

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-1	Multiple category	4.4.2 Competitors may only register in a single category. Exception: A competitor may also register in a lower category for the purpose of obtaining an IAC Achievement Award. 33.1 Hors Concours Entrants 33.1.1 A competitor may compete without the intent of earning flight medals or trophies. This is called an "Hors Concours" entry.	Allow trophy for HC competitors	4.4.2 Competitors may only register in a single category. Exception: A competitor may also register in a lower category for the purpose of obtaining an IAC Achievement Award. [commenter:] Some people look for loopholes in 33.1 and 33.2 - when there is only one competitor in a category they recruit someone to fly for a "patch". But since that person is flying hors concours they do not count for standings and for that reason it doesn't make sense to use these patch flights to circumvent 33.2. The whole point of having "minimum" competitors is that if you aren't vying against someone for points you don't deserve a trophy.
2022-2	Strike the rule requiring two competitors in a category for official ranking	33.1.2 A competitor competing in more than one category may only compete for medals and trophies in the highest category entered. 33.2 Minimum Competitors in a Category 33.2.1 The minimum number of competitors to comprise a category for official ranking and trophies is two.	Strike 33.2 entirely.	Rule 33.2.1 requires that there be at least two competitors to create an official ranking. The very word "ranking" implies the sense of this. However, rule 33.2.2 allows for all the other awards to be given (Grassroots, IAC Achievement Awards, etc). It appears that rule 33.2.1 is a leftover from before 33.2.2 was accepted.
2022-3	Allow trophies to be given out regardless of how many competitors are in a category	33.2.2 A competitor flying alone in a category competes Hors Concours but may still earn special awards (e.g. . Grassroots), IAC Achievement Awards, and point totals for regional, collegiate, or national awards.	Strike "if three or more competitors flew" from 33.3.1	Rule 33.3.1 allows for 3rd place trophies to be given out only of three or more competitors flew. Strangely, it has no similar restriction for 2nd place trophies in the case of only one entrant, etc.
2022-4	Late arrivals		Allow Jury to let late arrivals compete	Section 4.6 of the rule book discusses late arrivals. It only allows the jury excuse a late competitor if that tardiness is "outside of the competitor's control". One could argue (e.g. another sportsman competitor via protest) that if Nathan knew weather could be a factor that he had control to leave earlier. The jury is allowed only to interpret the rules in regards toward their intent, not violate them, so it could place the jury in an uncomfortable position. We have had instances at other contests where there was controversy over similar situations. Although I don't think likely that such a protest would occur, either because Nathan can actually make it in time or because other competitors wouldn't bother, you could request a rules waiver from Jim Bourke. Suggest you ask Jim to waive 4.6.2 to allow the jury to accept a late competitor without penalty for any reason and permit the jury to establish any operational steps necessary accommodate that competitor.
2022-5	Amend the Late Arrival rule to match actual practice	4.6 Late Arrivals 4.6.1 A competitor is declared late when it is no longer possible to complete registration, receive the required briefings, and be ready to fly prior to normal completion of their Known Program. 4.6.2 A competitor who arrives late to the contest will have zeros entered for any completed Programs unless the jury determines that the tardiness was outside of the competitor's control. 4.6.3 The jury may require the tardy competitor to fly the Known Sequence during a qualifying flight even if scores cannot be earned.	4.6 Late Arrivals 4.6.1 A competitor may arrive late with prior permission of the Contest Director. The competitor will be assessed a Failure to Prepare penalty unless an equal opportunity for Late Arrival was given to all competitors. 4.6.1 Absent prior permission, a competitor is declared tardy when it is no longer possible to complete registration, receive the required briefings, and be ready to fly prior to normal completion of their Known Program. 4.6.2 A tardy competitor will have zeros entered for any completed Programs unless the Contest Jury determines the tardiness was outside of the competitor's control. 4.6.3 The Contest Jury may require a Late Arrival to fly the Known Sequence during a qualifying flight even if scores cannot be earned.	