

MINUTES

SOCIETY OF MODEL AERONAUTICAL ENGINEERS LTD

(T/A British Model Flying Association)

Minutes of the **Technical Council Meeting**

held on the 20th October 2012 at 11am

at Chacksfield House, 31 St Andrews Road, Leicester LE2 8RE

Provisional until confirmed at the next Technical Council Meeting

PRESENT

Chris Bromley FSMAE	Technical Secretary / Meeting Chairman
Jo Halman FSMAE	Competition Secretary / Meeting Vice-Chair
Peter Halman FSMAE	FAI Delegate
John French	Records Officer
Ian Pallister	Scale TC Representative
Mike Proctor FSMAE	R/C Silent Flight TC Member
Clive Needham	Silent Flight TC Representative
Mike Colling FSMAE	Indoor TC Representative
Trevor Grey	FFTC Representative
Mike Francies	FFTC Member / FAIR Member
Vernon Hunt	CLTC Representative
Jon Edison	BARCS Representative

In Attendance

Linda Harding

Office Manager

AGENDA

- 1 Apologies for Absence.
- 2 Request for permission to be absent.
- 3 To verify the voting strength of the meeting.
- 4 Correction and adoption of the Minutes of the Technical Council Meeting held on 24th March 2012.

- 5 Matters/Actions Arising from the meeting on 24th March 2012 that are not included elsewhere on this Agenda.
- 6 To review the set agenda for the first meeting of a Technical Committee each year (Current issue appended as a separate document).
- 7 Tech Sec reminder to Technical Committees of their responsibility to send in the Technical Committee's Annual Return immediately after their first Committee meeting after the BMFA AGM.
- 8 To receive proposals for FAI Rule changes: (Full proposals appended)
 - a From CLTC – ABR A.15, A.16, B2.3, B.2.4. To stop fast-tracking.
 - b From FFTC – FAI Sporting Code Section 4 Volume 1 – F1Q.
 - c From Competition Secretary – Potential proposal for 2013 CIAM Plenary Meeting.
- 9 To ratify the following British Record Claims: (Full claims appended)
 - a Matthew Hart – F2 Open Speed 135 Pulse Jet (Initial notification received)
 - b Anthony Hebb – F1R (35cm) (Initial notification received)
 - c Elizabeth Robinson – Livingroom Stick Rubber Powered (Initial notification received)
 - d John Shaw – F1M (Initial notification received)
 - e Martin Walpole (Claim 1) – Class III Weatherman Speed – (Initial notification received)
 - f Martin Walpole (Claim 2) – Class III Weatherman Speed – (Initial notification received)
 - g Peter Fox – Class VI Weatherman Speed – (Initial notification received)
 - h Peter Fox – Class 0 Weatherman Speed – (Initial notification received)
 - i Paul Gibeault – Class I Vintage Speed (Initial notification received)
 - j Anthony Goodger – Class IV Weatherman Speed (Initial notification received)
 - k Neville Eyre/Edwin Needham (Claim 1) – British Goodyear (Heat) – (No Initial notification received)
 - l Neville Eyre/Edwin Needham (Claim 2) – British Goodyear (Heat) – (No initial notification received)
- 10 To receive **FAI/CIAM Technical Sub-Committee List** recommendations from Technical Committees.

Free Flight (Includes Indoor)

Control Line

R/C Power (F3 Aerobatics; F3 Helicopter; F3 Pylon Racing)

R/C Silent Flight (F3 Soaring; F5 Electric)

Scale

Space Modelling

Education

11 To receive **FAI/CIAM Judges List** recommendations from Technical Committees:

**Control Line (F2A, F2B, F2C, F2D) F2B: Jeff Smith BMFA Number 046195;
F2C: Mike Crossman BMFA Number 149408; F2C: Derek Heaton BMFA Number
50550**

R/C Power (Aerobatics, Helicopter)

Scale

Space Modelling

12 Barkston Heath Bookings 2013.

13 Quality of FAI Championship Sites – To discuss whether it should be an absolute requirement that the organisers have to work with the appropriate S-C and if there is a disagreement, then the S-C has the right to impose a binding decision on the organiser. A sanction fee (fine) of 2,000 Euros should be applied for each breach of the agreement. This should be included in the new FAI Organiser Agreement.

14 To discuss rules for F4H.

15 To receive:

- a De-briefing reports on this year's National Championships from Technical Committees.
- b A report from the Power Nationals Co-ordinator.
(Reports should be brief, preferably in writing & in advance.)
- c Updates on the results from this year's National Championships.

16 To receive any reports from Technical Committees. (Reports should be brief, preferably in writing & in advance and not concerning Agenda Items.)

17 To receive a report from the Competition Secretary to include:

- a Receipt and ratification of any contests for next year's FAI Calendar.

18 To receive any reports from Council, Sub-committees or Elected Officers. (Reports should be brief, preferably in writing & in advance and not concerning Agenda Items.)

19 To receive the list of nominations that the Competition Secretary has submitted to the BMFA Chairman for re-presentation of International Awards at the BMFA annual prizegiving dinner. (Invitations are at the discretion of the Society Chairman and depending on the numbers, not all nominees may be successful.)

20 To receive the dates of the 2013 Technical Council Meetings:

1st Technical Council – 23rd March 2013
2nd Technical Council – 19th October 2013

21 Any Other Business.

MINUTES

Today was Vernon Hunt's birthday and we all sang 'Happy Birthday' to him.

TC720/10/12 (1) Apologies for absence.

Apologies were received from R/C Power Technical Committee.

TC721/10/12 (2) Request for permission to be absent.

There were no requests.

TC722/10/12 (3) To verify the voting strength of the meeting.

There were eleven (11) members eligible to vote.

TC723/10/12 (4) Correction and adoption of the Minutes of the Technical Council Meeting held on 24th March 2012

There were no corrections.

The FAI Delegate proposed that the Minutes of the Technical Council Meeting held on 24th March 2012 be accepted as a true record of that meeting.

Seconded by the Indoor TC

Vote: For: 8
 Abs: 3
 Ags: 0

Carried by a majority vote.

ACTION/NOTES

TC724/10/12 (5) Matters/Actions Arising from the meeting on 24th March 2012 that are not included elsewhere on this Agenda.

Page 3

- **Penultimate paragraph, action Comp Sec re facilitation letters** – These are available and there is a notice on the website.

Page 4

- **Third paragraph from the top, action FAI Del/Comp Sec re election of Technical Experts to FAI/CIAM Technical Sub-Committees** – After looking in to this the FAI Delegate and Competition Secretary felt there would be complications and consequences if they pursued it with the FAI/CIAM. However the Competition Secretary will consider approaching the CIAM President.

COMP SEC

- **Penultimate paragraph, Nationals results** – It was agreed at the last meeting that the Records Officer would circulate the Nationals results to the Comp Sec and Tech Sec as soon as he received them and forward on to the Webmaster to publish as soon as possible.

To date this has not been done.

REC OFF'CR

Page 7

- Fourth paragraph from the top, World Champs two-thirds Indoor Junior Team with dedicated Junior Team Manager –

The Competition Secretary reported that we did send the two-thirds Junior team to the World Champs and they placed 16th out of 17 entries. She believes that she was correct in her previous comments to Full Council that at 7 and 11 years old they were too young.

Indoor Tech Committee disagreed entirely with the Competition Secretary's comment.

Page 8

- First paragraph, clarification of CAP 658 (2012) Model Aircraft; a guide to safe flying in relation to Free Flight –

The Technical Secretary advised that during initial talks with the CAA when preparing the first edition of CAP 658, Free Flight was discussed and they were more than happy to accept our assurances and recommendation that there were no safety issues in relation to Free Flight, except what was already included in respect of the launch phase.

- Fourth paragraph from the bottom, request by Steve Dorling offering to provide Scale pulse jet demo flying at the Power Nationals –

The Competition Secretary advised that she wrote to Steve Dorling with regard to providing demo flying however she received no reply and therefore there was no demo at this year's Power Nationals.

This concluded matters arising.

TC725/10/12 (6) To review set agenda for the first meeting of a Technical Committee each year.

A recent proposal adopted at Full Council in relation to the CTTF (Central Team Travel Fund) that says 20% of the fund total will be discretionary for exceptional costs on application from a technical committee, requires mention in the August letter to technical committees to aid them in making timely applications if necessary.

Full Council also requested that something should be included on the 'Set Agenda' for Technical Committees.

It was agreed that the Technical Secretary and Competition Secretary would decide on the wording for this action. Technical committees will be provided with a copy of the amended document.

**TECH
SEC/COMP
SEC**

There was some discussion with regard to providing additional information to technical committees including training and excellence and what if anything technical committees should be advising specialist bodies they need to be doing throughout the year.

It was suggested this information could be included in an appendix to the 'Set Agenda'.

The Competition Secretary was tasked with looking in to this and preparing a suitable information sheet. This would be circulated to Technical Council members for their comments prior to sending out with the Agenda for the March 2013 Technical Council meeting.

COMP SEC

TECH COUNCIL AGENDA MARCH 2013 – Include appendix for ‘Set Agenda’.

OFFICE MGR

A further suggestion was made to include details in the front of the relevant rule book, which specialist bodies are attached to that discipline. The Competition Secretary will put something together and run it by the relevant technical committees to obtain their permission and then pass on to the Technical Secretary to include in the 2013 rule books.

COMP SEC

A query was raised with regard to the future administration of SAM 35. The Competition Secretary advised that following a meeting with representatives of SAM 35 and the BMFA Chairman, CEO and Competition Secretary, changes will be introduced and the CEO will be taking on the responsibility for the administration of SAM 35.

SAM 35 will still however have representation on all the relevant technical committees that serve their disciplines.

This Council requested that the new procedure for administration of SAM 35 is formalised at the January Full Council meeting and technical committees will be made aware what will then be required of them.

BMFA
CHAIRMAN

AGENDA ITEM JANUARY 2013 FULL COUNCIL MEETING – Formalisation of administration for SAM 35.

OFFICE MGR

TC726/10/12 (7) Tech Sec reminder to Technical Committees of their responsibility to send in the Technical Committee’s Annual Return immediately after their first Committee meeting after the BMFA AGM.

The Technical Secretary reminded Technical Committees of their responsibility to provide the office with the Technical Committee Annual Return form, immediately after their first committee meeting after the BMFA AGM.

TC727/10/12 (8) To receive proposals for FAI Rule changes.

- a) **From Control Line Technical Committee –**
ABR A.15, A.16, B2.3, B.2.4 To stop fast-tracking of classes to Championship status.

**APPENDED FULL PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO FAI
(APPENDIX A)**

Cont/d...

Rule
change
cont/d...

CLTC proposed FAI Rule Changes including amendments.

Seconded by FFTC

Vote: For: 10
Abs: 1
Ags: 0

Carried by a majority vote.

**CLTC/COMP
SEC**

- b) **From Free Flight Technical Committee –**
FAI Sporting Code Section 4 Volume 1 – F1Q

**APPENDED - FULL PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO FAI
(APPENDIX B)**

**Scale proposed that we accept in principle the clarification of
the rule F1Q, subject to possible word change in agreement
with the Competition Secretary and FFTC.**

**COMP
SEC/FFTC**

Seconded by FAI Delegate
Carried unanimously

- c) **From the Competition Secretary – Potential proposal for 2013
CIAM Plenary Meeting: that a moratorium of at least four years
be imposed on classes being given Championship status.**

Seconded by FFTC
Carried unanimously

COMP SEC

- b) **Post Meeting Note**

The Technical Secretary gave permission for F3K Rule re-write to be voted on by email by the Technical Council members who attended the Technical Council Meeting. The vote was unanimous to submit the F3K proposals to CIAM.

