from the FFTC, as of the FFTC meeting on 19.06.13. In addition are suggestions from the rules officer (TG) after discussion/research as of 13.08.13

1	Separate BMFA 1/2A and F1J and run as a three flight contest
	Raised by Colin Foster for Morley club
	<p>I have been asked to write to you regarding a rule change for F1J/1/2A . Morley Club are proposing that F1J and 1/2A become 2 separate classes.The F1J rules would stay as they are now. In 1/2A the rules as in 3.11.7 would stay the same but the number of flights would be reduced from 5 to 3, the max would stay at 2.00 min.</p> <p>Reason for change:- reducing the number of flights to 3 and competing against similar models would encourage more entries.</p>
	In addition a slightly different proposal, on the same theme, was raised by Steve Barnes
	<p>I am contacting you to suggest some contest changes for the FFTC to consider for next year. This is to separate 1/2A from F1J and to run 1/2A as a three flight competition. As the average age of the free flight fraternity is older and older, i think that the prospect of tackling five flights is too daunting for many. Also the number of free flighters is diminishing so we need to encourage people to enter more than one contest on the day. I am sure that if you did this many more people would enter 1/2A. If you do not think it is feasible to separate the two classes then could we not run F1J domestically as a three flight contest.</p>
	Feedback:
	From FFTC in News No 57 <p>The committee is reluctant to separate the two classes effectively diluting entries. The possibility of extending the engine run of ½ A, perhaps to 10 seconds, was suggested to address the perceived inequity.</p>
	From Simon Dixon <p>In response to the proposed separation of F1J / 1/2a or the increased engine run for 1/2a.</p>

Whoever proposed this either doesn't get to many contests or hasn't looked at the results properly, here are the winners over the last 18 months :-

2012 3rd area	F1J
2012 Northern gala	1/2a
2012 Nats	F1J
2012 7th area	1/2a
2012 Southern gala	F1J
2012 Midland gala	F1J
2013 London gala	1/2a
2013 Nats	F1J

Hardly an F1J whitewash. There are not enough people flying either class so to separate them would make things worse and a 10 second run for 1/2a seems too much - double what F1J is allowed - hurm.

From Dave Hipperson

BMFA 1/2A Power was *created* (1995?) to deliberately encourage production and use of the lesser old fashioned 1/2A concept against the superior performing 1cc FIJ FAI models. To that end they were given a longer engine run. A few years ago you shortened both (can't remember quite when but it was presumably because the FAI reduced their FIJ runs). Trouble is that, that reduction on paper looked fair, but in practice was never going to work as the development in engines was in the 1cc sphere and always the .8s were going to accelerate much slower and be at a disadvantage more and more as runs got shorter. If interest is waning in the .8 1/2A then easy - as you suggest - increase their run back up to 10secs and watch. Put it back a bit if there is a mad dash to the .8s and they win all the comps but somehow I doubt even on 10secs they will do that. Don't *what ever you do* separate the classes you have got many too many already.

From Steve Barnes

In response to the proposed rule changes as outlined in FF News, here are my feelings.

With regards to 1/2A/F1J the feeling amongst all fliers that i have talked to (non F1J fliers) is that they would still prefer the two to be separated. The idea to increase engine run of 1/2A back to 10 secs would go some way to address the imbalance of performance.

However, you seem to have conveniently omitted one of the main bone of contention, that of reducing the number of flights from 5 down to 3. This in itself would increase the number of competitors, just as it has in mini vintage when you cut the flights to 3. Everybody is getting older and do not want to be making 5 flights in one class. This would also encourage people to enter more than one class in a day (again giving more entries). It seems as if you never want to upset the sacred FAI classes. Come on you have got to look after the domestic scene, there is no earthly reason why F1J cannot be flown to 3 flights domestically.

From Barry Lumb

After reading the FF News and the suggested 'compromise' to the proposal to separate F1J & BMFA 1/2A, I would like to make the following comment/s.

It is a fact the high tech F1J models will out-perform an 1/2A model - given all things being equal, I don't think that fact is in doubt, so increasing the motor run for an 1/2A model will help to even things up somewhat. However, I don't believe it is just performance of the models that this proposal has been put forward.