This is all taken from a Sport Aerobatics article titled "Rules No One Follows:" According to the rule book: Competitors are required to make the first briefing and be ready to fly the first program, which is the Known. Competitors who arrive late receive a penalty. Missing the briefing is a cash penalty of \$50 and a point penalty if that fee is not paid by the time of the first flight. Missing a flight entirely results in a DQ for that entire flight. That's right, big fat zeros for every figure! The jury is allowed to waive these penalties if the tardiness is outside of the competitor's control. In actual practice: Competitors do not seem to mind the cash penalty. I suppose that \$50 is seen as a drop in the bucket compared to the overall expense of competition. Maybe the competitor even rationalizes it as a donation. The point penalty for missing the briefing should apply if the funds are not handed over in a timely manner, but with so many busy people at the start of a contest, it's probably not a high priority. But what should the Contest Director do when a competitor calls a few days before the contest and asks to be allowed to skip the first day of the contest due to a work commitment? The only safe answer according to the rules is to say "That's up to the jury". But the motivation to get another competitor signed up is strong. The answer is usually "yes". Right now you might be thinking: so what? Why can't someone come in late? But don't the feelings of the other competitors, who settled their work commitments to show up on time and volunteer, matter? How does the jury, who is tasked with enforcing the rules, turn a blind eye to them when a competitor protests? Is a work commitment a circumstance beyond the competitors control, or isn't it? Don't we all work? This is a great example of a troublesome rule because there are so many different perspectives: we have the tardy competitor, who is trying to pay the bills and still find time to support a local contest; we have the other competitors in their category who had to sit out in the sun for a full day of volunteering; we have the Contest Director who wants to get one more person registered; and we have the jury who has to make a fair and impartial ruling. If you've been in this sport long enough you've probably been in each of these positions.
2022-6	Pilot Certifications	4.3.3 Competitors must meet legal pilot certification requirements appropriate for their Aircraft. Exception: A pilot with a sport Pilot Certificate may fly a non-light sport Aircraft in the Primary or Sportsman Category, if accompanied by a qualified Safety pilot.	4.3.3 Competitors must meet legal pilot certification requirements appropriate for their Aircraft. Exception: A pilot with any pilot Certificate (including Student Pilot or Sport Pilot) may fly any aircraft in the Primary, Sportsman or Intermediate Power Category and any Glider category, if accompanied by a Safety pilot qualified to fly such aircraft.	1. Fact - Current rules 'open the door' for pilots with lower than as otherwise required for the specific aircraft (and for pilots without current medical certificates) to compete. 2. Fact - The FAA allows for pilots to share the controls of their aircraft. 3. Fact - The IAC rules allow for Safety pilots through Intermediate in Power and through Unlimited in Gliders. 4. Fact - Spin training is not required for pilot certification and many CFI's even fear spins (and pass that fear onto their students). 5. Allowing Student pilots to get aerobatic and spin experience with a qualified safety pilot may provide for enhanced numbers in our sport while increasing their spin and unusual attitude 'safety' training during their pilot training. 6. Allowing power pilots to compete in gliders and glider pilots to compete in power, may increase numbers in our sport.

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-7	Flying in Intermediate or above should disqualify a competitor from Best First-Time Sportsman	None	Add 33.6.2 Competitors are disqualified from Best First-Time Sportsman if they have previously flown any higher category.	This comes up rarely but if a competitor skips Sportsman and flies Intermediate or a higher category at their first contests, then steps down to Sportsman, they should probably not qualify for Best First-Time Sportsman.
2022-8	Delete requirement for boundary judges	2.1.2 (K) The Contest Director will be assisted by staff in the following positions: k) Boundary and Deadline Judge: records infringements of the aerobatic boundaries.	Delete requirement for boundary judges Remove boundary judges and increase weight of presentation score	Challenging for many contests to arrange for and/or staff boundaries It is difficult enough to organize a contest so why waste precious volunteer resources on boundary judging. I think it would be better to remove the boundary judges and increase the weight of the presentation score. This would most likely require more training for judges but would eliminate extra volunteers.
