



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*



CIVA Rules Committee Report

Based on Rules & Judging Committees Joint Meetings

Agenda item 14.1

Version 1 / 23 October 2022

INTRODUCTION

The Rules and the Judging Committees jointly met in Lezno, Poland on 3 August 2022, and carried out work on outstanding items thereafter.

In attendance on 3 August meeting – with wrap-up and subsequent work involving Committees in full, except representatives from FAI-suspended NAC of Russia:

Rules Committee (RC):

Matthieu Roulet - Chairman (FRA), Hanspeter Rohner (SUI), Pierre Varloteaux (FRA)

Judging Committee (JC):

Pierre Varloteaux - Chairman (FRA), Madelyne Delcroix (FRA) (*online*)

CIVA President:

Nick Buckenham

Observers:

Carole Holyk (CAN), Steve Todd (GBR)

After the deadline of 1 July 2022 for the submission of Sporting Code “Normal Proposals”, the meeting package was assembled, and distributed on 22 July to the CIVA Bureau, RC / JC / GAC members, and to all CIVA Delegates. Two revisions followed (v2 published on 2 August with an update on Spain proposal ESP#4 ; v3 published on 24 August with addition of five missing Austria proposals submitted in Q4 2021). Successive versions were made available on the CIVA-News website as well as on the FAI CIVA Documents webpage.

In this report, we have summarized the actions taken by RC/JC Committees on the Power proposals (applicable to Section 6 Part 1). Actions on Glider proposals taken by the GAC (applicable to Section 6 Part 2) are reported in a separate Agenda report.

Those proposals submitted by Delegates which were either withdrawn or did not survive the RC / JC review are not included in this report, for the sake of brevity.

Passing the RC / JC review is the result of a consensus or majority decision by the Committees, that those proposals shall be considered by the Plenary. Please note that passing this review does not necessarily imply that the RC / JC recommend those proposals to be adopted.

Also for the sake of brevity, proposals are not reproduced in full in this report. Please refer to the CIVA “Rule Proposals for 2023” document for full details and rationales.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Roulet', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Matthieu Roulet
Chairman, CIVA Rules Committee
23 October 2022

NP2023-1:

Source: ESP #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase in the number of permitted figures in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

Add the following figures (A.15. Family 8.4.13 To 8.4.14) in the figures accepted for Programmes 2, 3 and 4:

-8.4.13.2

-8.4.14.2

NP2023-2:

Source: ESP #2

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase in the number of permitted figures in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

Add the following figures (A.15. Family 8.4.13 To 8.4.14) in the figures accepted for Programmes 2, 3 and 4

-7.4.2.3

-7.4.2.4

NP2023-3:

Source: ESP #3

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase in the number of permitted figures in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

Remove the paragraph:

A.15.1.3. Unlimited: No unlinked and opposite rolls (ref A.2.2.2), nor combinations of flick roll and aileron roll (ref A.2.2.4), permitted on the 45° down line of 8.4.15 to 8.4.18

And insert:

- A.15.1.3. Unlimited: Unlinked and opposite rolls (ref A.2.2.2), and combinations of flick roll first and aileron roll after (ref A.2.2.4), permitted on the 45° down line of 8.4.15 to 8.4.18

Note from RC: This proposal is actually to remove A.15.1.3.

NP2023-4:

Source: ESP #4

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase in the number of permitted figures in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

Modify paragraph A.2.2.3. as follows (addition underlined):

- A.2.2.3. Combinations of aileron roll first, and then flick roll, may be added in Families 1, 5, 7 and 8 on 45° up lines. The combined extent of rotation shall not exceed 540° with not more than 4 stops.

Remove the paragraph:

- A.8.1.1. All categories: In Family 5, No flick rolls permitted on ascending vertical or 45-degree lines, except in Family 5.2.1

And insert:

- A.8.1.1. All categories except Unlimited: In Family 5, No flick rolls permitted on ascending vertical or 45-degree lines, except in Family 5.2.1

Unlimited: In Family 5, No flick rolls permitted on ascending vertical, except in Family 5.2.1.

NP2023-5:

Source: ESP #5

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase in the number of permitted figures in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

Add the following figures (A.24. Family 9.10, Negative Flick-Rolls) in the figures accepted for Programmes 2, 3 and 4:

- Three quarter negative flick-roll in a 45-degree negative line up (9.10.2.3)
- Three quarter negative flick-roll in a horizontal negative line (9.10.3.3)
- Three quarter negative flick-roll in a 45-degree negative line down (9.10.4.3)
- Three quarter negative flick-roll in a 45-degree positive line up (9.10.7.3)
- Three quarter negative flick-roll in a horizontal positive line (9.10.8.3)
- Three quarter negative flick-roll in a 45-degree positive line down (9.10.9.3)

Note from RC: Repeat proposal from [NP2022-16] rejected at 2021 Plenary.