The other reason, and in an aging Free Flight society it is an important consideration, is that if 1/2A is still flown with F1J we have to do five flights, whereas if it was a

	<p>separate BMFA competition it would be only three flight.</p> <p>This would not only be an incentive to fly BMFA 1/2A but would mean that a competitor would be more likely to enter two three flight competitions than they would be if 1/2A was five flights plus at least three flights needed should they wish to fly in a BMFA second event, i.e. a total of eight flights for an FAI + a second BMFA competition.</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC thinks that separating these power classes is not a good idea. A three flight schedule would also create pressure for similar treatment to F1G rubber and F1H glider. However we are inclined to balance the perceived 'performance inequality' by increasing the motor run allowance for 1/2 A from 8 seconds to 9 seconds.</i></p>
	<p>Further Feedback:</p> <p>From Alan Gibbs</p> <p>I was pleased to see that the FFTC will continue that mini events (F1H, F1G & F1J/1/2A) to be a five flight event. This makes more of a contest and there is more of a chance of a result without having to have a fly-off.</p> <p>From Frank Rushby</p> <p>With regard to the proposal to split F1J and 1/2A I believe that there are probably a lot of potential 1/2A fliers who are indeed put off by the apparent performance of the top F1J models. I say apparent because I don't believe the difference between very good F1J and very good 1/2A is necessarily such a gulf as is perceived. Part of the problem lies in the fact that the "top" guys fly F1J, not 1/2A thus making F1J models look superior! That said, I do believe that the extra power available (and inherent additional component strength not possible for models which must be built much lighter) makes them more suitable for use in adverse weather and so makes them more "usable" in our general competition weather.</p> <p>I feel too that 1/2A, with it's relatively low power and equally relatively forgiving ways, used to be an introduction class for power fliers which was fun to fly. A class in which the flier always felt they were in with "a bit of a chance" & I think a lot of 1/2A fliers were lost when the engine run was reduced from 10 seconds as it became an "experts" class like most of the other power classes.</p> <p>My conclusions are that I think it would be favourable to split F1J and 1/2A and might encourage a lot of current fliers to try 1/2A again and maybe some new blood would emerge too. Whether they are split or not, I would be in favour of increasing the 1/2A engine run back to 10 seconds to make 1/2A better able to compete if they do remain flown together but ALSO to 10 seconds if they are split to stop it being perceived as an "expert" only class. If people feel they have a reasonable chance of making the fly-off they are more likely to have a go.</p> <p>While I am on the subject, in view of the increasing average age of competitors now, I would also like to see all mini classes reduced to 3 rounds for domestic contests. I think the reasoning behind this is quite clear and doesn't need further explanation.</p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>The general feeling from the above is that the first preference is for separating 1/2A and F1J with 1/2A becoming a 3 flight contest. The second preference being for keeping the classes combined with a 10 second run for 1/2A. My suggestion would be to separate with 3 flights for 1/2A- this would not require</i></p>

	<i>an increase in run (leave at 8seconds). Given that 1/2A and F1J are always held at the same time this would only require some extra certificates and occasional extra prizes (wine). This action 'might' also increase participation in 1/2A.</i>
2	Allow Ball race motors in SLOP
	Raised by Terry Dobson
	<p>Following discussions with fellow SLOP flyers, it would appear that it is becoming increasingly difficult to acquire suitable motors for SLOP. Many second-hand motors offered for sale, (usually by R/C flyers) have reached the end of their useful life. Production of new motors of suitable specification is almost non-existent, (P.A.W. diesels are an exception), as most manufacturers opt for larger capacities and invariably ball-raced journals in all sizes.</p> <p>The suggestion of allowing ball-raced motors in SLOP needs care if we are to preserve the nature of the class. Restricting ball-raced motors to 2.5 cc is one approach, but this could lead to the use of ultra-powerful units, Nelson's etc, designed for use in F1C.</p> <p>Perhaps the restriction could be to those motors of 2.5 cc which are produced by the large-scale manufacturers and are readily available via model retail outlets. If need be, specific manufacturers could be listed, as such a list would be short. Such motors would not offer any power advantage over existing SLOP motors.</p> <p>I think that the Tech Committee should consider this issue, especially as anyone wishing to take up SLOP could be faced with the difficulty of obtaining a suitable motor. To focus discussion, I will propose an addition to the SLOP rules, but I feel that the need for this should be made apparent to the Committee.</p> <p>Proposed addition to rules for SLOP. "Engines with ball-race journal bearings of up to a maximum of 2.5 cc may also be used, provided that they are from a large-scale manufacturer and are readily available via model retail outlets." I hope this will give the Tech Committee a basis on which to tackle the problem.</p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>From FFTC in News No 57</p> <p>The committee recognises the logic of the proposal, but is concerned about the possibility of making current equipment obsolete. Possible ways of integrating certain ball bearing engines into the class on an even footing were discussed. These included a restriction on swept volume, reduced engine runs, and a list of approved engines plus restrictions on modification.</p> <p>From John Thompson</p> <p>I do not see the need to change for glow motors , there is a sufficiency of 2.5 cc plain bearing ones available. Less so for 3.5 , but who wants larger engines ?.</p> <p>With diesel there is an argument that as SLOP is effectively a classic 1950's class that ball raced Olivers etc should be permitted. The power of such engines is about the same as the AM 3.5 which is the choice of most people, therefore same engine run could be permitted, if such ball race diesels were permitted. But do not let us go down the route of nominated engines this to me would raise a can of worms which would have to be updated every time an appeal was made?</p> <p>From Steve Philpott</p> <p>The request to change the rules to allow non plain bearing motors has come up before and it is always on the basis that there is a lack of plain bearing motors available.</p>