		7.5 Buffer 7.5.1 Boundary Judges are stationed such that there is a 50-meter (164 feet) buffer zone before boundary infringement penalties are noted.	Eliminate requirement for boundary judges	I would like to propose a change to the rule(s) (Section 2, 8 and 29 in the 2021 rule book) that requires the use of boundary judges in a contest. It is difficult enough to organize a contest and find volunteers so why waste precious volunteer resources on boundary judging. I think it would be better to remove the boundary judges and increase the weight of the presentation score. This would most likely require more training for judges but would eliminate extra volunteers. It would also improve the quality of flying by pilots. Instead of worrying about whether they are staying inside the box they will focus more on staying in the right place in the box.
		8 Boundary Judges 8.1 Qualifications 8.1.1 Boundary Judges must understand Aresti notation well enough to correctly determine which figure is being flown by a competitor. 8.2 Equipment 8.2.1 A visual sighting device will be used to determine each infringement. 8.2.2 A boundary infringement is considered to have occurred if the entire aircraft is seen outside of the sighting device. 8.3 Real-time Infringement Reporting 8.3.1 Boundary Judges will report in real time by radio: a) When the aircraft enters the Aerobatic Box buffer zone for the first time with intent to start the Performance. b) Each occurrence of a boundary crossing including which boundary was crossed and whether crossing out of the Box or crossing back in. 8.4 Infringement Records 8.4.1 Boundary Judges shall maintain written record of all infringements for each figure. Records will be provided to the Chief Judge when the Program is complete. 8.5 Traffic Alerts 8.5.1 Boundary Judges shall notify the Chief Judge immediately	Make Corner Judges Optional 2.1.2 (K) The Contest Director will be assisted by staff in the following positions: k) Optional - Boundary and Deadline Judge: records infringements of the aerobatic boundaries. 7.5 Buffer 7.5.1 Optional - Boundary Judges are stationed such that there is a 50-meter (164 feet) buffer zone before boundary infringement penalties are noted. 8 Optional - Boundary Judges	1. Unsafe to expose pilots to extreme heat with zero/limited shade and stress required by the Boundary Judge position, in addition to other common environmental factors such as biting bugs, wobbly chairs on unstable ground while trying to juggle sighting devices, reference sequencing cards and hand-held radios. This is a mentally and physically stressful role that impairs a pilot's readiness for flight, especially since they are typically last to get back to the flight line and cool down or rest. 2. Too few volunteers available at most contests. Additionally, the skill required to make good "Out on figure X, in on figure Y" calls dictate that more experienced pilots staff this role (who you need as judges and judge assistants). Furthermore, the Boundary Judge role is a disaster for new competitors and impairs the IAC's ability to encourage new members to come back. 3. Pilot's Presentation scores should reflect the pilot's ability to keep figures in the box. If the Intermediate, Advanced and Unlimited WACs don't have boundary judges, then I'm not sure why we need them.
		29.3 Grading Presentation 29.3.1 The exact method used to determine the Presentation grade is left to the individual judge but shall include the following criteria: a) Balance on the X axis. b) Management of wind conditions. c) Control of distance and altitude for best viewing angle. d) Consistent pacing. 29.3.2 While Presentation is intentionally subjective, judges must apply their methodology consistently to every pilot."	Make boundary judges optional at contests when circumstances do not allow them. In chapter 8, Boundary Judges, insert a section between 8.1 Qualifications and 8.2 Equipment. The new 8.2 will be: 8.2 Waiver 8.2.1 Boundary judges are required for sanctioned contests unless under any of the following conditions. a) there are fewer than 25 competitors. b) the area under the Aerobatic Box is inaccessible. c) the Volunteer Coordinator cannot source volunteers for these positions.	The rules require boundary judges even when it is logistically impossible to fill these roles. 1. Boundary judges are already effectively optional because Contest Directors and Contest Juries ignore the requirement when they are short staffed. Boundary judges are problems for many contests because to be qualified the volunteer must be able to read Aresti and such volunteers are in short supply. They require access to vehicles and a volunteer to drive them. Swapping out boundary judges adds a lot to the time cost of changing out judge lines between programs. Looking the other way on this rule creates hardship for the jury whose job is to make certain the rules are followed. Juries have no power to waive rules or make up new ones. This is relegated only to the sanctioning committee. 