The F3 Sub Committee Chairman had not indicated the deadline to Mike Fantham which is why this had to be dealt with post meeting.

**APPENDED – F3K FULL PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO FAI
(APPENDIX C)**

TC728/10/12 (9) To ratify the following British Record Claims:

British Record Claims were dealt with in the following order:

- a), b), c), d)
e), f), g), h), j)
i)
k), l)

- a) Matthew Hart – CL Fast Jet Speed
Date: 26/8/12 Venue: British Power Nationals
Speed: 210.48mph

- b) Anthony Hebb – F1R (35cm)
Date: 6/8/12 Venue: Belgrade Trade Fair

Cont/d... Duration: 25 mins 17 secs

Brit Rec
Claims
cont/d...

Elizabeth Robinson – Livingroom Stick Rubber Powered
Date: 7/8/12 Venue: Belgrade Fair Hall

c) Duration: 9 mins 26 secs

d) John Shaw – F1M
Date: 7/8/12 Venue: Belgrade Fair Hall
Duration: 13 mins 43 secs

The Records Officer commended the above record claims for ratification.

Seconded by CLTC
Carried unanimously

**RECORDS
OFF'R /
OFFICE**

e) Martin Walpole (Claim 1) – Class III Vintage Weatherman Speed
Date: 8/9/12 Venue: Old Warden
Speed 103.74 mph

f) Martin Walpole (Claim 2) – Class III Vintage Weatherman Speed
Date: 26/8/12 Venue: RAF Barkston Heath
Speed: 103.33 mph

g) Peter Fox – Class VI Vintage Weatherman Speed
Date: 25/8/12 Venue: RAF Barkston Heath
Speed: ~~73.95 mph~~ 110.97 mph

h) Peter Fox – Class 0 Vintage Weatherman Speed
Date: 25/8/12 Venue: RAF Barkston Heath
Speed 73.95 mph

j) Anthony Goodger – Class IV Vintage Weatherman Speed
Date: 27/8/12 Venue: RAF Barkston Heath
Speed 108.5 mph

The Records Officer commended the above record claims for ratification.

Seconded by FAI Delegate
Carried unanimously

**RECORDS
OFF'R /
OFFICE**

i) Paul Gibeault – Class I Vintage Weatherman Speed
The Chairman ruled the above Record Claim out of order as. Paul Gibeault is a Canadian citizen and therefore cannot hold a British Record.

The Records Officer will write and explain the situation to Paul Gibeault.

**RECORDS
OFF'R**

k) Neville Eyre/Edwin Needham (Claim 1) – British Goodyear (Heat)
Date: 26/8/12 Venue: RAF Barkston Heath
Heat: Race Time 4 mins 10.8 secs

The Records Officer commended the above Record Claim k) for ratification.

Seconded by Scale TC
Carried unanimously

**RECORDS
OFF'R/
OFFICE**

Cont/d...

*Brit Rec
Claim
cont/d...*

Neville Eyre/Edwin Needham (Claim 2) – British Goodyear (Heat)

Date:12/8/12 Venue: Barton Aerodrome

l) Heat: Race Time 4 mins 12.2 secs

The Chairman ruled the above Record Claim l) out of order as **neither the** notification **nor the record claim** was **not** received within 7 days as per requirement.

The Records Officer displayed the **newly** adopted Gordon Yeldham Trophy, which was brought to the meeting by CLTC. The Trophy is for F2C Team Selection for the European Championships and will be presented to the 2012 recipient at this year's Dinner/Prize giving.

The Records Officer announced that this is the last Technical Council meeting he will be attending as he relinquishes his position at the forthcoming AGM. He thanked the Delegates for their support over the years.

TC729/10/12 (10) To receive FAI/CIAM Technical Sub-Committee List recommendations from Technical Committees.

Free Flight – F1 - Ian Kaynes FSMAE

R/C Power –

AHA F3C and F3N Steve Roberts

GBRCAA F3A Bob Ailles

BMPRA F3D and F5D Geb Jones

Control Line – F2

Chris Barker

Peter Halman FSMAE

Vernon Hunt

John James

Barry Robinson

Silent Flight –

F3 Soaring, Clive Needham

F5 Electrics, George Shering **except F5J**

F5J Mike Proctor

Space – Mike Francies

Scale – F4

Chris Allen

Graham Kennedy

TC730/10/12 (11) To receive FAI/CIAM Judges List recommendations from Technical Committees

Control Line –

F2A – D Brewin / Peter Halman FSMAE / Jo Halman FSMAE

F2B – Jeff Smith / John Bonner / Roger Ladds / Barry Robinson

F2C – Mike Crossman / Derek Heaton / Chris Barker /

Cont/d... Bernard Langworth

F2D – Vernon Hunt / John James / Mervyn Jones / Gordon Price

FAI
Judge
List
cont/d...

R/C Power –
Bob Ailles F3A
Peter Brett F3A, F3P, F5A
Peter Cappleman F3A, F3P, F5A
Martin Cook F3C, F3N

Scale F4
Chris Allen / Graham Kennedy / Stephen Kessel/ Bill Dennis

Space
Nigel Bathe
Stuart Lodge

TC731/10/12 (12) Barkston Heath Bookings 2013.

The Chairman reminded Delegates that they must arrange for their respective technical committees/specialist bodies to make sure the Technical Secretary is provided with dates/information of any competitions and more importantly any team trial events, otherwise they will not be classed as valid team trials.

**ALL TECH
COMMS**

The list of proposed dates for use of RAF Barkston Heath for 2013 was circulated during the meeting.

Free Flight advised of a possible change to the first date on the list from 3rd February to 10th February. He has spoken with the CEO who is looking in to whether that date is available or not.

The reason for the list is to look at the possibility of discipline sharing.

Various options were discussed. The Competition Secretary will contact BMPRA to suggest a move for pylon racing from 14th July 28th July.

COMP SEC

1st Sept – F5B League 6 - Silent Flight was asked to contact F5B organiser to request a move from 1st September.

**SILENT
FLIGHT**

The Records Officer requested that the new Records Officer is provided with a copy of the list.

CEO

TC732/10/12 (13) Quality of FAI Championship Sites – To discuss whether it should be an absolute requirement that the organisers have to work with the appropriate S-C and if there is a disagreement, then the S-C has the right to impose a binding decision on the organiser. A sanction fee (fine) of 2,000 Euros should be applied for each breach of the agreement. This should be included in the new FAI Organiser Agreement.

Trevor Grey Free Flight representative left the meeting at this point. Mike Francies FFTC member stood in for Free Flight as representative.

Cont/d...

FAI
Champ
Sites
cont/d...

The FAI Delegate and Competition Secretary explained the background in relation to the above discussion item with a view to submitting a proposal to FAI based on the above suggestions.

It was agreed the Competition Secretary should formulate a proposal to the FAI.

COMP SEC

TC733/10/12 (14) To discuss rules for F4H.

Scale explained the background in relation to the disputed F4H rules regarding championship status.

Scale has drawn up a proposed revised set of rules. This Council agreed that these proposals should be put forward the 2013 FAI Plenary. Scale to liaise with the FAI Delegate to progress this.

APPENDED REVISED F4H RULES (APPENDIX D)

The Competition Secretary advised that she would also be submitting a proposal to FAI Plenary for the old voting principle for championship status.

SCALE/FAI
DEL

COMP SEC

TC734/10/12/ (15) To receive the following:

a) De-briefing reports on this year's National Championships from Technical Committees.

Control Line – Most of CLTC were attending the World Championships whilst the Power Nationals were taking place. However from information provided the Control Line events were reasonably well supported. F2D was however very poorly supported.

Apart from that there have been no reports **of other issues.**

Scale – WRITTEN REPORT (APPENDIX E)

Disappointing in that entry numbers were down slightly. Free Flight entries however were very good. The assistance from the roping crew and security/safety was very much appreciated.

BARCS F3F National Championships - Was held at Hole of Horcum and two very good days of competition. The Records Officer requested the results be sent to him, copied to the Competition Secretary and Technical Secretary.

JON EDISON

They held their very first World Championships in Germany. The three team members flew brilliantly and they placed 12th, 13th and 14th and the team placed 5th out of 52 flyers and 18 teams. It was an excellent attempt for their first ever championship.

However the site was most strange and not the normal kind of site we would fly on in the UK. For several weeks prior to the competition they were practising on 800ft cliffs/hills, there they were flying on 20ft/30ft cliffs which made a complete different style of flying **necessary.**

Indoor – All went very well. Work had been done on the building therefore the conditions were much better than the previous year. A banquet was held on the Saturday evening, which was very much enjoyed by all who attended.

***** **Free Flight/Space – WRITTEN REPORT (APPENDIX F)**

Silent Flight – This year the event was split over two separate weekends; Glider and Electric July and August bank holiday respectively.

Both events went very well. Entries for the Electric event were dealt with electronically which worked extremely well.

The weather for the Electric event in July was very good. Entries were slightly down.

Entries for the Gliding event during the August Bank Holiday weekend were about the same as last year except for F3K which were down. The weather was okay except for Saturday where there were thunderstorms all around.

The search to secure a suitable venue to hold the combined events continues. The Competition Secretary advised that there is a site close to where she lives that she believes would be suitable to hold the Silent Flight Nationals. The CEO has been informed and he was going to speak with Chris Moynihan.

b) **A report from the Power Nationals Co-ordinator:**
***** **WRITTEN REPORT – (APPENDIX G)**

c) **Updates on the results from this year's National Championships**

The Records Officer will be collating them and getting them to the webmaster for publication.

**RECORDS
OFFICER**

TC735/10/12 (15) To receive any reports from Technical Committees.

***** **Control Line – WRITTEN REPORT (APPENDIX H)**

***** **Scale – WRITTEN REPORT (APPENDIX I)**

Indoor – The World Champs went fairly well for the Senior team. The Junior team did not do very well with regard to times however they performed their duties very well and it proved excellent training for years to come. It means that we can build on that and they should do much better in two year's time.

Indoor has reviewed their rules and submitted to the Technical Secretary.

***** **Space/Free Flight – WRITTEN REPORT (APPENDIX J)**

Cont/d...

Tech
Comm
Rep
cont/d...

Silent Flight – There have been three World and European Champs, none of which produced any medals. The last of the leagues are finishing this weekend. It is late in the year but this was due to cancellation of events as a result of the weather.

The situation seems to be that you either get a field that you cannot get on and off or a field that you could get on if you could get to it. Both these issues are coming in to play.

Silent Flight put forward a request that minutes of the various technical committees are published on the website or relevant technical committee websites.

There were no objections raised in relation to this suggestion and there is no reason why we cannot send the webmaster a pdf file to and ask him to attach it to the relevant technical committee page.

The Chairman tasked the Office Manager with arranging to send pdf copies of technical committee minutes to the webmaster.

OFFICE MGR

There needs to be a note of caution on the website that the minutes are provisional until confirmed and any queries in relation to anything published in the minutes should be relayed to the relevant technical committee. The Technical Secretary will advise the webmaster accordingly to alert him to the fact that he will be receiving minutes for technical committees.

TECH SEC

The Competition Secretary suggested that to avoid confusion technical committees include a header at the top of their minutes to indicate 'Provisional' or 'Adopted' minutes. The Technical Secretary asked the Office Manager to check whether we do receive minutes from all technical committees as required of them under the terms and conditions for technical committees.