NP2023-6:

Source: ESP #6

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Remove the Perception Zero from the rule book

Proposal:

Remove the Perception Zero as an element of judging, and return to the previous system, in which any figure incorrectly flown with respect to a geometrical criterion or technical criterion (i.e. all the PZ cases, according 4.4.2.1) would be HZ.

Notes from RC:

- *Repeat proposal from [NP2022-18] rejected at 2021 Plenary.*
- *Potential workability issues (see dedicated paper).*
- *To be discussed in conjunction with [NP2023-13] on similar subject.*

NP2023-7:

Source: ESP #7

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Permit certain flick-roll and aileron-roll combinations in Unlimited

Proposals:

Change the paragraph in Sporting Code, Section 6 Part 1 - Powered Aircraft
APPENDIX A: LIST OF FIGURES FOR PROGRAMMES 2, 3 AND 4

A.10.1.1. All Categories: Flick-rolls are not permitted on the horizontal entry lines of figures in columns 1 and 2, nor on the horizontal exit lines of figures in columns 3 and 4, of 7.2.1 to 7.2.4.

For the following:

A.10.1.1. All Categories: Flick-rolls are not permitted on the horizontal entry lines of figures in columns 1 and 2.

Note from RC: Repeat proposal from [NP2022-19] rejected at 2021 Plenary.

NP2023-8:

Source: ESP #8

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Modify the limitation in the number of flick-rolls permitted in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

in TABLE Sporting Code, Section 6. Part 1 - Powered Aircraft. 2.3. Programmes 2, 3 & 4 - The Free Unknown Programmes 2.3.1.4.a):

Remove the paragraph:

Total of Families 9.9 and 9.10 not to exceed eight, at least two of which must be vertically climbing

Insert the paragraph:

Total of Families 9.9 and 9.10 not to exceed nine, at least three of which must be vertically climbing

Note from RC: Repeat proposal from [NP2022-21] rejected at 2021 Plenary (and current paragraph 2.3.1.4.a was already a change adopted at 2021 Plenary).

NP2023-9:

Source: ESP #9

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase the number of permitted flick-rolls per figure to two, in up to two figures, in Programmes 2, 3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal amended by RC (*editorials only – RC amendments highlighted*):

Remove paragraph 2.3.1.4 b):

2.3.1.4.b) There will not be more than 1 flick-roll (Family 9.9 or 9.10) per figure.

Insert the paragraph 2.3.1.4 b):

2.3.1.4.b) Two flick-rolls per figure will be permitted in up to two figures (family 9.9 or 9.10) ~~except in two figures per programme~~

NP2023-10:

Source: ESP #10

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Modification for the Programmes 3 & 4, as UNKNOWNS

Proposal:

Modify paragraph 2.3.1.5:

2.3.1.5 The contest Organiser shall provide copies of the list of figures to all competing NACs, and each NAC may submit to the International Jury a maximum of two sequences,

composed of these figures, for each Programme. The contest Organiser will determine the deadline for submitting proposed sequences. Computer files must be submitted, and must contain complete pages of all five Forms: A, B, C, R and L. Acceptable file formats and responsibility of submitting NACs in terms of up-to-date software are as described in rule 2.2.1.9.a).

Inserting 2.3.1.5:

2.3.1.5 The contest Organiser shall provide copies of the list of figures to all competing NACs, and each NAC may submit to the International Jury a maximum of two sequences for programme 2 and only one sequence for programmes 3 and 4, composed of these figures. The contest Organiser will determine the deadline for submitting proposed sequences. Computer files must be submitted, and must contain complete pages of all five Forms: A, B, C, R and L. Acceptable file formats and responsibility of submitting NACs in terms of up-to-date software are as described in rule 2.2.1.9.a).

And remove paragraph:

2.3.1.6.c) At least 12 hours before the commencement of each Programme, each competitor will notify the Organiser which of the proposed sequences he/she will fly

And insert:

2.3.1.6.c) At least 12 hours before the commencement of Programme 2, each competitor will notify the Organiser which of the proposed sequences he/she will fly. For programmes 3 and 4, at least 12 hours before the commencement of each Programme, one of the submitted sequences will be selected through a drawing of lots. This sequence will be flown by all the pilots.

And **modify** paragraph:

2.3.1.6.e) At least 1 hour before the start of Programme 2, the Organiser shall provide each NAC with a list of the Free Unknowns chosen by each competing pilot

The bases are:

-Programme 2 remains as today

-For programmes 3 and 4, each country proposes one sequence only.

*-International Jury checks **and approves** all the sequences, as today.*

-Drawing of lots of the proposed sequences, selecting one, at least 12 hours before the first flight, as today.

-All pilots fly the same sequence in programmes 3 and 4.

NP2023-11:

Source: ESP #11

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase in the number of figures permitted in Programmes 2,3 and 4 in Unlimited

Proposal:

Remove paragraph A.17.1.7.:

A.17.1.7. Unlimited: From 8.6.5 to 8.6.8: No flick-rolls on vertical down lines after a hesitation roll in the loop

Note from RC: Repeat proposal from [NP2022-26] rejected at 2021 Plenary.