As far as I am aware PAW still manufacture plain bearing motors and there appears to be a regular flow of plain bearing motors on ebay. In preparation for next years season I have purchased two in the last four weeks and over the last few days there have been several suitable motors sold the latest being a very good looking OS15mk3 from Simon Dixon.

However the new purchase is apparently quite limited and there does appear to be some rational in change I just looked up Enya who now apparently only have ball races engines on sale but their 15 now produces 0.5BHP the old version 15 was about 0.3BHP. I doubt that is all to do with the bearing but other changes too.

So I come to the same conclusion as the FFTC if change is made there needs to be some limit on the ball raced motors.

On the face of it general ball raced 15's appear about the same as older 20's but that then opens the door on the very high performance 15's such as Rossi, Nelsons etc which I would not think would do the class any good at all.

I fully support that current equipment should not be made uncompetitive or otherwise redundant.

My suggestion would be a list of motors and also perhaps some regulation on air intake sizes to cover where people have made new intakes to replace RC carbs particularly on old motors.

By the way I have previously flown this class and have been using the forced rest time into planning a return. Incidentally BTW currently on ebay there are:

1 xOS15FP
1x OS20FP
1x OS20
1xAM35
1xAM15
1 xFox 15
1x PAW 249 (also available new)

From Dave Hipperson

Slow Open Power motors. *Don't allow ball bearing motors.* The entire essence of Slow Open Power was simplicity. Simple engines, simple models. There are plenty of used plain bearing motors both glow and diesel and part of the pleasure is searching and finding the ones that still work well. As you suggest to open it up to the BBs could make many of the plain bearing models un-competitive particularly the diesels who already are at a disadvantage. When in doubt - don't change. It's still a wonderful class which has stood the test of 30 years with few modifications (engine capacity was a good one) and spawned most of the power classes which are so successful today. Don't change it.

From Robin Beckford

It seems unnecessary to complicate the SLOP rules. Plain-bearing engines suitable for SLOP appear regularly on sales sites such as ebay.

PAW will make a plain-bearing engine to order.

If a flyer wants to fit a ballrace motor into a SLOP airframe it can be flown in BMFA power instead.

(They would then have a choice of feed systems as well).

From Steve Barnes

Regarding SLOP, if it isn't broke, don't mend it. There are plenty of SLOP motors on eBay all the time and at swap meets. I do not think that we are going to get a large input of new power fliers starting up and if there are any that want any SLOP motors I