2. Boundary judges are already effectively optional due to the Rules Deviation provision in the rule book. The IAC President (and therefore chair of the Sanctioning Committee) receives many such requests for boundary judges that are always approved. The President has no better way to determine whether boundary judges are optional than the Contest Director does, so the CD request is approved. IAC Executive Director Steve Kurtzahn has kept count of how many contests ask to forego boundary judges. It is estimated that between the rules deviations and the contests that do it without asking that at least 50% of our contests run without boundary judges already. The rules should match the actual intent of the board. If the board wants these contests to run without boundaries then it should allow it in the rule book. If the board wants juries to invoke the "Contest Suspension" rule (31.3.1) and shut down the contest, it should leave the rule the way it is. Lastly I'll point out that CIVA no longer uses boundary judges. We aligned our Presentation K factors to roughly match the CIVA values already. I see two possible solutions: 1. Make boundary judges optional. This simply formalizes what is already happening in IAC-land. 2. Eliminate boundary judges entirely and either: A) use the Presentation score alone to penalize bad placement, or B) add deduction criteria for "placement" to each figure to create an additional penalty for flying a figure where it can't be properly judged. This would allow judges to penalize a competitor for flying an individual figure so far out of the box that they can't fairly judge it at all, which can be considered a distinct problem than Presentation which is about the overall aesthetics of the entire Performance. I will focus on option #1 for this proposal, but ultimately I think we should end up at option 2B eventually. It's a simple solution that I think gives everyone what they want.

2022-9	No actual requirement for boundary judges	None	Add such requirement	Question #21 on this year's R&C asks what action the contest organizers should take if it's not possible to deploy boundary judges. The accompanying hint refers to Rule 7.5.1: Boundary Judges are stationed such that there is a 50-meter (164 feet) buffer zone before boundary infringement penalties are noted. One of our judges, Mark Budd, pointed out that the gist of that rule is the geometry of the buffer zone. There's actually no language indicating that boundary judges are required, it's just an inference.
--------	---	------	----------------------	---

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-10	Rule Book is Definitive	None	26.1.9 (new) Grading Judges must base all scores and decisions solely on criteria that are explicitly defined in this rule book. Clarification: Judges must not invent or adopt other criteria, except as specifically permitted for radii and Presentation.	This is a fundamental principle of IAC judging that promotes consistency, yet it's not explicitly stated in the rules.
2022-11	Eliminate references to metric units, round all numbers to nearest 50 feet.	Numerous	To remove all metric units from the rule book: 1.Change, in all occurrences: a.3280 feet to 3300 feet b.164 feet with 150 feet c.328 feet with 350 feet d.656 feet with 650 feet e.3,937 feet with 4,000 (applies to gliders) f....etc... 2.Set the upper limit to the aerobatic box to 3,500 feet for all power categories. This eliminates the weird values of 3,609 foot upper limit for Advanced and the 3,280 foot upper limit for Unlimited.	The rule book specifies lengths in both Imperial and Metric units. The Imperial values are derived from the metric values. The Metric values have no purpose in the rule book except to explain how the rule book arrived at such odd numbers for the Imperial values. The precision of these values is unneeded because it is not realistic to imagine a judge can tell the difference between 3,609 feet and 3,500 feet, or 164 feet and 150 feet. Some of the current values are downright humorous, such as the upper limit of the box for gliders which is, thankfully, exactly 4,000 feet for Sportsman and Intermediate, but changes by exactly 63 feet for Advanced and Unlimited to precisely 3,937 feet! The overly precise values are hard to memorize, take up space in the rule book, and consume time in our judge training that could be better used for eating donuts or learning figure criteria.