NP2023-12:

Source: ESP #12

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Removal of Intermediate Category from Category 1 Championships

Proposal:

Remove the Intermediate Category from World Championship, Open Continental Championship or Continental Championship First Category competition status and move it to a Second Category event.

Existing rule:

1.2.2. Contest Categories

1.2.2.1. All flights carried out by competitors must be made solo; this applies to competition flights and training flights.

1.2.2.2. Contest categories are:

- a) Unlimited ("U")
- b) Advanced ("A")
- c) Yak 52 ("Y52")
- d) Intermediate ("I")

1.2.2.3. Intermediate World and Continental Championships: Specificities

- a) Intermediate World and Continental Championships shall be run to the exact same flying regulations as the "Y52" World and Continental Championships.

- b) The Organiser of “Y52” events (World or Continental Championships) may elect to combine it with an “I” International competition (see below).
- c) In case “I” and “Y52” are combined:
 - i) The “I” competition shall operate in all aspects in an identical manner to the “Y52” contest it is combined with (same programmes, same judges, same jury).
 - ii) Programmes shall be flown in an integrated manner, i.e. both types of entry shall be treated in exactly the same manner with regards to flight order and judging.
 - iii) The “I” and “Y52” results shall be determined separately.

New rule:

1.2.2.2.d) Remove the Intermediate “I” category

1.2.2.3. Delete references to Intermediate and I competitions

[further amendments to references to Intermediate and “I” competitions will be required throughout the SC].

Note from RC: To be discussed in conjunction with [NP2023-27] and with a President's proposal on same subject.

NP2023-13:

Source: ESP #13

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: Remove the Perception Zero (PZ) from the Sporting Code 6-1 and replace it with a series of fixed downgrades

Proposal amended by RC (*editorials only – RC amendments highlighted*):

Remove the Perception Zero as an element of judging, and return to the previous system, in which any figure incorrectly flown in respect to a geometrical criterion or technical criterion (i.e. all the PZ cases, according 4.4.2.1) would be HZ, and replace it by HZ or a fixed downgrade depending on the case.

Existing rule:

4.4.2. Perception Zero

4.4.2.1. A mark of "Perception Zero" (PZ) must be awarded if the Judge considers that the figure is incorrectly flown in respect of a criterion that is a matter of subjective perception, rather than clearly demonstrable fact. A PZ must be awarded if and only if:

- a) A flick-roll never started proper auto-rotation;

- b) A spin never started proper auto-rotation;
- c) A rolling turn included a flick-roll;
- d) A tail-slide does not move backwards by the required distance;
- e) An excessively long line is shown between looping segment and adjacent roll, or roll and adjacent looping segment;
- f) More than 45° of a roll is flown on the exit line of a rolling turn.

The proposed list would be:

Current PZ criteria	Downgrade
a) A flick-roll never started proper auto-rotation;	HZ
b) A spin never started proper auto-rotation;	HZ
c) A rolling turn included a flick roll;	HZ
d) A tail-slide does not move backwards by the required amount;	-4.0 points
e) An excessively long line is shown between looping segment and adjacent roll, or roll and adjacent looping segment;	-4.0 points
f) More than 45° of roll is flown on the exit line of a rolling turn.	HZ

Notes from RC:

- To be discussed in conjunction with [NP2023-6] on similar subject.

NP2023-14:

Source: ESP #14

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: Fixed downgrade of -2.0 points where an unlinked roll element after a spin is separated from the spin by more than a 'brief but perceptible pause'

Proposal:

Existing Rule:

- B.9.29.4. After completion of the prescribed number of turns, the aircraft must stop rotating precisely on the pre-stated heading, then a 90 degree down, wings level attitude must be seen. Grading criteria for the basic figure being flown then resumes. If a roll follows a spin, there should be a brief, but perceptible pause (similar to unlinked rolls) between the spin and the roll. Because there is no vertical line before the spin, there is no criterion to center either a spin element alone or a spin-roll combination on the vertical down line. Be alert for early stopping of the stalled autorotation followed by "aileronings" to the pre-stated heading. In this case, a deduction of one (1) point for every five (5) degrees of "aileroning" must be applied. For example, in a one-turn spin

the autorotation is observed to stop after 345 degrees of rotation and the ailerons are used to complete the rotation. The highest score this spin could receive is a 7.0.

New Rule:

B.9.29.4. After completion of the prescribed number of turns, the aircraft must stop rotating precisely on the pre-stated heading, then a 90 degree down, wings-level attitude must be seen. Grading criteria for the basic figure being flown then resumes. If a roll follows a spin, there should be a brief, but perceptible pause (no more than one second in duration) between the spin and the roll. If the pause exceeds one second a downgrade of -2.0 marks shall apply. Because there is no vertical line before the spin, there is no criterion to centre either a spin element alone or a spin-roll combination on the vertical down line. Be alert for early stopping of the stalled autorotation followed by "aileroning" to the pre-stated heading. In this case, a deduction of one (1) point for every five (5) degrees of "aileroning" must be applied. For example, in a one-turn spin the autorotation is observed to stop after 345 degrees of rotation and the ailerons are used to complete the rotation. The highest score this spin could receive is a 7.0.