	<p>am sure that I and many others, have plenty of such motors I would be willing to sell. Also if you are under the impression that such things as Nelsons would be no good to run on suction then this is wrong. Yes they are set up to run on pressure but you only have to reduce the venturi size a bit and they would run ok, this will only open a can of worms.</p> <p>From Dave Limbert Just to place on record , I am in complete accord with Steve Barnes on the rule change proposals; I don't think I can add anything further, all the bases have been covered.</p> <p>From Gordon Cornell There is an adequate supply of suitable engines for this model specification. The fact that many model shops may not have them in stock is misleading. I checked the Internet and determined that the OS LA 15 is currently available. Further research will reveal others. Plain bearing engines in this application last many years (Pete Watson has and is using my 20 year old engines which have excellent fits). There are vast numbers available of eBay and swap meets, the market is saturated. Many are new in box.</p> <p>The rules specifically exclude the modification of bearings/crankcases of ballrace motors to satisfy the Plain Bearing requirement. There are very good sound reasons for this - the intention being to use Sports Engines, not Racing Engines such as the Nelson, Rossi etc . An approved list of engines has proved unsatisfactory in Controlline applications.</p> <p>Should such a change be implemented differential engine runs would have to be introduced 5 secs for glow, 7 secs for diesel. PB as current. Otherwise all current models would become obsolete.</p> <p>Added to this how do you propose to deal with stopping the engine - this will take longer to stop. This is a problem for current timekeepers.</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>We are not inclined to alter the current specifications for what is our most popular power class - allowing only plain bearing motors up to 3.5cc capacity. Research suggests that there are plenty of motors available second hand and even a few new ones.</i></p>
	<p>Further Feedback:</p> <p>From Frank Rushby</p> <p>My view on the second proposal regarding the introduction of ball-raced engines into SLOP is simple, it's not necessary & shouldn't happen! It's becoming enough of a power-race already with modified engines etc. A Nelson 15 on suction will still be the ultimate and will set you back around £250 on e-bay now they are collectables! Of course there are plenty of cheap ball-raced radio motors available but I'm not in favour of more engine run restrictions and approved lists etc. Personally I just don't believe there is a problem.</p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>Their is a fairly obvious weigh behind leaving things as they are - not allowing ball race motors. I agree and think this is what we should do.</i></p>
<p>3</p>	<p>General comment on combined classes(arising from 1 and 2 above)</p>
	<p>Raised by Jim Paton</p>

	<p>Concerning the proposed separation of F1J and 1/2A and also the use of more modern ball raced engines in SLOP: I think these matters are best addressed by a handicapping system of engine run time. I feel the combined IC and electric classes could have been preserved in the same way. It is less of an achievement coming 3rd out of 3 entries, even if there is a trophy or bottle of wine. I started to build a half A a few years ago, but felt it not worthwhile to continue while I could be up against high tech F1Js. Without a handicapping system they are not comparable. I was out of aeromodelling when F1J was introduced, so I am not sure what the problem was with half A. I guess we are stuck with two close classes with dissimilar performance, hence the necessity of handicapping. Perhaps the FFTC has a threshold number of entries below which combining classes is desirable. Might I suggest 5?</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC has noted these comments with respect to future changes.</i></p>
	<p>Feedback: From Ron Marking</p> <p>Combined Classes:- I don't see any particular class dominating these events; so is there any need to go down the complicated route of handicapping. Anyway, it is virtually impossible to get right and you will never satisfy everybody!!!</p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>Handicapping is a valid and possibly useful idea, However it adds an extra layer of complexity and room for more disquiet. In practice we already have handicapping in the process of our current combined events - some work and some don't (viz. 1/2A-F1J above. In short 'comments noted for possible action if required at a future date'.</i></p>
4	<p>Timing of engine runs</p>
	<p>Raised by Pete Watson</p>
	<p><u>Re. the disturbing scenes following the timing of Mick Quinn's fly off at the Nat's.</u> I am not taking sides or apportioning blame on this matter as I hope to remain friends with everyone concerned.</p> <p>The fact that so many people became involved, and very strong opinions were expressed, does suggest that whatever did, or did not happen was far from satisfactory.</p> <p>Timing of engine runs has always been difficult, and I believe there will always be disagreements, and differences of what actually shows on stopwatches. This is especially a problem in SLOP, when engines often cough, splutter, burble, or run down following squash off of the fuel supply.</p> <p>I have written to the FFTC at length about this in the past, but was told that the current rules had worked for many years without problem, so there was no need to change them.</p> <p>This is clearly <u>not</u> the case. This was not the first time an unpleasant incident of this nature has taken place, and I believe the aftermath could rumble on. I believe the FFTC could help by changing the virtually non-existent rules covering engine timing, to something like.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cough, splutter, burble, run down are ignored. <p style="text-align: center;"><u>OR</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Cough, splutter, burble, run down, must be counted as part of the run