OFFICE MGR

TC736/10/12 (17) To receive a report from the Competition Secretary to include:

Receipt and ratification of any contests for next year's FAI Calendar.

A registration form had been received from F5J.

The Competition Secretary advised that she would be writing to all the technical committees to ask them to consider holding World Cups as she feels we should be holding more.

The Competition Secretary reminded delegates that any competition that is going to be run as an FAI competition has to go on the FAI Sporting Calendar. The procedure for this is the appropriate sub-committee or person so delegated completes the registration form that can be obtained from the FAI website or BMFA office or Competition Secretary. They send it to the

Cont/d...

Competition Secretary for checking to make sure all the relevant information has been provided.

Comp
Sec Rep
cont/d...

There was an issue this year that F3J held an Interglide competition which she was not informed of by means of a registration form and subsequently did not appear on the FAI Calendar.

The result of that is that the event will be declared invalid and the results will not stand. They can stand for team selection if that is what is used for the league but it cannot stand as a Eurotour event.

TC737/10/12 (18) To receive any reports from Council Sub-committees or Elected Officers.

FAI Delegate – FAI have been discussing the WADA Association and anti-doping. A suggestion that has been put forward is that as of the beginning of next year all category 1 competitions **will may** have on-site doping tests.

Records Officer – The Records Officer requested that results from any late team trials and competitions are sent to him as soon as possible as time is of the essence for him to send out invitations to trophy winners for presentation at the annual dinner/prize giving.

**ALL TECH
COMMS**

Technical Secretary – Reminded technical committees to provide him with any rule changes as soon as possible.

**ALL TECH
COMMS**

The Technical Secretary implored technical committees to make sure they let him have any entries for the BMFA contest calendar, especially any team trial events. **Even** if the event is not a full team selection event just an element of it is, does need to be advertised.

**ALL TECH
COMMS**

It is still okay to send incomplete information if a venue has to be confirmed. At least the event and date can be included and venue can be confirmed at a later date.

TC738/10/12 (19) To receive the list of nominations that the Competition Secretary has submitted to the BMFA Chairman for re-presentation of International Awards at the BMFA annual prize giving dinner. (Invitations are at the discretion of the Society Chairman and depending on the numbers, not all nominees may be successful).

International Championship re-presentation nominations are:
F1B Free Flight Rubber European Championship Individual Bronze – Russell Peers;

F1C Free Flight Internal Combustion Power European Championships Team Gold – Alan Jack, Ken Faux, Neil Allen and Team Manager Mike Woodhouse FSMAE;

F1D Indoor World Championships Team Silver – Bob Bailey, Derek Richards, Mark Benns and Team Manager Nick Aikman

F2A Control Line Speed World Championships Individual Silver
Ken Morrissey FSMAE; Team Gold – Ken Morrissey FSMAE, Peter Halman FSMAE, Paul Eisner (for the 15th year in succession)

Cont/d...

l'tnl
Awards
cont/d...

F3N Freestyle Helicopter European Championships, the first year this has been run as a championship – Individual Bronze Duncan Osborne; Team Bronze Duncan Osborne, Stuart Mott, Rob Turnbull and Team Manager Richard Mott.

TC739/10/12 (20) To receive the dates of the 2013 Technical Council Meetings.

The dates were confirmed as:
23rd March 2013
19th October 2013

TC740/10/12 (21) Any Other Business.

There was none.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 5pm.

Circulation:

All attendees of the meeting

Copies to:

All Technical Committee Members
All Members of the Full Council
Secretaries of Specialist Bodies
Fellows (Selected)
Club Bulletin
Office Manager
Accounts Manager
Chief Executive
Development Officer
Club Support Officer

Note Those with voting rights are the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the meeting, the FAI Delegate, Records Officer and two members from each of the six Technical Committees. The voting representatives of the Technical Committees can be any two members of the Committee, elected, co-opted or Specialist Body representative.

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

(a) **only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;**

(b) **in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;**

(c) **between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.**

Date: 2nd November 2012

Proposal submitted by: United Kingdom

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers Required:

Overall Votes Cast: or list:

Sporting Code Volume: ABR

Heading of section: Section A

Class: n/a

Number & heading of the paragraph: A.15 Change from Provisional to Official Rules

Page number if appropriate: 20

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	X
Clarification	X

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	X
-------	---

mark the boxes with X as appropriate

Amend paragraph A.15.1 as follows and delete paragraph A.15.2

A.15. CHANGE FROM PROVISIONAL TO OFFICIAL RULES

A.15.1. Before being considered for adoption by the CIAM as official FAI rules, provisional rules must first have been used in **a minimum of international World Cup contests spread over three consecutive years with at least one World Cup contest in each year.** involving a total of **At least five FAI member countries must have taken part over these three years with at least three countries per competition.** (but not necessarily five countries per contest).

A.15.2 ~~Where there is great demand for a class, the Plenary Meeting may decide to waive the conditions contained in paragraph A.15.1 and adopt the provisional rules as official rules, effective from the following January.~~

Reason: Since the inception of the "fast-tracking" of provisional rules to official rules as the first of the two-steps required for championship status, many new "fast-tracked" championships suffer from poor rules to the detriment of the championships.

This rule amendment:

- (a) deletes the fast-tracking clause;
- (b) introduces a more rigorous procedure to ensure that provisional rules are thoroughly tested at competitions (as they used to be before "fast tracking" was introduced into the Code) before being accepted as the first stage in the two-stage process of gaining championship status;
- (c) increases the status of World Cups;
- (d) will help to prevent the current rapid increase of CIAM championships.

CIAM Plenary has already unanimously voted that the number of Championships held must be reduced and so leaving the "fast-tracking" rules in the FAI Sporting Code is counter to this directive.

Note: this proposal is the first of two related proposals referring to the "two-step" process for provisional classes being granted Championship status.

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

(a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;

(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;

(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 2nd November 2012

Proposal submitted by: United Kingdom

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers Required:

Overall Votes Cast: or list:

Sporting Code Volume: ABR

Heading of section: Section A

Class: n/a

Number & heading of the paragraph: A.16 Eligibility for World and Continental Championships

Page number if appropriate: 20

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	X
Clarification	X

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	X
-------	---

mark the boxes with X as appropriate

New paragraphs A.16.1 to A.16.3 with some of the existing text of A.16.1 retained and new text added. The existing paragraph A.16.2 is deleted.

A.16. ELIGIBILITY FOR WORLD AND OR CONTINENTAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

A.16.1 Championship status may be conferred by CIAM either for World or Continental Championships only or for both Championships.

A.16.2 Before they can be considered by the CIAM for use in World and/or Continental Championships, there must be a minimum period of ~~two~~ **three complete calendar** years from the time the rules were made official during which at least ~~two international~~ **five World Cup** contests were held **in each year**, each with a minimum of ~~five~~ **three** FAI member nations participating. **Competitors from at least five FAI member countries must have taken part each year over the three years.**

For Europe: the five countries must be representative of the whole of Europe.

Additionally, for World Championship status to be conferred at least two World Cups must have been held each year in countries other than those in Europe.

Also, ~~Reports from the Chairman~~ **President** of the Jury in **for** each contest must be sent to the appropriate Sub-committee Chairman, **with copies to the Bureau**, for the latter's **Sub-committee Chairman's** recommendation to the CIAM. **(See also B.4.1 a & d and B.4.3.)**

~~A.16.2 In cases where the conditions in A.15.1 have been waived, the rules may be considered eligible for use in World and/or Continental Championships from, and including, the year in which they became effective.~~

A.16.3 The competition rules for any class that requests Championship status must be appropriate to that level of competition and must not have undergone major rule changes for the last two years before application to Plenary for Championship Status.

Reason: This rule amendment gives greater flexibility into the type of championship status to be granted. It also introduces a more appropriate level of rigor for classes wishing to be granted championship status.

cont/...

.../cont/...

As it is the second of the “two-step” process from provisional rules to Championship status. The amendment:

- (a) deletes the fast-tracking clause;
- (b) introduces a more rigorous procedure to ensure that the official rules are thoroughly tested at competitions (as they used to be before “fast tracking” was introduced into the Code) before a class may be given championship status;
- (c) increases the status of World Cups;
- (d) will help to prevent the current rapid increase of CIAM championships.

CIAM Plenary has already unanimously voted that the number of Championships held must be reduced and so leaving the “fast-tracking” rules in the FAI Sporting Code is counter to this directive.

Note i: This proposal is the second of two related proposals referring to the “two-step” process for provisional classes being granted Championship status.

Note ii: It ensures that the rules for classes wishing to be granted championship status are robust and appropriate and gives a sound foundation for the granting of championship status (World or Continental only or both, as is deemed appropriate for the class).

Note iii: Note that the reference to B.4.1 and B.4.3 takes into account the changes agreed at the 2012 Plenary Meeting for the 2013 Sporting Code for clarity.

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 2nd November 2012

Proposal submitted by: United Kingdom

Required: ~~For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers~~

~~Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:~~

Sporting Code Volume: ABR

Heading of section: Section B

Class: n/a

Number & heading of the paragraph: B.2.3 Continental Championships

Page number if appropriate: 37

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with **X**
as appropriate

Amends and expands rule B.2.3 and brings it into line with B.2.4.

B.2.3. Continental Championships

These are limited international contests in which the competitors are **must be** nominated by their NACs and.

These contests are for individual and possibly team classification and will be organised **no more frequently than every two years** only in the years when there is no World Championship in the particular class. **If a particular class also has World Championship status, then each Championship may only be organised in alternate years.**

For Continental Championships in Europe, persons or teams **must be** from at least four **twelve** different **European** nations. **For other Continental Championships, persons or teams must be from at least four nations.**

The Sporting Code General Section 3.5.1 applies.

Continental Championships shall be planned and scheduled by the CIAM.

The number of classes in one Continental Championship is limited to five (5) for Seniors and five (5) for Juniors except for **in** the case of Space Models, where the number of classes shall be limited to eight (8) for Seniors and eight (8) for Juniors.

Reason: Since the restructure of the Soviet Union into member countries, Europe now comprises a greatly increased number of countries and it is appropriate to increase from four, the minimum number of countries for a Continental Championship in Europe to be valid. The proposal also takes into account Continental Championships in other regions with fewer countries. The proposal also clarifies when Continental Championships may be held.

Note: the FAI sporting Code General Section 3.5.3.1 limits the minimum number of nations (NACs) to four for a first category event [competition]. To allow NACs to increase the number of nations then a rule amendment has to be approved by CIAM Plenary to go forward to the 2013 CASI meeting to amend rule 3.5.3.1. See the proposal "General Section 3.5.3.1 – GBR".

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
 (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
 (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 2nd November 2012

Proposal submitted by: United Kingdom

Required: ~~For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers~~

~~Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:~~

Sporting Code Volume: ABR

Heading of section: Section B

Class: n/a

Number & heading of the paragraph: B.2.4 World Championships

Page number if appropriate: 37

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with **X**
as appropriate

Amend paragraph B.2.4 as follows:

B.2.4. World Championships

These are limited international contests in which the competitors must be nominated by their NAC **and are persons or teams from at least fifteen different nations**. These contests are for individual and national team classification **and will be organised no more frequently than every two years. For those classes that have both World and Continental Championship status, then each Championship may only be organised in alternate years.**

The Sporting Code General Section 3.5.1 applies.

The World Championships shall be planned and scheduled by the CIAM.