Notes from RC/JC:

- *This proposal raises a consistency issue with other mentions of 'brief but perceptible pause' in other rules as well.*
- *Timing is currently never used as a judging criterion -- measuring the time elapsed after the spin exit until the next rotation starts, is not realistic.*
- *It is acknowledged that the existing rule can be improved. However it is recommended not to vote on this proposal as this would not help harmonization of existing rules, but to discuss at Plenary a way forward towards harmonization (in some areas there is "brief but perceptible pause", in some others "excessively long stop" with downgrades of "at least two points", there is a radius criterion for time between half loops and rotations with downgrades up to PZ...)*

NP2023-19:

Source: GBR #1
 Document: Section 6 Part 1
 Subject: Increase the Disqualification heights for Advanced, Yak52/Intermediate to 150m

Proposal:

To increase the Disqualification heights for Advanced, Yak52/Intermediate to 150m.

Existing rule:

3.8. Height Limitations

3.8.1.1. The following height limitations have been determined for all contest flights:

Category	Upper	Lower	Disqualification
Unlimited	1000 m	100 m	50 m
Advanced	1100 m	200 m	100 m
Yak 52 / Intermediate	1200 m	200 m	100 m

New rule:

3.8.1.1. Disqualification height for Advanced, Yak52/Intermediate is amended to 150m.

Notes from RC:

- The reason for rule change proposals NP2023-19 and NP 2023-20 only concerns countries which operate with EASA SERA rules.
- For these countries, minimum heights for VFR flights are stated in SERA.3105, and, as pointed out in the proposal rationale, specified in SERA.5005 (f) which includes the following sentence: “Except when necessary for take-off or landing, or except by permission from the competent authority, a VFR flight shall not be flown (...)”.
- While authorized minimum heights are not to be breached, it ensues that, according to a consulted aviation law expert, competent authorities of each individual country operating with EASA SERA rules have the right to authorize exceptions to minimum heights for aerobatics and under certain conditions. No issues with minimum height rules have been reported from these countries, i.e. mechanisms are in place.
- Therefore concerned countries have solutions, and there is no requirement to change current minimum heights for aerobatic competitions for these countries, let alone for all others.

NP2023-20:

Source: GBR #2

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Increase the Lower height limit for Unlimited to 200m and the Disqualification height to 150m

Proposal:

To increase the Lower height limit for Unlimited to 200m and the Disqualification height to 150m.

Existing rule:

3.8. Height Limitations

3.8.1.1. The following height limitations have been determined for all contest flights:

Category	Upper	Lower	Disqualification
Unlimited	1000 m	100 m	50 m
Advanced	1100 m	200 m	100 m
Yak 52 / Intermediate	1200 m	200 m	100 m

New rule:

3.8.1.1. Lower height for Unlimited is amended to 200m. Disqualification height for Unlimited is amended to 150m.

Notes from RC: see note from RC under NP2023-19.

NP2023-21:

Source: HUN #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: International Teams

Proposal *(not submitted to implementation vote – see notes below):*

According to FAI Sporting Code General Section paragraph 4.5.3.2, an International Team is a group of two or more competitors, who collectively represent more than one NAC or are FAI participants, and an FAI team is a group of two or more FAI participants.

It is proposed that all competitions are open to International Teams as well as FAI Teams.

All National Teams will be named from the country that they represent (e.g. Australia, Germany,...) and each NAC can enter only one National Team.

All International Teams and FAI Teams must be named so that no confusion is possible with any National Team (e.g. Breitling Team, RedBull Team, South American Team are acceptable, but Breitling Switzerland Team is not acceptable).

Notes from RC:

*To be discussed / debated at Plenary, but **not workable** as such, i.e. not implementable. Therefore, the proposal itself cannot be subject to vote. In case Delegates would favour moving forward in this direction, a Working Group should be established, with a mandate to elaborate and assess options for CIVA.*

RC's review and rationale:

- *FAI as well as CIVA's World and Continental championships revolve around the notion of Nations, just like the Olympic Games for instance: except in regulated cases in which this is not possible, competitors are entered by their respective NAC, and they represent their NAC in the championships. The entire CIVA Sporting Code is structurally imbued with this fundamental DNA premise, in the same way as other FAI championships and as Olympic Games.*
 - *Members of FAI are National organisations – or international organisations concerned with aeronautics or astronautics elected to membership of FAI. This is not applicable to commercial brands (such as Red Bull or Breitling as in the proposal examples).*
 - *Sporting Licences (mandatory for a competitor to enter FAI championships) are issued to individuals by FAI National organisations only (except in regulated cases in which this is not possible).*
 - *“Entry applications to a First Category Event shall be made only through the NAC of which the applicant holds a Sporting Licence or, in the case of an FAI applicant, through the FAI.”*