	<p>One of these options would make the current grey area clear, and I believe Option 1. is the best. (It is what they do in America).</p> <p>If this was to become a rule, it would presumably also have to apply to the other power classes that we fly (cannot see a problem), other than the FAI classes, where the FAI rules re. engine timing would apply.</p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>From Gordon Cornell (additional point from his feedback on SLOP motors)</p> <p>Far more important is to deal with unsatisfactory timing of engine runs.</p> <p>For example if a burp occurs after the watch has been stopped, then 2 seconds are added to the recorded watch time. This penalty will enforce improvement in cut off systems.</p> <p>From Dave Hipperson</p> <p>I see this <i>burble or cough</i> business is in the news and yes I know why and have spoken with many of the protagonists and witnesses from the Nats as you can imagine.</p> <p>A good loose diesel when spot on adjusted will cough a second after the end of the run (my AM35s used to) and yes of course the timekeeper has clocked off. However its only a cough not a burble which <i>can</i> be effective in both propulsion and pull out. Leave it alone. The diesels already have a disadvantage.</p> <p>If you put in an ad hoc 1sec or more ludicrously 2 seconds just for a cough it will open up a very interesting avenue of engine adjustment. A good diesel can be adjusted to hesitate (under-compressed) cough (nearly stop) on the climb. Mine often used to. So now all that would be necessary would be for the cough to be made distinct - quite feasible and say at half way up the climb. Timekeeper clocks off and adds your 1 sec. Trouble is it isn't a cough - its still running. Now what does he do. Competitor can have as long a run as he likes now the timekeeper has clocked off and added one second!</p> <p>Guys - great real! This system has been working quite well for more than 50 years. This is silly knee jerk reaction stuff that be-devils the Government. You must be looking for things to do to have even given this a second thought. Forget it for goodness sake.</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13):</p> <p><i>The FFTC are inclined to consider that if the engine produces burbles 'after' the watch has been stopped then 1 (or 2 ?) seconds should be added to the recorded engine run time. This would or would not produce an over-run depending on how close the flier risks setting their run.</i></p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13):</p> <p><i>Patently there is a feeling that we should more specific with our timing rules. The 'Cornell' suggestion has some merit but I see it creating as many disputes as it stops. The 'Watson' suggestion has more merit and puts the 'shut off decision' definitely in the timekeeper's hands, and, would be perceived as 'fair'. I would suggest that the engine run timing rule is rewritten to ignore coughs and burbles.</i></p>
5	Revision to HLG and CLG to produce fly-offs
	Raised by Bill Colledge
	To the best of my knowledge there has never been a flyoff in BMFA Catapult Glider,

	<p>and it's a very long time (best 5 from nine days) since there has been a FO in Hand Launched.(or Combined).</p> <p>I realise Fly Offs should not be guaranteed, but once in a blue moon doesn,t seem overkill.</p> <p>I would like to propose best 5 from 7 (or 5 from 9 or 7 from 9) for both Cat G, HLG, and combined.</p> <p>Let,s have some fly offs in these classes before it all fades away.</p>
	<p>Feedback: None yet received.</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC is inclined to support this change.</i></p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>Listening to spoken comments there seems a mixture of feelings with the general trend (and back-up statistics)suggesting that we leave the system as is. I would suggest just that no change.</i></p>
<p>6</p>	<p>To adopt the E36 class rules</p>
	<p>Raised by Chris Strachan and Trevor Grey</p>
	<p>Maximum wingspan allowed 36 in Minimum weight ready to fly 120g No auto surfaces allowed</p> <p>Any type of electric motor allowed Nickel or Lithium batteries allowed 2 cell Lithium or 6 cell Nickel limit Gearing and folding props allowed</p> <p>Two minute max (as per 3.11.1) First three flights to be made with a 15 second Motor run. If the max is reduced (due to prevailing conditions) the Motor run will be 10 seconds. If the first three flights are all maxes, a fourth flight to be made (straight away - not as a separate flyoff) with a 10 second Motor run, or a 5 second Motor run if the max has been reduced. If the fourth flight is maxed there will be subsequent flights made (again straight away) with a 5 second Motor run until a sub-max occurs. A competitors final score will be the total of all their flights.</p> <p>This Electric class originated in the USA and has been trialled at 4 club galas (up to and including 21.07.13). For a new class the entries have been reasonable - given the weather at each event and the time taken to sort and trim new models. In addition a number of E36 models have been used in BMFA Electric class (Open) contests - particularly the Nationals. Overall the interest in the class has been good and the general opinion seems to be one of making it an 'official' BMFA class. Note that the rules above lend themselves to 'small fields' and do not require a separate flyoff making the class adaptable to many sites and short flying days.</p>
	<p>Feedback: From Tom Brooke I entered my first Nats this year with an E30 and had a very enjoyable time even though I lost the model after 2 flights.I feel a bit in limbo at the moment. I have been</p>