~~Each World Championships is normally held every other year.~~

The number of classes in one World Championship is limited to five (5) for Seniors and five (5) for Juniors except for the case of Space Models, where the number of classes shall be limited to eight (8) for Seniors and eight (8) for Juniors.

Reason: Same as for the previous proposal ie Since the restructure of the Soviet Union into member countries, Europe now comprises a greatly increased number of countries and given the number of countries world wide it is appropriate to increase from four, the minimum number of countries for a world championship to be valid. As a World Championship, the minimum number of countries must be greater than that for a Continental Championship.

Note: the FAI sporting Code General Section 3.5.3.1 limits the minimum number of nations (NACs) to four for a first category event [competition]. To allow NACs to increase the number of nations then a rule amendment has to be approved by CIAM Plenary to go forward to the 2013 CASI meeting to amend rule 3.5.3.1. See the proposal "General Section 3.5.3.1 – GBR".

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;**
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;**
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.**

Date: 2nd November 2012

Proposal submitted by: United Kingdom

~~Required: For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers~~

~~Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:~~

Sporting Code Volume: General Section

Heading of section: Chapter 3 – Sporting Events

Class: n/a

Number & heading of the paragraph: 3.5.3.1 First Category Events

Page number if appropriate: 4-2

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	X
Clarification	

Safety	
--------	--

Noise	
-------	--

Other	X
-------	---

mark the boxes with X as appropriate

Amend the paragraph as follows:

First category events. A minimum of 4 NACs **or howsoever many NACs the Airsport Commission deems appropriate as long as the number is never less than four** shall have entered by the end of the official registration period, as defined in the local Regulations, with entry fees paid. If there are less than 4 NACs entered, the Air Sport Commission shall decide whether the event will take place and shall also decide whether or not the title of Champion will be awarded.

Reason: Refer to GBR proposals dealing with ABR B.2.3 & B.2.4 which necessitate a rule amendment submission to CASI for the Sporting Code General Section.

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date:

Proposal submitted by: BMFA

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F1
Heading of section: 4 - Aeromodelling
Class: F1Q
Number & heading of the paragraph(s): 3.Q.2. Characteristics
Page number if appropriate: 35

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend the three paragraphs (introduction and a) and b)) as follows:

3.Q.2. Characteristics

Nickel Cadmium (NiCad), Nickel Metal Hydrate ~~Hydrate~~ **Hydride** (NiMH) and Lithium (Li) batteries can be used.

Lithium type battery packs must be in "as manufactured" condition with the covering around the cell surface. If more than one cell is used a balancer connector must be fitted.

External Battery packs are required to have a safety tether to the fuselage.

Safety locks must be used to prevent unintentional restarting of motor(s) after motor(s) have been stopped.

Rule B.3.1. of Section 4b does not apply to class (No builder of the model requirement.)

The motor run time will be determined by a maximum energy amount. In addition, motor runs over 20 seconds are regarded as overruns. The energy budget of each model is 5 joules per gram of the total weight. For energy calculations, weight exceeding 550 grams is to be ignored. Energy limitation will be by an energy limiter or by a motor run limit related to measured power.

- a) For models with energy limiters. The allowed energy amount starts to be calculated with the launch of the model **and finishes when the motor has stopped**. If the energy limiter does not have the capability of detecting the launching moment it may start its calculation from ~~the beginning of the motor run~~ **when the motor is started**. The measuring device has to calculate the energy consumed in real time. ~~After coming to the end of the limited energy supply, the motor(s) must stop irreversibly. The timer stays independent, but the device may inform the timer about the end of the energy supply.~~ **The motor(s) must be stopped irreversibly by the end of the allowed energy amount or at the stated motor run time.**

cont

- b) For models without energy limiters the motor's energy in watt-sec over the motor run is calculated as the measured wattage multiplied by the motor run. A freshly charged battery (4.15 to 4.2 volts per Li cell, 1.2 volts per NiCad or NMH cells) should be used. ~~When the motor has reached full power,~~ **For wattage measurement the motor, its controller and timer must be set to reach full power within 5 seconds of start-up. 10 seconds after the motor has been started for this measuring process,** wattage is measured using a commercial wattmeter via 3.5 mm male and female bullet connectors furnished by the contestant. The calculated motor run should be clearly marked on the model.

F1Q models may use radio control only for irreversible actions ... to end of 3.Q.2. Characteristics, remain unchanged.

Reasons:

3.Q.2. Characteristics as written present specifications for models with Energy limiters - subsection a), and models without energy limiters – subsection b). The intention of the CIAM F1 Technical Meeting 2011 was to word these subsections so that each provided models with equal potential performance. Unfortunately the original wording was imprecise and unworkable. The CIAM Technical Secretary and F1 Subcommittee Chairman agreed a rewording that would make the subsection b) workable, and this was included in the 2012 sporting code. During the 2012 season it has become apparent that though subsection b) is workable it does not provide a model with equal performance to subsection a).

In practice models complying with subsection b) – models without energy limiters, do not have an equal performance to models complying with subsection a) – models with energy limiters. This is due to the wording not allowing an equivalent method of measuring energy used. The results of this wording have been a noticeable reduction in entries for the class in a number of countries.

The intentions of this proposal are to modify the wording so that the method of energy measurement used does produce an equal performance potential from both types of model. Additionally the proposal includes a number of word changes in the entire 3.Q.2. Characteristics, to produce a more precise meaning.

All of these wording changes are intended to provide a clear and easy method of implementing the required specifications. They do not alter the specifications of the models or the quantities of energy or weight required. As such it is suggested that the proposal might be implemented with immediate effect as a clarification of the originally intended rule.

Data is provided below showing the effects in energy consumption of two models without energy limiters.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

Sample Model Data: See the following pages

Sample Model Data

<p>Model 1 Motor: "Shockie IIM Prop: 8.5"D x 4.5"P Battery: Dualsky 450 mAh, 30C, 3 Cell. Recharged after each test A.U. Model Weight: 297.7 grams. Energy Allowance: 5 Joules/gram Energy Budget: $5 \times 297.7 = 1488.5$ Watt/Second</p>			
	Measured (Watts)	M'Run (Sec)	M'Run Variation
a) Power Measurement from start-up	106.0	14.04	Bench Mark
b) Power Measurement – Launch point	103.0	14.45	+ 2.9%
c) Average Power Measurement: (106 W + 90W)/2	98.0	15.19	+ 8.2%
d) Power Measurement – 10 Secs from start-up (effective Full Power)	97.0	15.35	+ 9.3%
e) Measured Total Energy used at a) = 1368.0 W/S, recalculated for Power	97.4	15.28	+ 8.8%
f) Total Energy allowed (as per energy limiter) = 1488.5 W/S, recalculated for Power as e)	97.4	15.28	+ 8.8%

<p>Model 2 Motor: "Shockie IIM Prop: 8.0"D x 4.5"P Battery: Dualsky 450 mAh, 30C, 3 Cell. Recharged after each test A.U. Model Weight: 286.4 grams. Energy Allowance: 5 Joules/gram Energy Budget: $5 \times 286.4 = 1432.0$ Watt/Second</p>			
	Measured (Watts)	M'Run (Sec)	M'Run Variation
a) Power Measurement from start-up	115.0	12.45	Bench Mark
b) Power Measurement – Launch point	112.0	12.78	+ 2.7%
c) Average Power Measurement: (106 W + 90W)/2	107.5	13.32	+ 7.0%
d) Power Measurement – 10 Secs from start-up (effective Full Power)	104.0	13.77	+ 10.6%

APPENDIX B 4/4

e) Measured Total Energy used at a) = 1188.0 W/S, recalculated for Power	95.4	15.01	+ 20.6%
f) Total Energy allowed (as per energy limiter) = 1432.0 W/S, recalculated for Power as e)	95.4	15.01	+ 20.6%

It should be noted that these tests were conducted in 'real' conditions (not in a laboratory) as would prevail at a typical competition. In such conditions test results vary with temperature and pressure. Typically tests conducted on different days produced variations, but the comparisons between the different measurements remained broadly equivalent.

What IS shown is the difference between non-energy limiter and energy limiter equipped models. These differences are considerable and increase when more power is drawn from the battery. The conclusion is: that the two specifications are not equal.

End of proposal

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Committees:~~ ~~Numbers~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.2.3

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.2.3 as follows:

5.7.2.3. Change of model glider

Each competitor is allowed to use five model gliders in the contest. It is permissible to change parts between these five model gliders. The competitor may change his model gliders at any time as long as they conform to the specifications and are operated on the assigned frequency. The organiser has to mark the five model gliders and all interchangeable parts of each of the five model gliders. All spare model gliders must stay outside the start and landing field and only one model is permissible in the start and landing field to score a valid flight time. The previous model must be removed before a replacement model may be launched.

Each competitor may only have one model glider in the start and landing field at any moment during the working time. Only the model gliders that are in a spare model area or in the start and landing field at the start of the working time may be used during the working time. To change model gliders, the 'old' one must be placed in the same spare model area as the 'new' one, before the 'new' one is taken out.

Reason: Clarification that only one model can be in the box at any one time and that only spare models from the spare model area may be used.

Note: Rule 5.7.1.2 "... The helper is the only person allowed to help the competitor when he is on the start and landing field..." prevents other people bringing models to the spare model area or touching models that are in there during the working time

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.2.4

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Delete the text in paragraph 1 as shown:

5.7.2.4. Retrieving of model glider

If the competitor lands the model glider outside the start and landing field during his preparation and working time, then it has to be retrieved back to the start and landing field either by the competitor or his helper. Other people, ~~including the team manager,~~ are not allowed to retrieve the model glider.

While retrieving the model, it is not permissible to fly it back to the start and landing field. Launching outside the start and landing field in this situation will be penalised with 100 points that will be deducted from the final score.

Reason: Mention of the team manager is not required and could cause confusion if he is the helper. If he is not the helper, then he is included under 'other people'.

Note: Since no penalty is mentioned and the 'other person' may be a well-meaning on-looker who decides to touch the model, such incidents should be handled via a protest if required.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Committees:~~ ~~Numbers~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.3.2

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Re-locate an existing sentence and add new text regarding a Spare Model Area.

5.7.3.2. Start and landing field

The organiser must define the start and landing field before the start of the contest. Within the start and landing field each competitor must have adequate space to conduct his launches and landings, at least 30 metres distance to any person in the start direction. The organiser should consider about 900 m² per competitor, (square of 30 m x 30 m). **The border line defining the start and landing field is part of the start and landing field.**

~~All launches and landings must happen within this area. The border line defining the start and landing field is part of the start and landing field. Any launch or landing outside this area is scored zero for the flight.~~

Competitors may leave the start-and-landing field while flying their model glider. For starting their model glider and in order to achieve a valid landing (see 5.7.6.2) the competitor must be inside the start and landing field.

Spare Models Areas: four areas must be defined outside, but within 2 meters of, the start and landing field for the storage and changing of spare models. About 4 square metres must be available for each competitor in a group in each area. For a rectangular start and landing field the spare model areas must be placed at the mid points of the sides. If the start and landing field is not a rectangle, the spare model areas should be distributed evenly around the perimeter.

Reason: To formalise where the spare models may be kept during a round.

Note: Please also see F3K 5.7.3.2 GBR 13 Version 2 which includes a change to paragraph 3, too.