- *When we look around at the sporting world, all international championship events are organised either as nation-based, or as “club”/commercial/brand-based, never both at the same time for the same event – because these two bases cannot be mixed: could one imagine a championship in which Nations would compete against e.g. Adidas / Coca-Cola / Google / Tesla? Possibly in an exhibition, not in a world championship event. Let us take just a few examples to illustrate this:*
 - *In football (soccer) and other collective sports, both concepts co-exist but they are not mixed in a single event: e.g. the World Cup is nation-based (with flow-down of all corresponding eligibility rules to be part of a team), while the champions league is club-based.*
 - *The Formula-1 car racing series is commercial/brand-based.*
 - *In cycling, the UCI world championships is nation-based (with, again, competitors representing their national federation), while e.g. the Tour de France is commercial/brand-based.*

These observations nevertheless may lead to new avenues for CIVA development, in the form of a distinct competition series that would be commercial/brand-based, and operate separately from / parallel to the existing championships that are nation-based – in case Delegates would declare interest in investigating and pursuing this opportunity.

- *The FAI Sporting Code General Section 4.5.3.2. defines ‘International Teams’ as groups “of two or more competitors, who collectively represent more than one NAC or are FAI Participants” (FAI Participants are competitors unable to represent a NAC). While the General Section gives such a provision for “International Teams”:*
 - *It does not give anything else than a definition; in particular it does not give any indication or specification about implementation, nor does it give any rule on whether such teams should or may be authorized in a given FAI event (except the following mention in 4.5.5.4: “In team*

events the relevant ASC may restrict the participation of International Teams in First Category Events.”

- “International Teams” are defined as representing more than one NAC, which means they would still represent a group of NACs, not a brand. In any event this definition therefore could open the door to groups of NACs only presenting a Team, however circumstances and articulation with respect to Teams presented by single NACs (baseline as of today) remain to be elaborated and understood entirely – with questions such as: can a NAC present a Team and at the same time be part of a group of NACs presenting a Team? Can any group of NACs be formed to present a Team, or would some rules apply? Would such a Team be entered by the corresponding group of NACs collectively, or could it enter itself (in which case CIVA could find itself in a situation where NACs are responsible to enter pilots who may compete against their National Team... see also NP2023-22), and in that case would it be required that concerned NACs approve International Team members? At what time such Teams would be required to be declared (a proposal is made in NP2023-22)? Would there be a minimum and/or maximum number of NACs assembling an ‘International Team’? etc.

- Therefore, available information makes it very difficult to understand the purpose of “International Teams” as per FAI Sporting Code General Section 4.5.3.2., what cases the concept was expected to solve when it was created, and more importantly how it could be implemented without generating unwanted consequences, up to colliding with FAI fundamental principles. Clarifications from CASI and/or the FAI EB shall be sought. Only then can CIVA discuss a potential way forward and Delegates can make fully educated decisions, otherwise there would be huge risk for CIVA to throw its established championship structure into chaos and hence considerably damage its future perspectives. The RC would fail its mandate if it ignored these key considerations, and came to the unavoidable conclusion that this proposal cannot be accepted as ‘good-to-go’ for Plenary vote.

NP2023-22:

Source: HUN #2

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: Predetermined members for Teams ranking

Proposal amended by RC (RC amendments highlighted) (parts on ‘International Teams’ not submitted to implementation vote – see notes under [NP2023-21]):

Section 6 Part 1 paragraph 1.2.6.1 and others are modified as follows (changes underlined):

Every NAC shall notify the Organizer of a Championship, not less than two months before it is due to start, of the number of competing pilots to be entered from their countries. (...). Of these pilots, a minimum of two (2) and a maximum of three (3), regardless of gender, can be eligible for a team medal of their NAC. The name of these two (2) or three (3) pilots will have to be given by every NAC at the latest the day before the official start of the competition.

All pilots who are not elected or who do not plan or who do not want to be elected by their NAC for competing for the team medal of their NAC can form International Teams, as defined by FAI. International Teams must be declared at the latest the day before the start of the competition.

All NAC composed of two (2) or three (3) pilots only will have all pilots eligible for team medal of their NAC by default and without the need of any notification, unless those pilots decide to form an International Team (there is no obligation for a NAC to enter a National Team).

As for individual ranking, each pilot belonging to a NAC is eligible for an individual medal as a member of his NAC, regardless of his belonging or not to a National Team or an International Team.

As a general rule and specifically in Section 6 Part 1 paragraph 2.3, no discrimination shall be made between National Teams and International Teams or FAI Teams. Therefore, the same rules for nominating figures apply among all National Teams, International Teams and FAI Teams.