2022-12	Offer more advice to ensuring there are no conflicts of interest on the judging line	11.3.2 Relatives (any person connected to a competitor by family, marriage, or domestic partnership) of competitors may not act as Grading Judges in categories wherein their relatives are competing.	Change 11.3.2 to read: 11.3.2 Judges shall be assigned to categories in a way that minimizes conflict of interest and the appearance of impropriety. Examples: spousal and familial relationships, training partners, chapter affiliation and coaching relationships are all examples of potential conflicts that can create an appearance of impropriety.	Rule 11.3.2 disallows judges to grade their spouses but at many contests there are allegations that the judge panel is stacked in favor of certain competitors. There are currently no rules disallows a coach from judging a student, even though there may be a financial interest in that student's success. There are many challenges to eliminating bias but eliminating the appearance of bias is fairly easy for obvious conflicts. However, we must recognize the challenge faced by contest organizers at small contests, where there are not many qualified judges to choose from. We need a rule that seeks to minimize the appearance of bias so that our contests will be felt to have integrity and so that any challenge of bias can be fairly met with "if you don't like it, become a judge so we have a better option next year." This proposal was written in a hurry based on a number of complaints I received the day before the proposal deadline, so it will pay for the rules committee to debate the wording.
2022-13	Prevent coaches from judging pilots they coach	None	11.3.4 (new) Coaches (any person who has provided coaching in a camp or other formal setting) of competitors may not act as Grading Judges in categories wherein their clients/pilots are competing. This prohibition does not apply to anyone who has, for instance, critiqued a pilot on an informal basis at a Chapter Practice Day or other similar event.	In order to prevent the appearance of biased judging impacting our sport I believe it is best to remove coaches from the Judging Line when pilots they have a relationship with are competing. 1. Coaches have an interest in seeing their pupils succeed (i.e. they can tell potential clients..."My pilots routinely win at regional contests/Nationals"). 2. If that interest is coupled with the potential to influence the outcome (i.e. acting as a Judge), that is a conflict of interest. 3. Even the best of us, while attempting to judge impartially and strictly on the figures as flown, can have sub-conscious bias with no ill intent (i.e. rule 11.3.2). Even if there is no bias, there is the appearance of a conflict of interest which can negatively impact the perception of the sport, particularly among newer competitors. 4. Therefore, to remove the potential appearance of an unfair outcome, coaches should be prohibited from judging when pilots they have a relationship with are competing. 5. This assures a clean and level playing field for all competitors free from as much bias as possible. No other sport that I am aware of allows coaches to judge their own athletes when they compete. The verbiage of this paragraph mimics 11.3.2 to maintain consistency.
2022-14	Declare primacy of the third flight for Primary and Sportsman	24 The Unknown Program 24.1 Applicability 24.1.1 The Unknown Program is reserved for competitors in the following categories a) Intermediate b) Advanced c) Unlimited 24.1.2 At the discretion of the Contest Director, flights may be scheduled during this Program for the Primary and Sportsman categories, in which case these pilots will repeat the sequences they flew during the Free Program.	Change 24.1 to: 24.1 Sequences to be Flown During This Program a) Primary competitors must fly the Primary Known Sequence. b) Sportsman competitors may fly the same sequence they flew in the Free Program. c) Intermediate, Advanced, and Unlimited competitors must fly Unknown Sequences as provided by IAC Headquarters.	Rule 24.1.2 states that the Unknown program is only for Intermediate through Unlimited and lower category pilots only participate at the CD's discretion: At the discretion of the Contest Director, flights may be scheduled during this Program for the Primary and Sportsman categories, in which case these pilots will repeat the sequences they flew during the Free Program. In reality, CDs tend to prefer giving the lower category pilots the opportunity to fly the third flight, even when it can only be offered at the expense of the other categories. This proposal makes it so the language used in the Unknown Program section mirrors the language used to describe the Free Program.

