

BMFA
FREE FLIGHT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETING 10th September 2014

Revised copy 12/09/14 – change in red under FIE team

					Action
Present	Mike Woodhouse	MW	Phil Ball	PB	
	Chris Strachan	CS	Trevor Grey	TG	
	John Carter	JC	John Jacomb	JJ	
	Stuart Darmon	SD	Ian Kaynes	IK	
	Dave Phipps (part time)	DP	Ken Faux (guest)	KF	
Apologies	All present				
Minutes of 11.06.14	Minutes accepted				
Matters Arising	No matters arising				
Contest Calendar	<u>2014 Calendar</u>				
	No immediate change other than Midland Gala (see below). However PB is negotiating for the use of Luffenham for an experimental event in November. Also MW is considering the use of the Sculthorpe booking for an experimental event on 4 th or 5 th October, if that booking is not needed for the team selection reserve date. MW will also contact the Competition Secretary to discuss the need to make use of the reserve date when the required 7 rounds have been completed at the first team selection meeting (as is the case this year) and the second meeting cannot be run due to site being unavailable or the weather being outside limits.				PB MW MW
	<u>Midland Gala 2014</u>				
	PB proposed that Mini Vintage and P30 be added to this event, as this has been the norm in previous years. It was agreed that this should be done but that the announcement should make clear that as they are a late addition they cannot count for Senior Championship points. SD to announce				TG SD TG
	<u>Barkston</u>				
	DP stated that there is no change for Free Flight activity. However the Free Flight Nationals are agreed for 2015. All were reminded that FOD remains a major issue				
	<u>Luffenham</u>				
	Continues to be used by Midland Area in the absence of Barkston. Bryan Spooner looking after farmer liaison but there is tension between the radio club and free flight. Bryan is trying to agree a “constitution “for free flight operation within or alongside RC. The position is further complicated by a new Regiment coming in in the next 2 to 3 weeks and the loss of army contacts for making bookings.				PB
	<u>Salisbury Plain</u>				
	TG reported that all is going well and he has been invited to a user liaison meeting in a couple of weeks time. It was agreed that as TG is handling the issue of site passes he should take over as Account Holder. JC to arrange.				TG JC
	<u>2015 Calendar</u>				
	TG submitted an updated list of dates for the 2015 calendar which was agreed along with final selection of dates for Stonehenge Cup (2 nd /3 rd May) and Equinox Cup (26 th /27 th September). CS to now raise the CIAM forms for these. TG to put out a final draft of these dates to the Committee for final comments within 24 hours. TG to produce a preamble of the classes to be held on each date and CDs for discussion at the next meeting.				CS TG TG
	<u>Plugge</u>				

	<p>It has already been agreed that the number and type of Plugge scoring events could be improved. All members to consider their suggestions once the content for 2015 has been agreed.</p>	ALL
SAM 35	<p>PB reported that he has spoken to both Ian Lever and Dave Finch and both are happy with how things went.</p>	PB
Nationals	<p><u>2014</u> JC reported that there are still a number of bills to be settled but a sensible profit is to be expected. A payment to Roy Wright of £200 in addition to his normal invoice was discussed and voted upon</p>	JC
	<p>Proposed by JC Seconded by TG Agreed unanimously</p>	
	<p><u>2015</u> It was agreed that discussion of changes and improvements for 2015 should be deferred to the next meeting. The Nationals report has been submitted. PB to email a copy to CS for records.</p>	PB
Officer's Reports	<p><u>Treasurer</u> Entries remain down this year due to flying site and weather problems. Nothing else to report. JC to check if any of our budgets are outstanding</p>	JC
	<p><u>Council Delegate</u> MW attended the Council meeting on 06/09 and had circulated a report to all members. All items were clear and no discussion needed.</p>	
	<p><u>PRO</u> Nothing to report</p>	
	<p><u>Results Officer</u> PB reported that to date 160 people have achieved points in the Senior Championships. Bad weather has produced slim results with, for example, only 4 entries per class at the Southern Gala. He is also concerned that discipline in Submitting results has declined. He will put out an email asking for improvement and for a nil result to be returned if nothing has happened.</p>	PB
	<p><u>Safety Officer</u> PB attended the recent Safety Committee meeting. Only two Free Flight injury claims were mentioned. Colin Foster's accident was just that. The model striking a spectator at the Bowden was discussed at the meeting. The Committee came up the following safety suggestions</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice on tickets etc. saying model flying is dangerous (as at Power Nationals) • Tannoy warning of take offs • A safety officer to agree all clear before each take off • Similar precautions to space modelling. JJ to send space RSO documentation to all members • All spectators to be up-wind 	JJ
	<p>PB agreed to produce a further summary of ideas</p>	PB
	<p><u>Rules Officer</u> Nothing to report except below under Rules.</p>	
International Teams	<p><u>F1A,B,C</u> The Team Managers report has been submitted. All went well and the whole team only dropped about one minute which resulted in 3rd place overall team but no individual awards. It is clear that in F1A,B and C performance is out flying almost all sites and in all</p>	