Notes from RC:

- *Submitted to vote: “pre-declaration” of competitors entering the Team ranking. The pre-declaration will be per gender in case of gender-based rankings, genderless otherwise.*
- *Parts related to ‘International Teams’ form an extension to [NP2023-21] and therefore cannot be submitted to implementation vote.*
- *This proposal gives further elements on the intended ‘International Teams’ concept, which confirm and amplify concerns raised in RC notes under [NP2023-21]: competitors, who are entered by NACs, would potentially elect by themselves not to compete for their National Team but for a self-declared International Team. This would set the stage for conflicts within NACs and chaos at CIVA championships.*

NP2023-23:

Source: HUN #3
Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2
Subject: Teams ranking method

Proposal *(not submitted to implementation vote – see notes below):*

Sporting Code Section 6 Part 1 chapter 5 is modified as follows.

2 options:

HUN Proposal #3-1

All National Teams, International Teams and FAI Teams are placed together in a unique ranking.

HUN Proposal #3-2

All National Teams, International Teams and FAI Teams are placed together in an overall teams ranking. National Teams are also ranked separately in a team ranking of nations.

Notes from RC: Continuation from [NP2023-21] and [NP2023-22] on the ‘International Teams’ concept. Refer to RC notes above.

NP2023-24:

Source: HUN #4
Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2
Subject: Entry limitations per NAC

Proposal:

All limitations to the number of pilots to be entered by each NAC is removed.
All limitations to the number of male or female pilots to be entered by each NAC is removed.

In case the total number of participants notified to the organizer two months before the due start of the competition exceeds the maximum number that can be entered due to organizational reasons, the number of participants will be reduced progressively as follows:

- the organizer will consider limiting the number of competing pilots from each NAC who notified entering more than 3 pilots to a reasonable number (which can be more than 3);
- the organizer will limit the number of competing pilots from all NAC to 3 pilots maximum;
- the organizer will limit the number of competing pilots from all NAC to 2 pilots maximum.

Note from RC: Proposal linked to the 'International Teams' concept (ref in rationale: "the more pilots are entered in the competition, the more International Teams can be formed (...)"), however may be addressed on its own.

NP2023-25:

Source: HUN #5
Document: Section 6 Part 1
Subject: Remove Gender Distinction in Power Unl

Proposal:

Sporting Code Section 6 Part 1 chapter 5 as well as all other chapters and paragraphs mentioning pilot's gender are modified as follows:

HUN Proposal #5-1

All reference to gender is removed from all CIVA rules. As a consequence, there will be only one overall ranking among males and females.

HUN Proposal #5-2

All reference to gender is removed from all CIVA rules, except for individual female ranking. As a consequence, there will be only one overall teams ranking among male teams and female teams, but individual separate female ranking is kept.

Notes from RC:

- *Proposal #5-1 is a repeat from Proposals submitted several years recently – last time in 2020, rejected after in-depth review and debates at CIVA Plenary. Refer to 2020 RC report: The RC urges the Plenary to reject this proposal, which would be detrimental to CIVA.*
- *Proposal #5-2 is in effect void: the CIVA rulebook is – and shall continue to be – neutral with respect to genders, i.e. not one gender is treated differently than the other. When there is a gender-based ranking, this shall apply to both genders.*

NP2023-27:

Source: POL #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1

Subject: Remove Intermediate and Y52 class from Powered Category contests

Proposal:

To remove Intermediate and Y52 class from Powered Category contests.

Editorial changes of FAI Sporting Code section 6, part 1:

- 1.2.2.2 - remove c) and d)
- 1.2.2.3 - remove entirely
- 1.2.3.3 - remove entirely
- 1.2.5.2 - remove „Y52 and I“
- 1.2.6.1 b) - remove „Y52 and I“
- 1.2.6.2 b) - remove „Y52 and I“
- 1.3.1.1 c) xiii) - remove entirely
- 1.3.2.1 c) ii) - remove entirely
- 1.3.2.3 c) ii) - remove „and at least 5 nations in Yak52 / Intermediate“
- 1.3.4.3 - remove entirely.
- 1.4.8.1 - remove „or at least one in Y52 / I“
- 2.2.1.4 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“
- 2.2.1.8 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“
- 2.3.1.1 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“
- 2.3.1.2 - rewrite to remove „Yak 52 / Intermediate“
- 2.3.1.4 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“

3.4.1.1 - remove „(or in Yak52 / Intermediate, the first flight)“

3.6.2.6 - remove entirely

3.6.4.6 b) - remove part of table „Y52 / I“

3.8.1.1 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“

3.12.3 - remove entirely

3.13.1.2 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“

4.1.5.8 b) - remove „Y52 / I“

4.3.1.1 - remove „Y52 / I“

4.3.5.2 - remove „Y52 / I“

4.3.6.2 - remove „Y52 / I“

4.3.7.2 - remove entirely

4.3.8.4 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“

5.2 - remove part of table „Y52 / I“

5.7 - remove entirely

Appendices - remove all text related to Intermediate / Yak52 classes.

Note from RC: To be discussed in conjunction with [NP2023-12] and with a President's proposal on same subject.