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012
 Proposal submitted by: GBR
 Required:- For proposals from Submitters: Members:
 Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:
 Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft
 Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders
 Class: F3K
 Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.3.2
 Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with **x** as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.3.2 as follows:

5.7.3.2. Start and landing field

The organiser must define the start and landing field before the start of the contest. Within the start and landing field each competitor must have adequate space to conduct his launches and landings, at least 30 metres distance to any person in the start direction. The organiser should consider about 900 m² per competitor, (square of 30 m x 30 m). **The border line defining the start and landing field is part of the start and landing field.**

All launches and landings must happen within this area. The border line defining the start and landing field is part of the start and landing field. Any launch or landing outside this area is scored zero for the flight.

Competitors may leave the start and landing field while flying their model glider. For starting their model glider, **during the flight** and in order to achieve a valid landing (see 5.7.6.2) the competitor must be inside the start and landing field. **If a competitor leaves the start-and-landing field during the flight, the score for that flight is zero.**

Spare Models Areas: four areas must be defined outside but within 2 meters of the start and landing field for the storage and changing of spare models. About 4 square meters must be available for each competitor in a group in each area. For a rectangular start and landing field the spare model areas must be placed at the mid points of the sides. If the start and landing field is not a rectangle, the spare model areas should be distributed evenly around the perimeter.

Reason: To prevent pilots from leaving the box to be closer to the flying model – this can help to exploit small areas of slope lift far from the box. Spare model area definition added as last paragraph.
Note: If a pilot is sure he will land out, he can leave the box to retrieve and take a zero. If he thinks he might land out, he will need to wait until he is sure. The helper may leave the box to retrieve the model if preferred.

Note: This proposal makes an amendment to the 3rd paragraph compared to F3K 5.7.3.2 GBR 13 Version 1

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;**
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;**
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.**

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

~~Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:~~

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.4.1

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with **X** as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.4.1 as follows:

5.7.4.1. Contact with person

In order to guarantee the highest level of safety, any contact between a flying **moving** model glider and any other person (except the competitor or start helper) either in or outside the start and landing field has to be avoided. **This includes contact that happens while the glider is flying or while the glider is being handled by the competitor (or start helper) between landing and launching.**

If such contact happens during either the working or preparation time **the preparation time, the working time or the landing window**, the competitor will receive a penalty of 100 points on the total score. In addition, if the contact happens during the **preparation time or** working time, at the launch of the model glider, this will result in a zero score for the whole round.

Reason: Contact during the landing window and launching during the preparation time are not currently covered; neither is contact while the pilot is touching the model, including between catching/picking up and release.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) *only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;*
 (b) *in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;*
 (c) *between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.*

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Committees:~~ ~~Numbers~~
 Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.4.3

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.4.3 as follows:

5.7.4.3. Safety area

The organiser may define safety areas. The organiser must ensure that the safety areas are permanently controlled by well-trained personnel. A competitor will receive a penalty of 100 points, if:

- (a) His model glider lands inside the safety area or touches any ground based object like eg car or building,
 (b) The model glider flies below 3 metres over the safety area (measured from the ground).
- a) If his model glider makes contact with an object or person within the defined safety area, then the competitor will be penalised by deduction of 100 points from his final score.**
b) If contact is made with more than one person or object in the same incident, then only one penalty applies.
c) Penalties shall be listed on the score sheet of the round in which the infringement(s) occurred.

Reason: Maintain the 100 point penalty; no need for parity with other Soaring classes. (Contact with a person outside the safety area is already covered by rule 5.7.4.1).

The word, "permanently", is removed from, "permanently controlled" as this is not practical and is only required while the competition is running. The use of safety areas should be avoided as far as possible.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

(a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;

(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;

(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.4.5 (new)

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with as appropriate

Add a new rule as follows:

5.7.4.5. Safety Helmets

During flying, all persons inside or within 5 metres of the boundary of the start and landing field must wear a safety helmet, with a fastened chinstrap, strong enough to withstand the impact of an F3K model aircraft in any phase of its flight.

Reason: It is possible that someone could be injured by a model glider.

Note: The proposed words are based on F2 rules. Currently helmets are optional.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required: ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Committees:~~ ~~Numbers~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.8 (new)

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Add a new rule at 5.7.8 and re-number the subsequent paragraphs.

5.7.8. Re-flights

The competitor is entitled to a new working time if his attempt has not been judged correctly by the official time-keepers. The new working time is to be granted to the competitor according to the following order of priorities:

- 1. in a following group, provided existing flyers in that group do not object;**
- 2. if this is not achievable, then a new group of pilots (minimum 4) should be flown. The new group should be made up of other competitors, selected by random draw. If the transmitting frequencies of the drawn competitors conflict or a member of the same team as the re-flight competitor is selected or the drawn competitor does not wish to fly, the draw is continued until a group can be formed;**
- 3. if this is not achievable, then the original group will fly again at the end of the current round.**

In cases 2 and 3, the better of the two results of the original flight and the re-flight will be the official score of the competitors in the re-flight group, except for the competitor entitled to the re-flight who takes the result of the re-flight as his official score for the round.

A competitor chosen at random for a re-flight group will not be entitled to a further re-flight for any reason.

Reason: There is no existing rule to cover this.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;**
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;**
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.**

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Committees:~~ ~~Numbers~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph:

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.9.3 as follows:

5.7.9.3. Landing window

No points are deducted for flying over the maximum flight time or past the end of the working time. Immediately after the end of the working time, or after each attempt for the task “all up last down”, the 30 seconds landing window will begin. Any model gliders still airborne must now land. If a model glider lands later, then that flight will be scored with 0 points. **For all Tasks except Task C, a 30 seconds landing window will begin at the end of the working time. For Task C (All up, last down, seconds) the landing window will end 3:33 after the start signal. Any model gliders still airborne must land before the end of the landing window. If a model glider lands later, then that flight will score zero.**

The organiser should announce the last ten seconds of the landing window by counting down.

Reason: There is no working time for “all up last down” and a 3 second launch window is available. With a signal 3:30 after the launch signal, often used now, late launchers will have a less than 30 seconds landing window. By fixing the end of the landing window at 3:33 after the start signal for this task only, all pilots will have at least until the watch shows 3:30 for their flight to land.

There will be a consequential change at rule 5.7.11.3.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

(a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;

(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;

(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.10.1

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with as appropriate

Delete the text as shown:

5.7.10.1. Final score

The final score is the sum of normalised scores of rounds minus penalty points.

If 5 or more rounds are flown then the lowest score is dropped.

~~If 9 or more rounds are flown then the lowest two scores are dropped.~~

~~If 14 or more rounds are flown then the lowest 3 scores are dropped.~~

~~If 19 or more rounds are flown then the lowest 4 scores are dropped.~~

~~If 24 or more rounds are flown then the lowest 5 scores are dropped.~~

Penalty points must be shown in the results list with an indication of the round in which they were levied. The penalty points are retained even if the score of the round in which the offence occurred is dropped.

If a competitor collects more than 300 penalty points, he will be disqualified from the contest.

Reason: To reduce the number of dropped rounds.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

(a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;

(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;

(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.10.3

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------

mark the boxes with as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.10.3 as follows;

5.7.10.3. Fly-off

The organiser may announce a fly-off prior at **to** the beginning of the event. **For World and Continental Championships the fly-off is mandatory for seniors.**

The fly-off should consist of at least 3 rounds with a maximum of 6 rounds. If 5 or 6 rounds are flown, the lowest score is dropped.

The maximum number of competitors in a fly-off is limited to 12. The minimum number of competitors in a fly-off should be 10-15 % **percent** of the total number of competitors.

A junior fly-off may be held with the maximum number of competitors being 2/3 of the seniors' fly-off.

A separate junior fly-off is not mandatory.

If a fly-off is flown, the points of the previous rounds are not considered.

Reason: *To introduce mandatory fly-offs at Championships (for seniors).*

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from Submitters: Votes: For: Against:~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.11.3

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.11.3 as follows:

5.7.11.3. Task C (All up, last down, seconds):

All competitors of a group must launch their model gliders simultaneously, within 3 seconds of the organiser's acoustic signal. The maximum measured flight time is 180 seconds. The official timekeeper takes the individual flight time of the competitor according to 5.7.6 and 5.7.7 from the release of the model glider and not from the acoustic signal. Launching a model glider more than 3 seconds after the acoustic signal will result in a zero score for the flight.

The number of launches (3 to 5) must be announced by the organiser before the contest begins.

The preparation time between attempts is limited to 60 seconds after the ~~30 seconds~~ **end of the** landing window. During this time the competitor may retrieve or change his model glider or do repairs. If a competitor's model glider lands outside the start and landing field, the competitor may change his model glider without retrieving and bringing back the one which has landed outside the start and landing field. This is an explicit exception to 5.7.2.3 and only valid for this particular Task C.

The flight times of all attempts of each competitor will be added together and will be normalised to calculate the final score for this task. No working time is necessary.

Example: Competitor A: 45+50+35 s = 130 s = 812.50 points
Competitor B: 50+50+60 s = 160 s = 1000.00points
Competitor C: 30+80+40 s = 150 s = 937.50 points

Reason: This is a consequential amendment required if the amendment to 5.7.9.3 is approved. (It removes the reference to "the 30 seconds".)

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

(a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;

(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;

(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume:

F3 Radio Control Steering Model Aircraft

Heading of section:

Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class:

F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph:

5.7.11.5

Page number if appropriate:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------

mark the boxes with as appropriate

This proposal is a:

Amend paragraph 5.7.11.5 as follows:

5.7.11.5. Task E (Poker - variable target time)

Before the first launch, each competitor announces a target time to the official timekeeper. **The maximum target time that can be announced is 9 minutes and 58 seconds.**

He **The competitor** can perform an unlimited number of launches to reach or exceed, this time. If the target is reached or exceeded, then the target time is credited and the competitor can announce the next target time, which may be lower, equal or higher, before he releases the model glider during the launch. If the target time is not reached, the announced target flight time can not be changed. The competitor may try to reach the announced target flight time until the end of the working time. Towards the end of the working time, the competitor must still announce a real time specified in minutes and/or seconds. Calling only "until the end of the working time" is not permitted.

The announcement may be repeated 5 times. The 5 flights with achieved targets are scored. The achieved target times are added together.

This task may be included in the competition program only if the organiser provides a sufficient number of official timekeepers, so that each competitor in the round is accompanied by one official timekeeper.

Working time is 10 minutes.

Example:	Announced time	Flight time	Scored time
	45 s	1st flight 46 s	45 s
	50 s	1st flight 48 s	0 s
		2nd flight 52 s	50 s
	47 s	1st flight 49 s	47 s
	60 s	1st flight 57 s	0 s
		2nd flight 63 s	60 s
	60 s	1st flight 65 s	60 s
	Total score is 262 s		

Reason: A flight of 9:59 may be theoretically possible but it depends too much on the skill of the timekeeper to judge the moment of launch accurately and the reaction times to operate the stopwatch at the start of the flight and for the landing. A genuine 9:59 might be scored as 9:58 giving a zero score.

"The 5 flights with achieved targets are scored", changed to, "The flights with achieved targets are scored", because there may be less than 5 flights.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Amiteos: Y~~ ~~Numbers~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.1.2

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.1.2 as follows:

5.7.1.2. Helper

Each competitor is allowed one helper who is not allowed to become physically involved in the flight, except for retrieving the airplane, if it has landed outside the start and landing field. ~~The helper is the only person allowed to help the competitor on the start and landing field. Team managers are not allowed to stand inside the start and landing field.~~

The helper is the only person allowed to help the competitor when he is on the start and landing field.

After the end of the working time the competitor and the timekeeper must sign the results of the round. If the result is not signed by the competitor, **then** the score for the round will be 0 points.