but very good weather fly-offs are becoming an eyesight contest.
The meeting agreed to prepare a programme of submissions to CIAM with the aim of getting back to a sensible level of performance in 3 years' time. This will require a revision to the change procedure to permit changes with delayed implementation and a set of model specification changes to reduce performance whilst causing as little obsolescence as feasible. It was agreed that MW would co-ordinate the process with JC leading for F1A, MW for F1B and KF for F1C. The latest date for submissions is November 17th so all suggestions to MW asap.

MW
JC KF

F1E team

IK reported disappointing results but a team who worked well together. Paul Fynn had asked the organisers for help in retrieving and this worked very well with a local young, fit aeromodeller allocated to help for whom he paid about 25 euro per day.

An idea to be considered?

Space team

Nothing to report

Team managers and ATMs

Advertisements required in next issue of BMFA News Action SD

SD

Team Selection

2014

The second team selection meeting is due on 20/21 September at Sculthorpe but the site may be at risk. See under Contest Calendar above

Stonehenge Cup and Equinox Cup Space Modelling

JC reported that entries are coming in with 45-50 so far.

Nothing to report. CS asked JJ to let him know submissions to CIAM for technical experts and judges asap

Rules

The rule change proposals received up to 28/08/14 together with any feedback are attached as Appendix A. The Committee considered each proposal and commented as below.

1 Revised operation of Team selection

This would not require a rule change. However withdrawn by FFTC pending more work on training and support of CDs as part of Training and Excellence

2 Anticipation of weather for team selection

The FFTC is minded to support this

3 Revision to Classic design eligibility

The FFTC is minded to support this with explicit prevention of extension to any other sources

4 Revision to visual aids

The FFTC is minded to support this

5 Number of FAI Flights at Area Meetings

The FFTC is not minded to support this

6 Addition of flexibility to Bowden rules

The FFTC is minded to support this

7 Minimum max times in F1E
The FFTC is minded to support this

8 BMFA Electric Performance
The FFTC is minded to support this

9 Introduction of combined Electric
The FFTC is minded to support this subject to acceptance of item 8

10 Changes to FAI Classes F1A and F1Q
The FFTC will implement these as they are “house keeping” changes”

11 To prevent movement between sites at Area Centralised Events
The FFTC is minded to support this

12 To specify fly-off times
The FFTC is not minded to support this

These comments will be included in the list in appendix A which will then be circulated inviting any further feedback.

Proposal from Peter Tribe

This proposal was too late for inclusion in the main list above and requested that “*All Free Flight contests come to a close, including fly-offs and vacating the field by 6.00 pm or 2 hours before sunset at Greenwich whichever is the earlier.*” The purpose of this being to conform to the strict licence implementation being enforced at Merryfield. The Committee discussed the implications of this and agreed to reject the proposal which would discomfort the many for the accommodation of the few. It was also pointed out that only the 4 summer Area meetings continue after 6.00 pm and for those Salisbury Plain is an alternative site to Merryfield. CS to inform Peter Tribe

CS

BMFA and FFTC websites AOB **Transfer to BMFA Website**
Ongoing
None

TG

Next meetings **Dates**
Tuesday 11th November (Note moved from 5th)
Wednesday 3rd December

FFTC 12/09/14

Critical dates for FFTC

BMFA News Copy dates	December 2014 Issue– copy date 25 th November
Full Council	10 th January Agenda deadline 8 th December
Technical Council	18th October Agenda deadline 22 nd September
FFTC meetings	11 ^h November 3 rd December