NP2023-28:

Source: AUT #1

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: Line between unlinked rolls

Proposal:

Add a new paragraph to Sporting Code Section 6 Part 2, Appendix B, B.9.22.3 e) (B.9.24.4.f) in Part 1):

- B.9.22.3.e) Unlinked and opposite rotations require a brief, but perceptible pause in between the roll elements. An excessively long stop in between the rotational elements is at least a two (2) point downgrade.

Note from RC/JC: With no definition or no reference to what is an "excessively long stop", this proposal lacks maturity and, above all, integration into the overall system of downgrades. see Notes from RC/JC under NP2023-14. Therefore, as for NP2023-14, it is recommended not to vote on this proposal as this would not help harmonization of existing rules, but to discuss at Plenary a way forward towards harmonization.

NP2023-29:

Source: AUT #2
Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2
Subject: Stalls during rolls

Proposal amended by RC/JC (RC/JC amendments highlighted):

Amend Sporting Code Section 6 Part 2, 4.5.2.1.c) (4.4.2.1.c) in Part 1) to read (changes underlined):

4.5.2.1.c) A rolling turn or aileron roll included a flick roll (B.9.3.6.g and B.9.23.3)

Introduce a new paragraph Sporting Code Section 6 Part 2, Appendix B, B. 9.23.3 (B.9.25.4 in Part 1):

B.9.23.3. If a flick roll is performed instead of an aileron roll, or if an aileron roll starts correctly but at some point turns into a flick roll, the figure is graded PZ.

Note from RC/JC: For consistency with the rest of judging rules, a flick roll performed instead of an aileron roll should result in a HZ mark (wrong figure).

NP2023-30:

Source: AUT #3
Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2
Subject: Include PZ in Mix of Zeros

Proposal amended by RC/JC (editorials – RC/JC amendments highlighted):

Amend the paragraph Sporting Code Section 6 Part 2, 4.5.6.2 (4.4.6.2. in Part 1) to let it say (changes underlined):

4.5.6.2. If during this process the Chief Judge establishes that there is a mix of Hard Zeros, Perception Zeros and Numerical Zeros for the same whatever error i.e. it is only the extent of the error above 45 degrees that cannot be established (i.e. e.g. a stall in a loop occurred and a Judge awards PZ (RC/JC note: use other, valid example for Part 1), in the same figure judges award either 0.0 or HZ for an angular error being below or above 90 degrees) and these combined Zeros are in the majority for this error, the Chief Judge shall instruct those judges with the Numerical Zeros to change their score sheets to Hard Zeros and sign the sheets accordingly. the Chief Judge will then shall fill the CHZ field. Consequently, no judge will in this instance have a point added to his Hard Zero anomaly count.

Notes from RC/JC:

- *The core of this proposal is more to address Mix of Zeros caused by different errors in a figure, rather than to merely add PZ in Mix of Zeros considerations.*
- *The proposal raises as such a valid point not really covered in the rulebook. As pointed out in the proposal rationale there is no “priority rule” between types of zeros for different errors in a given figure, which would probably solve the issue.*
- *However the proposal as such raises consistency questions. What is expected of judges is a clear comment detailing the reason for a zero, therefore the sentence in the proposal rationale suggesting that “The reason “why” a figure is worth nothing should not matter, as long as there is a majority of judges who vote that no points (for whatever reasons) are to be awarded.” may be misleading or collide with firmly established judging principles in other parts of the rules (not only for traceability, but also different types of zeros will be treated differently in the FPS).*
- *A good example is given in the proposal rationale: what if, in a flick roll, “one judge thinks the flick never departed (giving a PZ) and other judges think the flick stopped early and was concluded by an aileron roll of a bit less (0.0) or more (HZ) than 90 degrees”? The intent of the original rule 4.4.6.2 (Part 1) has been not to penalize judges who would have awarded a 0.0 (e.g. perception of a 89° error) while other judges would have awarded a HZ (e.g. perception of a 91° error) – in this original intent, the case of a judge awarding a PZ for “flick never departed” but who may also have perceived e.g. a 89° early stop, is simply not addressed at all.*
- *As a conclusion, it is recognized that something is missing in the rulebook to cover such cases, however the proposed solution may not be void of adverse consequences, and it is recommended that the RC/JC work further on this topic. It is recommended not to vote on this proposal but to discuss at Plenary a way forward.*

NP2023-31:

Source: AUT #4
Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2
Subject: Video Veto right for CJ

Proposal:

Introduce a new paragraph in Sporting Code Section 6 Part 2, 4.5.4.4 b) (4.4.4.4.b) in Part 1), saying:

4.5.4.4.b) If in a case where there is a mixture of scores, Hard Zeros and Perception Zeros for a figure the Chief Judge is convinced that there is substantial evidence on the video displaying a Hard Zero, the Chief Judge shall tick the CHZ box and then refer the matter to the International Jury for clarification and a decision.

Amend 4.5.4.4 a) so that “not be able to” reads “and he is not able to”.

Amend 4.5.4.4 b) and c) to read c) and d) respectively.