Reason: To make it clear that the Team Manager is not allowed to help the pilot in addition to the pilot's official helper.

Note: It is possible for the TM to be the official helper.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.1.3

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------

Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------	--------------------------

Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------	-------------------------------------

mark the boxes with as appropriate

Delete the paragraph.

~~5.7.1.3. Start Helper~~

~~Disabled persons may ask for assistance at launching and retrieving (catching) their model glider. This start helper has to be different in every round, meaning that every start helper can only be used once. The competitor has to touch the start helper before each launch of the model glider.~~

~~During a competition with only one class, competitors of less than 1.5 metres height may be assisted for launching and/or catching.~~

Reason: F3K is essentially a physical sport. A competitor using a series of 'super launchers' may have an unfair advantage.

Consequential changes are necessary in rules 5.7.4.1, 5.7.6.1, 5.7.6.2 and 5.7.7.

The organisers of non-championship or local events may wish to keep their own version of this rule.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) *only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;*
- (b) *in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;*
- (c) *between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.*

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

Required:- ~~For proposals from S~~ ~~Committees:~~ ~~Numbers~~
Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.2.1

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Amend paragraph 5.7.2.1 as follows:

5.7.2.1. Specifications

Model gliders are gliders with the following limitations:

Wingspan maximum 1500 mm

Weight maximum 600 g

Radius of the nose must be a minimum of 5 mm in all orientations. (See F3B nose definition for measurement technique.)

The model glider must be launched by hand and is controlled by radio equipment acting on an unlimited number of surfaces.

~~The use of gyros and variometers onboard the model glider is not allowed.~~

Any technological device used to aid in supplying data of the air's condition or direct feedback of the model's flight status is prohibited during the flight. These devices include any transmission or receiving devices not used to directly control the model aircraft (telephones, walkie-talkies, telemetry of airspeed and altitude etc.), temperature detecting devices (thermal imaging cameras, thermometers etc), optical aids (such as binoculars, telescopes etc.), and distance/altitude measuring devices (GPS, laser range finders etc.). Telemetry of signal strength at the aircraft receiver and state of the receiver battery is permitted. Use of corrective eyeglasses and sunglasses are permitted. If an infringement of this rule occurs, the pilot will be disqualified from the contest.

The model glider may be equipped with holes, pegs or reinforcements, which allow a better grip of the model glider by hand. The pegs must be stiff and an integral part of the model glider within the half-span of the wing, and be neither extendable nor retractable. Devices, which do not remain a part of the model glider during and after the launch, are not allowed.

Reason: To attempt to prevent the use of 'artificial' aids to enhance model performance.

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 5th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

~~Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:~~

Sporting Code Volume: F3 Radio Control Soaring Model Aircraft

Heading of section: Class F3K Hand Launch Gliders

Class: F3K

Number & heading of the paragraph: 5.7.2.2

Page number if appropriate:

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate

Delete wrong and unnecessary references and add clarifying text:

5.7.2.2. Unintentional jettisoning

If the model glider suffers any unintentional jettisoning during the flight, then the flight shall be scored zero according to 5.3.1.7. **unless that jettisoning occurs as a result of a mid-air collision.** If, during the landing, any unintentional jettisoning occurs (ref. 5.7.6.) after the first touch of the model glider with ground, any object or person, then the flight is valid.

Reason: Reference to 5.3.1.7 (an F3B rule) is incorrect and not required and reference to (5.7.6) is not required. The mid-air collision reference is added because 5.7.4.2 states that there is no penalty for a mid-air.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
(b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
(c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 8th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F4

Heading of section: n/a

Class: F4H

Number & heading of the paragraph: ANNEX 6F

Page number if appropriate: n/k

This proposal is a:	Rule Change	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	mark the boxes with ✕ as appropriate
	Clarification	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							

Type the instruction in the space below:

The addition of a Static Judges Guide as F4 ANNEX 6F

Note: This proposal is related to the fully revised F4H rules in proposal F4H_6.9_GBR_13

Type the text changes in the space below (show deletions as ~~strike-through~~ and additions as **bold underlined**):

ANNEX 6F

F4H - JUDGES GUIDE FOR STATIC JUDGING

6F.1 General

As with other scale classes, before individual judging commences, all the models entered should be reviewed in order to superficially grade the models in relation to each other. It is particularly important during this initial evaluation, that because all static judging is carried out at 5 metres, judges should avoid any close up examination of the models.

The documentation requirements for F4H have been reduced to the minimum which is considered necessary to make a fair assessment of the judging aspects required. It is important that judges do not waste time seeking to assess any aspect which is not adequately supported by the documentation.
The penalty marks as stated in ANNEX 6A paragraph 6A.1.9 will apply.

Generally 15 minutes (approximately) is considered sufficient judging time for each model.

When all the models have been individually judged, the spread of marks awarded, particularly the 'Complexity marks' for all the models should be reviewed by the panel of judges. The panel of judges have the right to alter the marks retrospectively if they subsequently believe them to be unfair. The relative mark of one model compared with the others is important and only when the Chief Judge agrees that this has been achieved should the scores be released for publication.

6F.1.4.1 Scale Accuracy (Outline)

As with all static judging, photographs are the prime means of assessing scale accuracy. If good photographs are provided which show side view, front view and plan view, there will be no need to refer to the drawings. Paragraph 6A.1.10.1 provides further advice on assessing scale accuracy.

6F.1.4.2 Originality of Model Design & Construction

The judge must examine the Competitors Declaration including any supporting evidence presented by the competitor and if necessary question the competitor, in order to evaluate the extent to which the competitor has contributed to the Scale Accuracy (Outline Accuracy). A maximum of 10 marks should only be awarded to a model which is entirely 'scratch built' and declared as such by the competitor. The score must be reduced if the Scale Accuracy is achieved by someone other than the competitor, or by the use of commercially available machined, moulded or pre-cut parts. However an allowance should be made if the competitor is able to provide evidence that he has modified such parts to improve Scale Accuracy. A model which has been assembled 'straight out of the box' should score a zero. The following should be used as a guide:

<u>Scratch built models entirely designed and built by the competitor</u>	<u>10 marks</u>
<u>Models built from a kit or a published plan based on a built-up structure and which may include pre-cut parts and some proprietary items</u>	<u>5-9 marks</u>
<u>Models built from a kit based on a moulded/grp fuselage and veneered foam or grp flying surfaces</u>	<u>2-4 marks</u>
<u>Typical ARTF – moulded or built-up and covered structure</u>	<u>0-2 marks</u>

6F.1.4.3 Colour and Markings Accuracy

Colour accuracy is determined by comparison of the model with the documentation which is presented. The ambient light conditions (e.g. light and shade) prevailing during judging may not be the same as that which applies to the documentation and particular consideration should be given when this occurs. Camouflage colour schemes should show the correct pattern and the correct degree of merging of the shades. Paragraph 6A.1.10.2 provides further advice on assessing colour. Check the colour, position and size of all markings, insignia, numbers and lettering. Judges should not make assumptions that markings are the same on each side of the model and should only award high marks when all the markings are fully supported by the documentation. Paragraph 6A.1.10.3 provides further advice on assessing markings.

6F.1.4.4 Colour and Markings Complexity

Consideration should be given to the effort involved in reproducing the colour and markings of the prototype. This should not be confined to the number of colours and the extent of the markings, but also how they are distributed on the model. i.e. the complexity of the boundary between colours and whether applied to a flat or curved surface, on fabric or solid surfaces etc. It is important to ensure that the marks awarded are a fair comparison with the spread of marks awarded across the range of models entered. Paragraphs 6A.1.10.2 and 6A.1.10.3 provide additional guidance on assessing Colour and Markings Complexity.

cont/...

6F.1.4.5 Realism

Judges should consider how well the model captures the character of the full size aircraft as portrayed in the photographic documentation. If the subject aircraft is 'factory fresh' or an unblemished museum example, then the model should be in a similar pristine condition. Alternatively if the photograph of the subject aircraft shows worn or stained surfaces and weathered paintwork, then this should be reflected in the model. Judges should be careful to avoid penalising the omission of details which are not clearly visible at 5 metres.

Type the reasons in the space below:

There is currently no Static Judges Guide for Class F4H.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

None

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: 8th November 2012

Proposal submitted by: GBR

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers

Required:

Overall Votes Cast: For: Against:

Sporting Code Volume: F4

Heading of section: n/a

Class: F4H

Number & heading of the paragraph: 6.9 CLASS F4H – STAND-OFF SCALE
(PROVISIONAL)

Page number if appropriate: 85

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Clarification	<input type="checkbox"/>						

mark the boxes with **x** as appropriate

Type the instruction in the space below:

Replace the existing Class F4H rules entirely with the revised rules as shown on the subsequent pages of this document.

Note There are two additional proposals submitted separately in relation to this proposal, these are:

The Competitors Declaration (Volume F4 ANNEX 6E.1) – see proposal F4H_Annex_6E.1_GBR_13

The Static Judges Guide (Volume F4 ANNEX 6F) – see proposal F4H_Annex_6F_GBR_13

Type the text changes in the space below (show deletions as ~~strike-through~~ and additions as **bold underlined**):

6.9 CLASS F4H – R/C STAND-OFF SCALE MODEL AIRCRAFT (PROVISIONAL)

6.9.1 General Characteristics

The General Characteristics of the model shall be the same as Class F4C. (Para 6.3 refers), with the exception of para 6.3.10 (Final Scoring) which is as shown below at para 6.9.7..

6.9.2 Eligibility

No model which has previously been placed in the top three in a Continental or World Championship F4C competition, including repaints and rebuilds, will be permitted in F4H The requirement for the competitor to have constructed his own model (rule 6.1.9.4.e) is not applicable to Stand-Off Scale, however the surface finish (colour and markings) on the model must have been applied by the competitor.

6.9.3 Declaration

The competitor must complete and sign the Declaration Form at ANNEX 6E.1 certifying that he has applied the surface finish (colour and markings) to the model. The declaration also includes a questionnaire which is used by the Static Judges to assess how much the competitor contributed to the Scale Accuracy. If an incorrect declaration is subsequently revealed, the competitor may be disqualified from the contest. The competitor may also use photographs or sample material in support of the declaration.

6.9.4 Static Judging

Three Static Judges shall be appointed. The final static score shall be the average of the individual judge's marks.

All static judging is carried out at a distance of 5 metres. This is measured from the centre line of the model to the judges seating position.

Each of the following items will be awarded a mark out of 10 by each Judge in increments of half a mark.

6.9.4.1 Scale Accuracy.

This an assessment of the outline accuracy of the model compared with the prototype as seen from three aspects (side, front and top plan), judged by comparison with the documentation presented.

6.9.4.2 Originality of Model Design & Construction

This is an assessment of the extent to which the scale accuracy of the model is due to the effort of the competitor. Maximum marks will be awarded to a model which is designed and constructed in its entirety by the competitor. A model which is built from a kit will score less, dependent upon the extent of prefabrication. An ARTF model will score zero (unless evidence is presented of extensive modification by the competitor).

6.9.4.3 Colour and Markings Accuracy

This is an assessment of the accuracy of the colour and markings of the model by comparison with the documentation presented.

6.9.4.4 Colour and Markings complexity

This is a subjective assessment of the difficulty in reproducing and applying the finish and markings to the model.

6.9.4.5 Realism

This is a subjective assessment of how well the model captures the character of the prototype as illustrated by the documentation; taking into account the surface finish, weathering and any detail that is noticeable at 5m.