Appendix 1

Rule change Proposals for 2015 (V1.0)

The following are those proposals received as of 28.08.14 with comments and resulting rule changes/introductions proposed by the FFTC. Final comments please by 22.09.14 in writing to the FFTC Secretary, Chris Strachan, 56 Way Lane, Waterbeach, Cambridge, CB25 9NQ; or via e-mail at : chris.strachan@btinternet.com

C	Revised operation of Team Selection
	Raised by John Carter
	<p>1/ ALLOW FLYER CDs TO RUN TEAM SELECTION 2/ AT ALL TEAM SELECTION MEETS A JURY MUST BE APPOINTED PRIOR TO START OF FIRST ROUND ONE MEMBER FROM A ONE FROM B ONE FROM C The job initially is to help CD decide appropriate round break, max to be used in round and flight line position .plus to conclude on wind speeds For the purpose of these decisions the jury has one vote per member and CD 2 votes The jury would also decide on any protests as per the rule book.</p> <p>Reason CD costs are out of proportion to entry fees and it is getting harder to find willing and competent CDs Flyers are more in touch with the aims of selection .</p>
	Feedback From John Cooper <p>I am totally opposed to this, reasons as below.</p> <p>Whilst I'm sure we all realise that interest in the Team Selection events has drastically waned (in my case because I find them to be far too boring and slow moving) my view is that this proposal (however well meaning) would finally kill off interest.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>1) The CD MUST be present at all times to observe what is happening. That isn't to say that the CD currently sees everything, but if they are flying / retrieving they definitely won't see anything!</p> <p>Two examples; at the last trials I ran I was involved in two difficult decisions.</p> <p>a) a competitor had his glider DT at about 3ft on the start line. Question, had it DT'd on the towline (if so, 2nd attempt allowed) or had it DT'd off the towline (in which case 2 secs scored). The timekeeper was unsighted (and didn't know the rules anyway). Luckily I did see it happen.</p> <p>b) a competitor launched after the end of round hooter but the timekeeper didn't hear the hooter. There were a number of 'complaints' from other competitors re this but the competitor did eventually accept that my observation that his launch had been just after the hooter was unbiased and did not object when the flight was scored as a zero.</p> <p>A CD who was competing would probably not have been around to see what happened anyway and (as a potentially biased person) I doubt that the competitors would have accepted the CD's observations.</p> <p>2) The current Team Selection meetings have very few entries at the first event and even fewer at the second event (from memory we've twice been down to only 4 or 5 flyers in some classes at the second event). As such a competitor / CD will have to come from one of the likely front runners for a Team place. There are a number of decisions that a CD can make that do impact on the flying and results, e.g. wind speed, visibility, max to be set, flying location for glider on rough sites like Salisbury Plain. I suggest that other competitors (particularly if narrowly beaten for a Team place by the CD) will be discouraged from bothering again if they feel that a CD decision has worked against them.</p> <p>As a fairly regular non-flying CD at the trials I have regularly been put under pressure from competitors to follow their 'helpful suggestions' on such matters. As a non flying CD my decisions, whilst probably</p>