NP2023-32:

Source: AUT #5

Document: Section 6 Part 1 / Part 2

Subject: No mix of 2-pilot and 3-pilot teams

Proposal:

Amend the paragraph Sporting Code Section 6 Part 2, 1.2.6.1.b) (1.2.6.1.a)iii) and 1.2.6.1.b)iii) in Part 1) to let it say (changes underlined):

1.2.6.1.b) In the event that fewer than 34 teams comprised of 3 or more pilots compete, the number of pilots required to constitute a team will be reduced to 2. The requirements of paragraph 1.2.5.1 still apply.”

Appendix 1 – Initial list of proposals from the “Rule Proposals for 2023” document

Highlighted in Yellow: Proposals for which the GAC and the RC/JC were to aim for a common position.

Repeat of proposals rejected
at Plenary 2021 or 2020

CIVA#	NAC	#	Subject	Allocation	
NP2023-1	ESP	1	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	
NP2023-2		2	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	
NP2023-3		3	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	
NP2023-4		4	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	
NP2023-5		5	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	NP2022-16
NP2023-6		6	Remove PZ	JC / RC / GAC	NP2022-18
NP2023-7		7	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	NP2022-19
NP2023-8		8	Remove limitation in number of flick rolls in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	NP2022-21
NP2023-9		9	Number of flick rolls per figure in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	
NP2023-10		10	Unknown sequences	RC / JC	
NP2023-11		11	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	RC	NP2022-26
NP2023-12		12	Remove Intermediate from Cat.1	RC	
NP2023-13		13	Remove PZ and replace by fixed downgrades	JC / RC / GAC	
NP2023-14		14	Downgrade in spin + roll combination	JC / RC / GAC	
NP2023-15	FRA	1	Drawing of lots for Unknowns	GAC	
NP2023-16		2	Figures in Unlimited Unknowns	GAC	
NP2023-17		3	Shorter Free Known	GAC	
NP2023-18		4	Edit	GAC	
NP2023-19	GBR	1	Disqualification Height in Adv / Y52 / Int	RC / JC / GAC	
NP2023-20		2	Low & Disqualification Heights in Unl	RC / JC / GAC	
NP2023-21	HUN	1	International Teams	RC / GAC	
NP2023-22		2	Predetermined members for Teams ranking	RC / GAC	
NP2023-23		3	Teams ranking method	RC / GAC	
NP2023-24		4	Entry limitations per NAC	RC / GAC	
NP2023-25		5	Remove Gender Distinction in Power Unl	RC	NP2021-19
NP2023-26	LUX	1	Freestyle	RC / JC	
NP2023-27	POL	1	Remove Y52 & Int categories	RC	
NP2023-28	AUT	1	Downgrade in roll combinations	JC / RC / GAC	
NP2023-29		2	Stalls during rolls	JC / RC / GAC	
NP2023-30		3	Include PZ in Mix of Zeros	JC / RC / GAC	
NP2023-31		4	Video Veto right for CJ	JC / RC / GAC	
NP2023-32		5	No mix of 2-pilot and 3-pilot teams	RC / GAC	

Appendix 2 – Check-list on all items in the “Rule Proposals for 2023” document

In red what was discussed in the RC/JC

Item	Part 1 for Plenary vote (incl. with amendments)	Rejected by RC/JC or Withdrawn	Part 2 (incl. with amendments)	Other	Comment
NP 2023-1	✓				
NP 2023-2	✓				
NP 2023-3	✓				
NP 2023-4	✓				
NP 2023-5	✓				
NP 2023-6	✓		✓		In connection with NP 2023-13
NP 2023-7	✓				
NP 2023-8	✓				
NP 2023-9	✓				
NP 2023-10	✓				
NP 2023-11	✓				
NP 2023-12	✓				In connection with NP 2023-27 and President’s proposal
NP 2023-13	✓		✓		In connection with NP 2023-6
NP 2023-14	✓		✓		Recommendation to discuss way forward but not to vote
NP 2023-15					
NP 2023-16					
NP 2023-17					
NP 2023-18					
NP 2023-19	✓		✓		
NP 2023-20	✓		✓		
NP 2023-21				✓	Discussion but no vote (ref RC notes)
NP 2023-22	✓		✓	✓	Part on ‘International Teams’ not for vote (ref RC notes)
NP 2023-23				✓	Discussion but no vote (ref RC notes)
NP 2023-24	✓		✓		
NP 2023-25	✓				<u>RC/JC recommendation to reject</u>
NP 2023-26		✘			Not mature. Would require unspecified review and revision of a number of rules (e.g. priority ; competition length ; separation of Freestyle competition with dedicated competitors...)
NP 2023-27					In connection with NP 2023-12 and President’s proposal
NP 2023-28	✓		✓		Recommendation to discuss way forward but not to vote
NP 2023-29	✓		✓		
NP 2023-30	✓		✓		Recommendation to discuss way forward but not to vote
NP 2023-31	✓		✓		
NP 2023-32	✓		✓		