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-15	Bring back the Known as a qualifying flight	31.6.1(j) Reckless flying - any violation of traffic patterns, unscheduled aerobatic maneuvers, or operation of an aircraft in an unsafe manner or in such a manner that would create an unsafe situation or cast an image of recklessness on the IAC.	Change 31.6.1(j) to Reckless flying - any violation of traffic patterns, unscheduled aerobatic maneuvers, or operation of an aircraft in an unsafe manner or in such a manner that would create an unsafe situation or cast an image of recklessness on the IAC. Any flight in the Known program scoring below 50% is an example of reckless flying.	The IAC used to DQ competitors if their Known flight was very bad. This rule was eliminated partially because there were accusations that judges would tank the scores of a competitor to keep them from being a threat in the competition, or would do the opposite and give scores away to someone to keep them in the competition. Since that decision, the HZ rule has helped to make it much more clear when a competitor flies a flight that is very, very bad. It seems there must surely be a threshold value for a Known flight below which the competitor is unsafe flying the Unknown. It concerns me that I sometimes see people fly Unlimited without respect for the dangers. In many other countries, pilots are not allowed to move up until demonstrating success at the lower category. This may be an alternative solution, or one to consider simultaneously. This suggestion came to me the final day of the proposal period so the wording should be reviewed. I tried stuffing this into 31.6.1(j) but that might not be the best place.
2022-16	Get rid of inverted signaling rule	14.4.4 If the first figure following Signaling begins in inverted flight, Signaling must be performed in inverted flight and the competitor must change the flight attitude from upright to inverted only by a half roll prior to the first wing dip.	Eliminate 14.4.4	Rule 14.4.4 says: If the first figure following Signaling begins in inverted flight, Signaling must be performed in inverted flight and the competitor must change the flight attitude from upright to inverted only by a half roll prior to the first wing dip. This implies some practices that I have never seen correctly executed at a regional contest, nor have I seen penalties applied. These indicate to me that the rule may not have value. This rule seems overly harsh since the introduction of 14.4.5 which otherwise eliminated the rigor we once demanded regarding signaling. This has been proposed before and rejected but has been often suggested to me.
2022-17	No numerical scores received	30.8.1 Before sending Program Forms to the Scoring Director, Chief Judges shall verify that all paperwork is correct: a) Review the Chief Judge Penalty Forms for accuracy and provide specific reasons for any Zeroed Flight Program, Disqualification, or Illegal Free penalties. b) Ensure that each competitor's Free Program Forms are signed and dated. In the case of unsigned forms, or any other irregularity noted in a Free Program Form, check the "Illegal Free Program" box on the Chief Judge Penalty Form.	Clarify process if no numerical scores are received from the grading judges	Sourcing your answer from the rule book, what should a Chief Judge do if he gets the following scores: A, A, HZ, HZ? See 30.9.1. Note that it says numeric grades, so no conference should have been called. If any scores had been changed during conference it would have been illegal anyway since there is no possibility of changing HZs or As to numeric values. DJ: The question was what the Chief Judge should do with a mix of HZ's and A's. Rule 30.9.2 states: "Conferences may not be called when ... there is a mix of zeros and Averages only." Therefore the answer is: nothing. I agree that 32.5.2 tells us how to determine if HZ's are in the majority when A's are also present. I also agree that the CJ is responsible for spotting situations in which there are no numeric scores and moving to fix the problem as soon as practical. But if that's spelled out in the current rules, I can't find it.
2022-18	Downwind Entry notation on forms	21.3.4 The notation, "Note Y Axis Entry", or "Note Downwind Entry" shall appear on Forms B and C if the sequence does not begin upwind.	Mandate notation to be in field of Forms B and C for ready visibility	I remember we used to have "Note Downwind Entry" in a box within the drawing itself, not just at the top of the page. It will have a lot more value if it is within the drawing because competitors typically trim the borders before putting the sequence card in their airplanes. If the note isn't found in that area I'm not sure it is worth enough to us to justify keeping this rule around. That's a thought for the rules committee to take up.
2022-19	Remove Presentation K from Form A and the Free Program Checklist	21.2.3, 23.8.1(h), 31.4.2(h)	Remove Presentation K from Form A and the Free Program Checklist	JaSPer is pre-programmed with the Presentation K factor for each category. Therefore, there is no need to print them on Form A and no reason to penalize Free Programs that have a missing or incorrect Presentation K. Anyone who needs to know the Presentation K factors can find them in the Rule Book and see them in the JaSPer output.