	told that the E30 class finishes in 2014. There is a lot of talk about the E36 but this is not a BMFA class as yet. Do you have any idea when a replacement class for the E30 will be announced?
	FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC is considering the inclusion of the E36 class.</i>
	Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>The response to 'club run' events for the class has been positive with lots of interest shown. In addition E36 models are being flown in BMFA and F1Q electric class events increasing the entries in these classes. All of this seems good reason to make the class 'official' by adding it to the rule book.</i>
7	To consider FAI class 'classification prizes'
	<p>Raised by Stuart Darmon</p> <p>I wish to propose an addition to the BMFA rules for F1A B & C contests..</p> <p>In all competitions run by the BMFA, including team selection and world cups, for classes F1A, F1B & F1C, a separate classification be made, and prizes awarded, for models conforming to FAI specifications as well as the following additional restrictions:</p> <p>F1A GB</p> <p>Horizontal and oblique flying surfaces to remain fixed in incidence, camber and area except for DT.</p> <p>F1B GB</p> <p>Propellers to remain fixed in pitch and diameter except for fold .</p> <p>Flying surfaces to remain fixed in camber. No more than two automatic trim changes plus DT permitted per flight.</p> <p>F1C GB</p> <p>Direct drive engines only.</p> <p>Flying surfaces to remain fixed in camber and area (except when resulting from changes in incidence)</p> <p>REASONS</p> <p>The perception of FAI flying as elitist and the models as too complex/ costly is well known and needs no further elaboration.</p> <p>This proposal differs from previous attempts at reduced technology classes in several crucial respects;</p> <p>It does not rely on attempting to equate the performance of two disparate types of model</p> <p>The models are fully FAI legal and as well as their own classification also qualify for any prizes/ points etc in the overall contest.</p> <p>The models are not overly retrogressive. Straight tow gliders and no-functions power models are already abundantly catered for elsewhere, there is no incentive to fly such</p>

	<p>models in FAI.</p> <p>This is not 'yet another class'. By definition anyone flying it would be adding to, not diluting, the entry of an existing BMFA contest.</p> <p>By running it all season as opposed to a single trial comp, we get a genuine picture of whether continuing to promote FAI is worthwhile; if there are no takers, we still learn something valid. All it will cost is some certificates and three Nats medals.</p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>None received so far</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC is considering this classification.</i></p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>Although there will be appeal in this proposal for the those who wish to avoid 'technology' it is in reality neither "fish nor fowl" (neither complete low-tech or full-blown modern). Personally I don't think this is appropriate for insertion in the rule book. In short do not adopt in rulebook but suggest that a 'league' a-la 'Southern Coupe' and 'Biggles' Leagues is set up by the proposer.</i></p>
8	To transfer some items of the Team Selection operation 'guide lines' to the Team Selection rules.
	<p>Raised by John Carter</p> <p>Rules 3.2.4.1 (F1A, B, C, P Team Selection Events) need modification of items (c), (e) and (f) to provide more flexibility in the running of the events. (JC to fill in details)</p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>None received so far</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC is considering this transfer.</i></p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>Some changes to team selection rules may be required but I would be wary of making the 'organisational' rules too prescriptive - flexibility is very useful in certain situations.</i></p>
9	To consider 'Motorised Retrieval'
	<p>Raised by Nick Bosdet</p> <p>If I may put forward a suggestion to the BMFA Committee for clarifying/adding/amending the FF Rules. It's a bit off the wall and it's of no benefit to myself. I should have sent this earlier but was in 2 minds.</p> <p>A number of active Free Flight Competitors have mentioned the physical pain and difficulty whilst retrieving their models. Eventually this difficulty overwhelms their enjoyment which results in their retirement from competitive activity.</p> <p>I propose that for a clearly defined group of competitors, so that they can continue enjoying their competition flying a little longer, that the FFTC would reconsider motorised retrieval. To add transparency and a light touch, but necessary regulation, that the rules should include a defined period of flying, say 45 minutes, after which</p>