6.9.5 Static judging K - Factors

Scale Accuracy –

<u>Side View</u>	<u>K = 15</u>
<u>Front View</u>	<u>K = 15</u>
<u>Upper Plan View</u>	<u>K = 15</u>
<u>Originality of model Design & Construction</u>	<u>K = 15</u>
<u>Colour and Markings Accuracy</u>	<u>K = 15</u>
<u>Colour and Markings Complexity</u>	<u>K = 5</u>
<u>Realism</u>	<u>K = 20</u>
<u>Total K = 100</u>	

6.9.6 Documentation

The documentation requirement is the minimum considered necessary to fully assess the outline from 3 aspects, the colour, the markings and the realism. As with all scale aeroplanes static judging, good photographs are the prime means of judging scale accuracy. Photographs and reproductions should be of a reasonable size, (approximate A5 minimum) and presented on separate sheets or as a montage no larger than A2. A book with page markers is not acceptable.

There are no prescribed penalties for missing or inadequate documentation, but judges can only award marks on the basis of the documentation available. Poor documentation will be reflected in reduced scores and any item of static judging for which there is no documentation will result in a Zero score for that item.

6.9.6.1 Photographic evidence:

At least three photographs or printed reproductions of the prototype, one or more of which must show the actual subject aircraft being modelled. Ideally these must show the entire aeroplane and show the three aspects; side view; front view and top plan view (the underneath plan view will not be judged). There is no requirement for close up or detail photographs, but additional photographs can be used to support the three aspects if the outline needs clarification.

6.9.6.2 Drawings:

Drawings are only required and will only be used by the judge if the photographic evidence for any of the outline views is inadequate. If used, drawings must conform to the requirements of rule 6.1.9.4(b). (Cautionary note - if the competitor is in any doubt on this subject, then drawings should be supplied)

6.9.6.3 Proof of colour and markings:

This may be in the form of colour chips or original paint samples, colour photographs (which may be the same photos supplied for outline), or colour illustrations published in books, magazines or on kit boxes. Published descriptions are also acceptable when accompanied by examples of similar colours used on other aircraft types. Authenticated colour chips will not be a requirement for proof of colour.

6.9.7 Final Scoring

One third of the marks are available for Static, two thirds for Flight. Normally three rounds will be flown and the final score will be the sum of the best two flight scores and the static score. If one round is flown the flight score will be doubled, if two rounds are flown, both flight scores will be used.

6.9.8 Flying Schedule

The Flying Schedule shall be the same as F4C (Paragraph 6.3. refers with the exception of paragraph 6.3.10)

Type the reasons in the space below:

The errors within the existing rules are as follows:-

1. Paragraph 6.9.1 – States; “Model aircraft specification: See rule 6.1.1”
Rule 6.1.1 (page 9) is the “Definition of Scale Model Aircraft” and states;
“A scale model aircraft shall be a reproduction of a heavier than air, fixed wing, man-carrying aircraft. The aim of a scale contest is to recreate the accurate appearance and realism of the full size aircraft as best appropriate to each model aircraft class. This shall apply equally to static judging and flight performance.”
The current F4H rules do not comply with the last sentence of this rule, because the maximum marks which can be awarded for static judging (with three judges and using the K-factors in para 6.9.4) are 1,350 and the maximum marks for flight judging (with 3 judges using the K factors in para 6.3.6) are 3,000. This is in fact a ratio of 0.45 : 1
2. Paragraph 6.9.2 Documentation – there is no sub-para 2 between sub paras 1 and 3.
Sub para 2 originally specified the drawing requirements but was removed as a result of a badly written proposal submitted by the Sub-Committee to the 2011 CIAM plenary.
Drawings are not specified as a Documentation requirement. Does this mean that drawings are not required.
(Note: Drawings were used by the judges at the last F4H competition in Spain)

3. Paragraph 6.9.3 states that; *“The competitor is required to fill in the relevant parts of the Competitors Declaration (Annex 6.E) to declare that the complete colour scheme and markings are applied to the surface of the model by the competitor. No other declaration is required.”*
This is in conflict with the Declaration Form (Annex 6.E) which has two additional sections (related to flight) which are applicable to F4H.
4. Paragraph 6.9.4 , Item 4. - Requires the judges to assess “Craftsmanship on colour and markings only”.
It is not possible to assess how the colour and markings are applied from a distance of 5 metres, ie it is not possible to determine if the model is painted, or covered in heatshrink film, or whether the markings are painted or transfers or vinyl stickers. Therefore the judge cannot make a fair assessment of the craftsmanship.
5. Paragraph 6.9.4, Item 5 - Requires the judge to assess “Scale Details”, which according to the Note at the end of the paragraph is limited to surface details and engine details.
It is not possible to judge surface and engine details from a distance of 5 metres. Many models have fully enclosed engines with little or no engine details visible, therefore this rule discriminates against these models.
6. **The F4H rules also have several other serious omissions, eg there are no rules for the Competition programme, the number of static judges, the final scoring (see item 1 above), the organisation of the event and no Static Judges Guide and these aspects cannot be assumed to be the same as F4C.**
7. **Using the current K factors, 44.4% of the total static score is to be awarded on the basis of rules which are either impossible to judge or unfair.**

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

None

6F.1.4.5 Realism

Judges should consider how well the model captures the character of the full size aircraft as portrayed in the photographic documentation. If the subject aircraft is ‘factory fresh’ or an unblemished museum example, then the model should be in a similar pristine condition. Alternatively if the photograph of the subject aircraft shows worn or stained surfaces and weathered paintwork, then this should be reflected in the model. Judges should be careful to avoid penalising the omission of details which are not clearly visible at 5 metres.

Type the reasons in the space below:

There is currently no Static Judges Guide for Class F4H.

Type any supporting data for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

None

**FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE
AEROMODELLING COMMISSION (CIAM) - PROPOSAL FORM**

Reference Plenary 2010 - submit the proposal:

- (a) only electronically; hard copy no longer necessary;
- (b) in Word 97-2003 or rich text format only;
- (c) between 1st August and 15th November in the year immediately preceding the Plenary Meeting.

Date: **8th November 2012**
 Proposal submitted by: **GBR**

For proposals from Subcommittees: Voting Numbers Required:

Overall Votes Cast: or: Inst:

Sporting Code Volume: **F4**
 Heading of section: **n/a**
 Class: **F4B, F4C, F4G, F4H**
 Number & heading of the paragraph: **ANNEX 6E.1**
 Page number if appropriate: **73**

This proposal is a:

Rule Change	X
Clarification	X

Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	X
--------	--------------------------	-------	--------------------------	-------	----------

mark the boxes with **X** as appropriate

Type the instruction in the space below:

Replace the existing ANNEX 6E.1 with the revised format as shown in the subsequent pages of this document.

Type the text changes in the space below (show deletions as ~~strike-through~~ and additions as **bold underlined**):

Note: for clarity the text of the proposal appears on pages 2 & 3 of this document

Type the reasons in the space below:

- 1 This is a change which will be necessary following the adoption of the revised rules for Class F4H under proposal F4H 6.9 GBR 2013.
- 2 This is essential clarification of the Competitors Declaration requirements for Classes F4C, and F4G. During the 2012 World Championships for F4C and the open competition for F4G in Spain, there was strong suspicion of cheating and clear evidence of breaches of the Builder of the Model rule (6.1.9.4 e). There is a growing awareness that something must be done to make life more difficult for those who flaunt the rules. The addition of a questionnaire will help the judges prevent this unsporting activity.
- 3 The endorsement of the declaration by a Competitor's NAC will provide additional verification of the Declaration and share the responsibility with the Competition Organiser in the event of a disqualification.
- 4 Additional clarification necessary because the form is used for several classes

CHAMPIONSHIP LOGO and FAI emblem

COMPETITORS DECLARATION FORM (ANNEX 6E.1)

This form must be completed and signed by the competitor and endorsed by the competitor's NAC. Competitors are to indicate answers YES or NO by circling the appropriate boxes

Competitor's Name	National identification.	Model name & type	Class - F4B F4C, F4G, F4H
-------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------------

If your flight schedule is to include Optional Demonstrations 6.3.7. P or Q - Flight function by subject aircraft - provide full details of your manoeuvre(s) here or on a separate sheet.

NON-AEROBATIC DECLARATION - Under the terms of rule 6.3.7, do you consider your aircraft to be non-aerobatic ? If YES give reasons below.

YES	NO
-----	----

Annex 6E.1 continued - STATIC JUDGING QUESTIONNAIRE

Was the structure of this model researched and designed entirely by you ?	YES	NO
Was this model built using a commercially available design or plan ? If YES state the name of the person who has drawn the plan.	YES	NO
Was this model built from a kit? If YES, state kit manufacturer's name	YES	NO

Indicate if any of the following items are supplied as part of a kit or not made by you. List any additional items (other than R/c equipment) in the empty spaces or on a separate sheet.

Moulded or built up fuselage	YES	NO
Pre-formed or built up wing panels	YES	NO
Pre-formed or built up tail surfaces	YES	NO
Moulded canopy	YES	NO
Moulded or spun engine cowlings	YES	NO
Undercarriage assembly	YES	NO
Wheels	YES	NO
Tyres	YES	NO
Guns, bombs or other fittings	YES	NO
Spinners	YES	NO
Scale propellers	YES	NO
Instrument panel or cockpit interior	YES	NO
Printed or pre-cut markings or decals	YES	NO
Wire rigging or fittings	YES	NO
	YES	NO
	YES	NO

COMPETITORS CERTIFICATION

F4B, F4C and F4G - I certify that I am the builder of the model and the answers given above are correct

NameSignature.....

F4H only – I certify that I applied the colour scheme and markings to the model and the answers given above are correct

NameSignature.....

ENDORSEMENT BY THE COMPETITOR'S NATIONAL AIRSPORTS CONTROL

I certify that the Competitors Certification is valid and the answers given above have been verified.

Name.....Signature.....

Position Held /Authority.....

RATIFIED

SCALE Nationals Report to Council - 08/09/12 and Tech Council 10/10/12

The Scale Nationals for R/C, C/L and F/F were held successfully at RAF Barkston Heath during the August Public Holiday. For once the strength of the wind had less of an impact until, after a pilots' meeting on Monday, the CD took the sensible decision to cancel the final round of F4C as the gathering wind strength would not have allowed a full round to be completed. Frequent showers did interrupt proceedings, especially on Saturday, but with entries in the R/C events being lower than usual this did not prevent full rounds being flown. The reasons for the lower entries (18% down on last year) will be investigated by the Scale Tech Committee but the proximity of the World Championships in Spain which ended only 2 weeks prior to the Nats is likely to account for the lack of our usual overseas competitors. Nevertheless, the interest in the new Standoff Class, which had the highest class entry of 11, is encouraging and this did attract previous entrants of F4C and Flying Only as anticipated. The provision of an extra tent to allow the weighing of models out of the wind was much appreciated and had the added benefit of providing additional protection for models during the frequent showers. Same again next year please!

The main area of concern on the Scale R/C flight line was the repeated incursions into scale airspace by certain show line aircraft. The wind direction necessitated a cross-runway flight pattern for Scale and the flight judges had to be positioned on the far side of the runway intersection with their backs to the show line. Several large, high-energy show aircraft came so far out of their designated zone that they were observed persistently conducting reversals above the heads of our judges which is not acceptable. There was good communication between the 2 lines throughout the weekend and some show pilots did respond to requests to amend their flight patterns but others did not. Eventually it was agreed that scale would cease flying to allow some demonstration flights but this was only possible because we were not pushed for time and it cannot be allowed to be the norm. In addition, pyrotechnics were let off unannounced during the Red Arrows pair display which was very distracting for someone in the middle of a contest flight. There is no need or place for pyrotechnics to be used on the show line at this event where competition flying must take precedence, however rich and famous the display pilots! I must add that a productive exchange was had after the event with the show line director and we have an assurance that most of our concerns will be addressed next year.