2022-20	Back-to-back form printing	4.2.1 An entrant must pay the entry fee and submit completed standard IAC forms as follows: a) Official Contest Entry Form. b) As many certified, legible copies of IAC Free Program Forms A, B and C as are needed. Forms B and C are separate forms and should not be printed back-to-back.	4.2.1 An entrant must pay the entry fee and submit completed standard IAC forms as follows: a) Official Contest Entry Form. b) As many certified, legible copies of IAC Free Program Forms A, B and C as are needed. Forms B and C can be printed as separate forms or printed back-to-back.	Save lots of paper. Reduce difficulty of managing a stack of paper in the wind. It is already common for pilots to submit frees as two sided as well as contests to print out B and C forms back-to-back. This rule change would not mandate either way but let contest organizers determine which approach to use.

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-21	Clean up rules regarding signatures for Free Programs	<p>4.2.1(b) As many certified, legible copies...</p> <p>23.7.1 It is the competitor's responsibility to have their Free Program Forms checked for compliance with these rules signed, and dated by a current judge who must provide their IAC member number on the Form A.</p> <p>23.7.2 The judge's signature does not have to have been in the current contest year, if there were no rule changes which affected a previously certified Free Sequence legality.</p> <p>23.7.3 Such certification does not relieve the competitor of the final responsibility for the legality and legibility of the forms.</p> <p>23.7.4 A competitor who is also a judge may not sign off their own Free Program Forms.</p> <p>23.7.5 Any changes or alterations void the signatures and render the forms noncompliant.</p> <p>23.8 Checklist for Free Program Forms</p> <p>23.8.1 The following items comprise a checklist for judges to use for certifying Free Program Forms.</p> <p>31.4.2(i) Execution: If the Forms are not signed and dated, the competitor will be assessed a Failure to Prepare Penalty.</p>	<p>In 4.2.1(b), remove the word "certified".</p> <p>In 23.7, the reference here is redundant in any case. Remove everything after "these rules," leaving the sentence: It is the competitor's responsibility to have their Free Program Forms checked for compliance.</p> <p>In 23.8, make no change.</p> <p>In 31.4.2(i), make no change.</p>	<p>The rules require a signature. This is stated in four places:</p> <p>a. Section 4.2.1 (b) which says that only "certified" copies of Free Programs are allowed at Registration.</p> <p>b. Section 23.7, which states it is the competitor's responsibility to have their Free Program checked and then "signed and dated by a current judge who must provide their IAC member number on Form A".</p> <p>c. Section 23.8.1(i), which provides the Checklist for Free Program Forms, which instructs judges, under Execution, to "sign and date each of the three Forms A, B, and C" if all items are correct.</p> <p>d. Section 31.4.2(i), which instructs the jury to apply a Failure to Prepare penalty if a free program is not signed.</p> <p>E-signatures are allowed throughout the world for all sorts of things, including legal documents, but the IAC language is strong enough it may appear to disallow them.</p> <p>I have previously recommended that we drop the signature requirement. My arguments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This rule requires that we train judges not just to read Aresti, but to construct Aresti. Reading Aresti is a worthwhile skill for any aerobatic enthusiast, but learning how to construct Aresti figures from catalog numbers and K values, including the arcane nuances of positive vs negatively loaded snaps, etc, consumes a full day of our two day judge school. Even when taught well, students often misunderstand the purpose of this training and come away from class thinking that being a grading judge is much harder than it is. Dropping this requirement will dramatically simplify judge training and make the topic feel more approachable. 2. OpenAero is in widespread use. The old Visio solution is no longer supported. OpenAero checks sequences automatically and notates that the check passed on the bottom of the forms. It will be pointed out that OpenAero has had several bugs over the years. This is true, but those bugs can be communicated about when discovered and fixed for everyone. When a human judge has a misunderstanding or is too lazy to do their job properly the mistakes are harder to spot and fix. I believe there are more human errors than there will be software errors. 3. Requiring human signatures is a logistical challenge that annoys competitors and gums up contest registration. 4. It is much harder to find a judge willing to properly examine a free than might be expected. Most judges just ask "has it been through openaero?" and just sign the form if it has. <p>But I am intentionally digressing from the subject of this proposal to grind my favorite axe and enter these arguments once again into the record. The proposal is just to simplify the wording of these rules:</p>