	<p>not always popular, have at least been accepted as unbiased.</p> <p>3) The proposal includes setting up a Jury to assist the CD with decisions as in 2) above. I accept that having such a Jury would REDUCE the issues I've raised, but certainly wouldn't eliminate them. By having an ABC jury it will cause delays (because at least one will potentially be downwind) hence on a day with the wind speed near the limit it's easy to envisage a day of waiting for Jury meetings. It's difficult enough to get 7 rounds in over a weekend from September onwards (because of daylight hours and 2 hour rounds). Having Jury meetings on such matters will mean only 4 or 5 rounds flown.</p> <p>4) The final part of the proposal re advance cancellation does have merit in principle, although has risks. I'm sure we've all encountered days with a good forecast and then gale force winds or vice versa. Personally I consider there to be little reliability over windspeed forecasting more than 12 hours ahead.</p> <p>Despite being very anti the proposal, I do understand the rationale behind it and certainly agree with the excess costs versus interest / entries issue. I would suggest that the simple solution, with at least as much chance of picking a good team, would be to select the Team from the Stonehenge Cup / Equinox Cup events, with the Nats as a back-up event. In general the same people as with a Team Selection event will make the team and having an occasional 'outsider' in the Team will probably be a good thing and might actually increase interest slightly.</p>
	<p>Feedback From Peter Watson</p> <p>1. I have always thought that Team Selection matters take up a totally disproportionate amount of FFTC time, and the few people genuinely concerned with this, could, and should, sort it out amongst themselves. The proposed change goes a long way towards this.</p>
2	<p>Anticipation of weather for team Selection</p>
	<p>Raised by John Carter</p>
	<p>For team selection meetings - If the weather forecast as indicated by two approved weather sites indicates the wind speed and or visibility to be such that flying is compromised ie wind at or above 15mph constant for more than 50 percent of contest . As indicated in forecast two days prior to event then the event can be postponed . It will be conveyed to all entered contestants by e mail or phone Reason We are now low in numbers and most competitors would agree that flying in inappropriate weather is not desirable.</p>
	<p>Feedback</p>
3	<p>Revision to Classic design eligibility</p>
	<p>Raised by Phil Ball</p>
	<p>Can I please suggest that designs in the Frank Ziac 59/61 Yearbook published May 61 be accepted within the Classic Rules.</p> <p>The designs published in this book were collected well within the current cut-off date of Jan 31 1961 ref previous discussions with Ron Pollard on his design the Buck Clayton Special, Ron sent the plans and details to Frank in 1959, the design is published on page 139 but is not legal within the current rules and was therefore not available to the actual designer in his later years although he knew it to be contemporary with many that were.</p> <p>The book contains approximately 150 designs, many can be found in other publications and are therefore legal but many interesting and competitive designs are not but were all built and flown prior to the official cut-off date.</p>

	<p>Classic models are popular and allowing another batch of designs will stop the class becoming stagnant.</p> <p>Allowing this publication would not be the thick end of the wedge as it is well documented and I personally do not know of any other similar publication.</p>
	<p>Feedback From Robert Willis</p> <p>Zaic Yearbook - yes let's have these designs included; more variety of models and it would include the Boxall and McGillivray rubber models that are already in the Bournemouth list.</p>
4	Revision to visual aids
	Raised by Stuart Darmon
	<p>From rule 3.1.8.5 (Visual Aids), remove the sentence "The magnification of such devices shall be no greater than eight"</p> <p>REASONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This phrase no longer serves a useful purpose. The cost of instruments is largely determined by optical quality rather than magnification, and in any case practical considerations prevent the use of extreme 'astronomical' type devices. The FAI sporting code (B 13. 7.) specifies only a minimum magnification (7). 2. As the FF population ages, deterioration of eyesight will become more common. A simple increase in magnification may not be an automatic solution but removing restriction will help individuals optimise their vision. 3. Increasing the chances of seeing the model to the ground aids retrieval, particularly if there is doubt as to whether it is on or off the field. <p>I feel this makes sense irrespective of any future measures to restrict performance.</p>
	<p>Feedback From Robert Wills</p> <p>Binoculars - yes remove the X8 rule - everyone has a personal magnification they are comfortable to hold for the flight duration, I've got an old pair of X 10 that are quite steady..... although I use some 8 X 50s with a compass in for timing.</p>
5	Number of FAI Flights at Area Meetings
	Raised by Roy Vaughn
	<p>In area events the requirement for five flights for the FAI classes (large and mini) makes it difficult if not impossible for competitors to compete in more than one class during the day unless the conditions are exceptionally benign. Apart from the reduction in fun of not being able to fly another class, it places them and their clubs at a disadvantage in the Plugge, senior champs, etc.</p> <p>It is therefore proposed that FAI classes <u>flown at area meetings</u> are three flight competitions.</p> <p>An additional advantage which follows from this change is that it encourages participation in FAI classes and thus, potentially, improve performance at international championships. Three flights will also improve participation amongst the elderly who struggle with five.</p> <p>There may be an objection that three flights is somehow not compatible with these being FAI</p>