After fear that C/L Scale might be in the final stages of becoming an endangered species there were some encouraging signs of a rekindling of interest. Whilst there were still only 4 entrants this year, the CD reported that he received a number of enquiries and expressions of intent to dust off old skills. We look forward to seeing whether this comes to fruition.

The main area of success this year was in Free Flight, which had more entrants than R/C for the first time in many years with a total of 30 entries, evenly spread across the three classes. We were also blessed with some good weather on both evenings and a more favourable wind direction. Although not all returned a qualifying flight score there were some spectacular flights and a good collection of new models to entertain the spectators. The main concern after last year was safety and the changes we made worked well. We were more flexible with the positioning of the crowd line, which was set further back to give more room and time to react. The competitors cooperated in staying within the pits area and also launching well away from the crowd and pits, although one large model did run into the back of a modeller who was unaware. We all need to be alert with warnings. The big improvement was the provision of two stewards in dayglo vests who kept the spectators within bounds. This was much appreciated and we would hope to have the same provision next year.

Finally, as always, the STC would like to put on record our thanks to the judges and assistants (31 in all!) and our appreciation for sterling job done once again by our CD, Graham Kennedy.

Ian Pallister

Council Delegate Scale TC

7 September 2012

Free Flight Nationals report 2012

The Free Flight Nationals were held over the Bank Holiday Weekend 2-4 June, one week later than usual due to the movement of the Bank Holiday for the Jubilee. Concerns that the Jubilee might adversely affect entries proved to be unfounded, with a slight increase over 2011. Once again the BMFA office did an excellent job in processing entries, transporting and setting up equipment and distributing results.

As ever, the contest was dependent on the weather which was good but breezy on the Saturday, wet, windy and horrible on the Sunday and very good on the Monday. Fortunately, wind direction was stable on each day and there was no need for movements of control. All contests achieved results with no problems.

SAM 35 presence was greater than previously and in spite of some misunderstandings about events to be run during the run-up to the Nationals, all worked smoothly over the three days with good liaison between the SAM 35 co-ordinator and the BMFA organisation. The addition of the variety of events run by SAM helped to create a more inclusive atmosphere that was very welcome.

RAF liaison and airfield security both worked well. Farmer liaison had done a good job of establishing potential problem areas and with the wind direction being kind to us there were no reported problems.

Financial results are expected to show a small positive balance.

FFTC 20/08/12

CEO/NATS Co-ordinator report to Tech Council – October 2012

Attached is the 'wish list' submitted to Cranwell for consideration. Please note that these are requests and are not confirmed. It is unlikely that we will be granted all of the dates requested.

SF Nats Venues

In liaison with the SFTC, I have resumed work to try and secure a suitable venue for the 2013 SF Nats.

RC, Scale & CL Nationals 2012

From an organisational point of view, the Nationals ran very smoothly this year. We had hoped that the promise of full airfield access from Thursday night would have made the set-up easier, but the emergency arrival of a Puma helicopter on Wednesday afternoon created some complications.

Fortunately on Friday, the Puma crew were left to liaise with us which allowed us (albeit slightly restricted) access onto the airfield. Until mid-afternoon, it looked as though they would be with us for the weekend, with the Puma parked in the hangar with a permanent guard. However, they were able to depart late afternoon allowing full airfield access. The majority of the airfield set-up was completed by Friday evening, and the arrangements with the three CL cages seemed to work particularly well.

Even the weather was fairly kind to us this year, although the poor forecast no doubt reduced gate figures on Saturday.

The Swapmeet was located outside this year and the location we selected worked very well. It was far easier to marshal and caused less disruption. It also seemed to be well received by those attending, although had it been raining it may have been a different matter. The established 'Nats Team' did a truly excellent job this year and particular thanks should be noted for (in no particular order):

Keith & Christine Lomax – who were first to arrive on site and last to leave. Keith helped with the pre-event set-up and then worked as Treasurer and Christine managed the Camp Gate and security team.

Wayne Pendleton – helped with the set-up and then worked as Flightline Controller.
Tony Butterworth – Organised the camp site team with the efficiency we have come to expect.

Tom Jones – Responsible for the hired in plant & equipment and ensuring that those who needed electricity received it (and that it all kept working during the weekend). Tom improves and develops this area year on year and already has plans for next year.

Robin & Poppy Gowler – Who looked after the VIP's.

Mark Wigley and the roping crew who were super-efficient this year.

Andy Symons – Event Safety Co-ordinator responsible for the safety team. Also involved in set-up and break-down and co-ordinating the Swapmeet marshalling team.

Nikki & Pete Hadlow – Who organised the trade village.

Linda Harding – Who co-ordinated the day gate team.

John French – Who assisted with the supervision of the grass cutting and marquee set-up.

Mick & Hazel Stroud – Who set up the toilets/showers and took on the customary unblocking of drains!

Manny Williamson and his team who organised the Showline. Manny also co-ordinated production of this years programme along with Gemma Sargeant who designed it and John Irish who sold the advertising space. I am pleased to report that this year the programme generated an income of £800 for the event!

Sian Sargeant who was responsible for pre-event ticketing and pre & post event accounting.

Helen Feaver who organised the Dart Building Workshop this year.

Keith Barker who organised the BMFA Stand.

Nigel Hancock who created the Nats website for us, commentated on the Showline and supervised the grass collection. Nigel is 'fairly new' to the Nationals, but has quickly become a valued and integral part of the team.

Flt Lt Leon Creese – RAF Liaison Officer and Showline commentator. Leon is extremely valuable to us and it is great that he has become an integral part of the team.

Pete James – Who is one of the instructors at Barkston Heath and who has been extremely useful to us over the years. Pete helped with the VIP's again this year and his son Matthew worked with Linda on the day gate. Although they live locally, they camped on site.

Bill Marsden – Who managed the hangar & Swapmeet (along with Phil Wigley).

There were of course innumerable other people involved and I apologise if I've missed out any of the 'key players'. I think everyone is on-board for next year and I look forward to working with them all again.

We are also fortunate that we work with an excellent range of contractors and suppliers, most of whom we now have long standing relationships with and they know exactly what's required. New for this year was Charles Herring who supplied all of the crowd barriers and CL cages. He did an excellent job for us.

I am aware of the issues which arose between Showline and Scale and some changes will be introduced for 2013 which should help alleviate further problems in the future.

The accounts are not yet finalised, but early indications are that the surplus will be a few thousand pounds.

Arrangements have already commenced for 2013 (the marquees are booked and I've confirmed Manny as Showline Co-ordinator once again!).

Dave Phipps
CEO & NATS Co-ordinator

In a control-line year in CIAM, the inclusion of a silencer and noise reduction of 14dBa in F2C finally came to fruition, but has not been well received by F2C competitors world wide, effective from 2013.

Clarifications were also made in F2A and F2D.

Control-line competitors had a 'weather disruptive' start to the year, but actually had the best weather for years at the Nationals in August. By virtue of the World Championships in Bulgaria being held at the same time, many of our fliers were missing, raising some issues over team selection for the European Championships in Hungary next year.

Our only success at the World Championships was in F2A Speed, with 2nd, 5th and 8th winning the gold medal. This was the 15th consecutive year that the team has been successful.

The flying site for the World Championships had been changed from its original venue and proved to be below the standard expected for such an event. Numbers in control-line remain static with 'mature' support; the juniors not forthcoming, which is a concern.

Vernon Hunt
Control-line delegate

SCALE TC REPORT TO TECHNICAL COUNCIL – 20 OCTOBER 2012

Chris Allen and Andy Sephton have undertaken a comprehensive rationalisation of the Section 6 Scale Contest Rules for 2013. This eliminates duplication, separates rules from the Judges' Guide, incorporates changes agreed for 2013 and makes the numbering of the whole book more logical. Chris has also published a think piece in the Scale Newsletter and on the STC website to seek views and stimulate debate on eliminating the segregation between aerobatic and non-aerobatic prototypes and changing the emphasis on how realism should be judged. Any changes ensuing from this would not be introduced until 2014.

The F4C team result at this year's World Championships was disappointing by GBR standards with Mick Reeves the highest placed at 10th and the team placing 5th out of the 16 countries taking part. Results in the concurrent Internationals were better with Mick Henderson 2nd in F4H (Standoff) and Richard Crapp 4th in F4G (Large Scale). The conditions in Spain left a lot to be desired with the narrow runway suffering a crosswind and strong thermal activity for most of the week making conditions for biplanes much of a lottery. Our GBR team manager and judge have both made strong representations to the CIAM sub-committee chairman on the need for more critical selection of flying sites and a more rigorous application of the rules, particularly with respect to the Builder of Model rule.

As there have been no bids to host a European Championships for F4C in 2013 we did not hold a team trial this year.

Ian Pallister

Scale Tech Committee Chairman & Delegate

Free Flight report to Technical Council 2012

An extensive rules change process (from 2011 rules) was completed in time for the publication of the 2012 rules book and the start of the 2012 contest calendar. Operating procedures incorporating the FAI rules where practical and relevant were incorporated and in particular the rules for the Team Selection process were completely rewritten.

The Contest programme for the year is now nearly complete with two events to go. In general, despite the 'wettest summer on record', it has run without problems. Entries have been comparable with previous seasons (wet and dry).

The Free Flight Nationals were held over the Bank Holiday Weekend 2-4 June. Entries were slightly increased from 2011. The weather was good on day one, Saturday; wet and nasty on day two, Sunday; and very good on day three, Monday. All contests achieved results with no problems. SAM 35 presence was good and despite some miscommunication about events to be run, all worked smoothly over the three days with good liaison between SAM35 and the BMFA organisation. The variety of events run by SAM helped to give a pleasant atmosphere that was reminiscent of 60s and 70s Nationals. Financial results are expected to show a small positive outcome.

The first of the two UK run Free Flight Internationals (Stonehenge Cup) ran smoothly and attracted a moderate overseas entry. The second event (Equinox Cup) also ran smoothly but unfortunately only attracted a single overseas entry.

Teams were selected and sent to: The F1A, F1B and F1C European Championships; F1E European Championships; and Space World Championships with results varying from generally good to excellent. In particular the F1A, B and C teams did very well with an individual Bronze medal in F1B Rubber and a Team Gold in F1C Power. The team for the Space World Championships produced a generally good and professional performance. However, no medals were won due to problems with motors and retrieval conditions.

A 'Technology Workshop' event was held at the beginning of the year with the intention of providing practical information to those who felt that they needed help with utilising the benefits arising from modern Free Flight technology. The event was held at the Husbands Bosworth Gliding Club and was based round hands-on experience and 'show n' tell'. Overall it was well received and most participants went home better informed and keen to make good use of the knowledge acquired.

Planning for 2013 is well underway. The contest calendar – including the Free Flight Nationals and UK International - has been published but requires some minor revisions. The rules change is nearly complete and the changes required for the 2013 Free Flight rule book will be sent to the Technical secretary within the next 14 days. Lastly, another 'Workshop' event is being planned for early spring. Organisation of the programme is in progress with the intention of providing even more 'practical' experience.

FFTC 18/10/12