	<p>said group suspend flying to "jump" into a nominated car to retrieve their models in order to commence their second flight in a defined period of time, say 45 minutes. The nominated car(s) is to legitimise motorised retrieval where the flying site's local rules may preclude such activities.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria might be agreed locally, depending on terrain, etc.</p> <p>Bearing in mind R/C D/t is allowed, which has increased options to limit flights and to reduce risk to models and fliers, this suggestion is made on compassionate grounds and to promote - prolong participation in free flight competition. I hope will receive more than just a cursory consideration than just a laugh.</p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>None received so far</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13):</p> <p><i>The FFTC will consider this.</i></p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13):</p> <p><i>Motorised retrieval is already adequately covered in CD guidelines. Making it specific within the rule book will open more cans of worms. No Change.</i></p>
10	To consider 'Bladder' tanks for SLOP
	<p>Raised by Brian Spooner</p> <p>In SLOP allow bladder feed as well as suction feed. This is primarily a suggestion to improve safety as engines are far less likely to cut on launch if using a bladder.</p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>None received so far</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13):</p> <p>The FFTC will consider this.</p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13):</p> <p><i>Bladder (soft) tanks are 'pressure feed'. Although this proposal has merit from a safety viewpoint it alters the 'no pressure feed' requirement for the class specification. For this reason most fliers would be against it. If we feel that there is a safety problem then we should sanction all forms of pressure feed. If there is no safety problem then no change.</i></p>
11	To consider Flyoff 'Schedules'
	<p>Raised by Frank Rushby</p> <p>I propose that fly-off start times should be published at the beginning of BMFA contests. i.e the time at which the first fly-off period will commence and subsequent periods (if necessary) will follow (e.g. "fly-offs will commence at 6.10 p.m. and will consist of 10 minute rounds commencing at 15 minute intervals). The fly-off order to be drawn out of a hat.</p> <p>The logic is 2-fold. Firstly I think it is only reasonable that prospective competitors have sufficient information when entering to make an informed choice about whether they will have the opportunity to compete freely without time constraints. This requires that they have some idea at least as to what time the competition will run until. Of course the competition must include fly-offs.</p> <p>Second, the outcome of contests, particularly Area Centralised where events are</p>

	being held in numerous places with no coordination, can be effected by the order in which the fly-offs take place. OK, still an element of that if the order is randomly generated but at least there can be no suggestion of preferential treatment. In both instances this proposition will have the effect of taking the onus off the CD and also make the CD less open to being "leaned on" as can sometimes be perceived to happen under the current system.
	Feedback: None received so far
	FFTC Thinking (19.06.13): <i>The FFTC will consider this.</i>
	Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>As with Team Selection organisation rules and motorised retrieval this is too prescriptive. Flexibility in flyoff times as far as currently allowed by the rule book is more useful. No change.</i>
11	To consider Reduction of Vintage Power Motor Run
	Raised by Dennis Davitt May I ask that the FFTC consider the following in any rules revisions. I had previously asked for separation of vintage rubber and vintage power. The FFTC declined, I think because of too many classes, and low entries in each. I think that the situation now is that a good vintage power can do 6 -7 minutes, whereas a good vintage rubber can do about 4 minutes. I think the pendulum has swung much too far in favour of power. My suggestion is, whilst maintaining a combined class, to reduce the engine run of power models to give equitable performance to rubber. I have almost given up vintage rubber, but would like to continue, given a level playing field.
	Feedback: None received so far
	FFTC Thinking (19.08.13): <i>The FFTC will consider this.</i>
	Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13): <i>A reasonable suggestion and not the first time this has been raised. I think The figures quoted here are a little optimistic/pessimistic respectively. The reality is more likely 5/6 minutes for power and 4/5 minutes for rubber. Given this a reduction in power run from 18 seconds to 15 seconds would be reasonable.</i>

CS/TG for FFTC 18/08/2013

Addendum

Rule change Proposals for 2014 (2)

The following are those proposals that come from information requested in the original document, plus those changes required as a result of FAI sporting code changes that become effective on Jan 1st 2014 . In addition are suggestions from the rules officer (TG) after discussion/research as of 10.09.13.