	<p>classes. The counter to that is that area competitions do not resemble proper FAI competitions in any meaningful way, i.e. lack of formality, no rounds, line, etc., not to mention the obvious fact that the variability of weather across the flying sites make the competition much more of a lottery.</p> <p>In summary, this proposal if adopted will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remove an anomaly in Plugge scoring which currently discourages participation in the FAI classes • lead to more activity at national level in international classes and therefore tend to improve participation and performance in international competitions • make it more practical for those less able to cope with strenuous retrieves to continue to participate in international classes at area meetings.
	Feedback
6	Addition of flexibility to Bowden Rules
	Raised by FFTC
	<p>We propose that the Bowden rules should be prefaced with a statement as follows. “These full rules are in the spirit of the original Bowden contests and should be adhered to when weather conditions permit. However in adverse conditions at the discretion of the CD the flying requirements, and associated scoring, may be appropriately modified at the commencement of flying . Any such modification must then apply throughout the contest.”</p> <p>This change will reflect the pragmatic decisions that have already been taken when it has been unreasonable to expect models to ROG in a high wind and/or extreme turbulence and even if this was achieved the judging of flight style and landing approach could not sensibly be undertaken.</p>
	Feedback
7	F1E Minimum 'Max Times'
	Raised by Ian Kaynes
	<p>In view of our fluctuating circumstances of F1E sites I would like to suggest a rule change to allow a maximum of less than 2 minutes. This deviates from the FAI standard but still allows useful competitions on small sites without risking models or sites on long flights. It is likely that we would never drop below 1 min 30 as a max, but it would be easier to simply remove the lower limit, i.e.</p> <p>Change 3.1.4.1 (b) to read</p> <p>In F1E contests the maximum will be any time up to 5 minutes as indicated by the CD before the start of the round concerned.</p>
	Feedback
8	BMFA Electric Performance
	Raised by Tony Shepherd
	<p>It is a widely held opinion that the present performance of the BMFA Electric Class is too high for the majority of sites. Additionally there needs to be delineation</p>

	<p>made between function equipped and non-function equipped models. These performance restrictions could be achieved by reducing the maximum motor run allowance:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Change 3.7.4 (b) to read</p> <p>(b) Motor Run, maximum time from launch:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For Brushed motors (no functions)..... 15 seconds</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For Brushed motors (with functions)..... 12 seconds</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For Brushless motors (no functions)..... 12 seconds</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">For Brushless motors (with functions)..... 10 seconds</p>
	<p>Feedback</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Introduction of Combined Electric Category</p>
	<p>Raised by Trevor Grey</p>
	<p>There are currently 'Combined Class Categories for Rubber, Glider and Power. These serve the purpose of giving the opportunity to fly a number of different classes at area centralised events, according to the competitor's individual interests. At the same time these reduce the overall number of classes flown. Introducing a 'Combined Electric Category would have the same benefits.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Add to 3.1.9.3, para (iv) to read:</p> <p>(iv) Combined Electric: F1Q (3.5.Q)</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">BMFA Electric (3.7.4)</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">E36 Electric (3.11.8)</p> <p>Consequent to the above there would need to be the following para' added to the E36 Electric rules 3.11.8 (b):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">... "When E36 models are flown in Combined Electric contests the motor run will be 15 seconds for all flights including any fly-off."</p>
	<p>Feedback</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>Changes to FAI Classes F1A and F1Q</p>
	<p>Raised by FFTC Rules Officer</p>
	<p>Changes to F1A (use of RDT) and F1Q (specifications for Energy Limiters, timed run allowances and Energy Allowances) were passed at CIAM in April 2014 for implementation as of Jan 1st 2015. These changes and any consequential changes need to be incorporated in the BMFA 2015 FF rule book.</p>

11	To prevent movement between different sites at Area Centralised Events
	Raised by FFTC Rules Officer
	In 2014 a competitor made a number of flights in one class at different area sites. Currently there is nothing specified in the rules to prevent this. It is suggested that this is not within the general intentions of Area Centralised Events and that the practice should be prevented in the future.
	Feedback
12	To specify fly-off times
	Raised by FFTC Rules Officer
	It has been pointed out that the references to the times at which fly-offs commence are vague. Some of these references appear in the "General Rule Book" and some in the "Free Flight Rule Book. It is suggested that the timing of fly-off start times need to be specified exactly and appear in the Free Flight Rule Book.
	Feedback

CS/TG for FFTC 28/0