8	To transfer some items of the Team Selection operation 'guide lines' to the Team Selection rules.
----------	--

	<p>Raised by John Carter</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Team Selection.</u></p> <p>We have tried in 2012 a new [if not readopted an old] system to select our teams for the following championships. I believe this system should be used for the selection in 2013 and at least 2014. [Maybe we consider later to incorporate the w/ cupsStonehenge/Equinox but would need a complete rule change, something for later discussion] It became apparent during the two meeting that we need to add a few additional rules and guide lines in order to have a better chance to achieve a series of events that are as near to the principle in the rule book as we can. I.e. 2x 7 round events flown in favourable conditions with if necessary fly offs to determine the team placing's One major problem is finding willing and competent CDs. The guys flying would be the best to be CD but it is not practical with the present rules. contest and fairer result 1/ THE START TIME ON THE FIRST DAY SHOULD REMAIN AS 9 AM <i>but be amended to 8am for the second day [Sunday] provided access is available to the site used.</i> 2/ THE FINISH TIME ON THE FIRST DAY TO BE AS NOW <i>but again amend the finish time on the second day first meeting to be able to fly rounds to end at sunset [no fly offs at this first meeting]</i> 3/FINISH TIME FINAL DAY, <i>amend the finish time to one hr. before sunset</i> THE ABOVE CHANGES WILL OPEN UP MORE TIME TO GET IN THE 7 ROUNDS AS INTENDED IN THE RULES. 4/ <i>Specify a standard round time as was in the old rules 30minutes per round</i> 5/ <i>specify the order and sequence of flying ROUND OF F1A THEN BREAK THEN COMBINED F1B/F1C.</i> 6/ SPECIFY A STANDARD BREAK BETWEEN ROUND SUCCESSIVE ROUNDS THIS TO BE EITHER 15 MINUTES [PROVIDED EASY RETRIEVEL] OR 30 MINUTES MAXIMUM [IF WIND OR HARD GOING IE SALISBURY] 8/ MAXIMUM TO BE FLOWN REMOVE FROM THE RULES THE ABILITY TO REDUCE THE MAX FLY 3 MINUTES ALWAYS APART FROM ONE ROUND AT INCREASED MAX TO 3.5 MINS FOR F1A AND 4.0 MINS FOR B/C 9/ REMOVE FROM THE RULES THE REFERENCE TO FOLLOWING YR RULE 3.2.4.1[A] <i>[This will allow the selection to be completed in the same yr. as the champs they are for.]</i> 10/MINIMUM NUMBER OR ROUNDS TO COUNT <i>amended to be 10 not as now 3 .3 is not enough?</i> <i>If we add or amend the current rules to include these suggestions we will have a better fairer contest with far less chance for the CD to make dodgy decisions and affect the outcome of the event</i></p>
	<p>Feedback:</p> <p>None received so far</p>
	<p>FFTC Thinking (19.06.13):</p> <p><i>The FFTC is considering this transfer.</i></p>
	<p>Rules Officer Suggestions (13.08.13):</p> <p><i>Some changes to team selection rules may be required but I would be wary of making the 'organisational' rules too prescriptive - flexibility is very useful in certain situations. (10.09.13):To effect the proposals the following changes are required, my comments are appended to each:</i></p> <p>Rules 3.2.4.1</p> <p>(a) <i>remove: "in the following year" from para 1, in two places. (OK if this is really practical)</i></p>

	<p>(b) <i>change to</i> A minimum total of 10 rounds must be completed over both meetings for the Team selection process to be valid. (This is better than the original 3 rounds but may be too much - 7 might be a better approach)</p> <p>(c) <i>delete</i> or 2 minutes 30 seconds if conditions dictate a reduction. (A valid idea for the best quality flying. However, with the best will it may not always be possible. Some form of get-out when required {to avoid arguments} would be better. I would suggest rewording to : ... or less if weather conditions dictate or safety could be compromised.)</p> <p>(e) <i>change to</i> The start time at each meeting (parts 1 and 2) will be 9am on the first day and 8am on the second day if access to the site is available. (OK)</p> <p>(f) <i>change to</i> (part 1) will be 6pm or sunset which ever is later. Finish time on the second day at the second meeting (part 2) will be 6pm or 1 hour before sunset whichever is earlier. (This leaves a very short period to hold flyoffs if required)</p>
12	To change rule 3.1.6.1 consequent to FAI Sporting Code changes
	Raised by Rules Officer
	As a result of changes to F1A attempt rules (consequent on RDT use). Our attempt rules require changing.
	Feedback:
	None received so far
	FFTC Thinking (10.09.13):
	none
	Rules Officer Suggestions (10.09.13):
	Rule 3.1.6.1
	<i>Change to:</i> any type of glider (including Hand Launch Gliders and Catapult Gliders but excluding F1E soarers, and F1A Gliders when flown in any F1A only competition) that is under....
13	To change rule 3.5.Q consequent to FAI Sporting Code changes
	Raised by Rules Officer
	As a result of changes to F1Q specifications our short form 3.5.Q rules require changing. In addition the 'full' F1Q rules will require changing as per the exact FAI sporting code (N.B. the latter is usually dealt with by the technical secretary).
	Feedback:
	None received so far
	FFTC Thinking (10.09.13):
	none
	Rules Officer Suggestions (10.09.13):
	Rule 3.5.Q
	<i>Delete:</i> 2 paras from: On-board energy limiters..... to : by the contestant.
	<i>Insert from FAI sporting code 2014: 3.Q.2 Para 6 Section (a), sub para 1.</i>

Insert from FAI sporting code 2014: 3.Q.2 Para 6 Section (b), in full.

Insert after heading: "Timing of motor run" ... (for non energy limiter models)

CS/TG for FFTC 10/09/2013