2022-22	Provisional categories	None	Include provisional categories in rule book	<p>With the creation of Provisional Categories, i.e. the new Legacy Category, we now have categories that are not mentioned in the Rule Book, making it difficult to find information on rules for penalties, qualification, altitudes and such. This makes it hard for Contest Directors, Judges, and Pilots to be aware of the Rules for said category. To make sure that all the rules for the contest are in one place, including an appendix or separate chapter to deal with the Provisional Category's until they are either made permanent or discarded will aid in the smooth running of contests.</p>
2022-23	Add Sportsman Pro category	None	Include: Add list of Unknown figures for Sportsman	<p>There is consensus that Sportsman needs to attract more pilots and be made more equitable by accounting for a range of pilot skill and aircraft type.</p> <p>One comment states several pilots moved-up to Intermediate because they want the additional challenge of flying an Unknown, although some may be uncomfortable with snap rolls and rolling turns. Another said Intermediate is not practical for certain aircraft types (e.g., RV's) due to design/structural limitations to snap rolls and rolling turns.</p> <p>There is also a common opinion that adding Sportsman-Pro would make contest administration too complicated – I recognize this to be a potential problem.</p> <p>After reviewing the survey, I conclude a workable compromise is to modify existing Sportsman rules by simply adding an Unknown option to the third flight (see below):</p> <p>Three Sportsman Flights:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Known – Use current Sportsman Known rules. 2. Known or Free – Use current Sportsman Free rules. 3. Known or Unknown – Same Sportsman design rules as Known, e.g., no snap rolls, no rolling turns, no extreme inverted or outside figures, etc. NOTE: Total K Unknown must equal Total K Known. <p>It would be the Sportsman pilot's choice to fly either: a) three Known flights, or b) Known-Free-Unknown flights. All Sportsman pilots compete together as one group for overall first-second-third place trophies. There would be an additional trophy for highest scoring Sportsman pilot who flew Known-Free-Unknown (e.g., a "Sportsman-Pro Trophy").</p> <p>This may not be a perfect solution addressing equity in Sportsman pilot skill and aircraft, but it seems the most practical based on survey comments. Also, addition of a Sportsman Unknown will enhance safety and preparation skills for pilots transitioning from Primary to Sportsman to Intermediate.</p> <p>In conclusion, I suggest a "rule change proposal" this year adding an Unknown option to the third Sportsman flight.</p>

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale																
2022-24	Introduce snap rolls back into the Intermediate Category	37.2.25 Sub-Family 9.9 Positive Flick (Snap) Rolls [Table of allowable figures. Only full snap on horizontal line allowed for Intermediate Unknown, tagged with footnote 1] Footnote: 1) Only at the apex of a Looping Line.	Introduce the snap roll Figure 9.9.3.4 inside snap on a horizontal line and Figure 9.9.2.2 a half snap on a 45 degree up line back into the Intermediate Category for allowable figures in the Known and Unknown sequences.	<p>The Intermediate Category has become a "Super Sportsman" Category with only a few challenging figures and no real preparation to safely move up to the Advance Category.</p> <p>The argument has been that pilots have been "stuck" in the Sportsman Category for life because they refuse to subject their airplanes to snap rolls.</p> <p>The airplane in questions has been the Super Decathlon. I spoke with a tech fellow at American Champion and he felt very strongly that if the pilot respects the published entry airspeed for a snap roll of 90mph there is not a problem.</p> <p>The same information appears on the American Champion website under Frequently Asked Questions...</p> <p>Are snap rolls an approved maneuver for the Aerobatic Model Decathlon.....</p> <p>"Yes, snap rolls are an approved maneuver. To reduce unnecessary wear and tear:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect the aerobatic gross weight (1800 lb for the 8KCAB and 7GCBC, 1750 lb for the other Citabria models) - Perform snaps at or below the listed entry speeds (90 mph for the 8KCAB, 85 mph for the Citabria models) - Limit the acrobatic fuel load to half tanks or less. <p>For a typical owner snap rolls will not create a maintenance concern."</p> <p>I hope that you will seriously consider adding the snap rolls described above back into the Intermediate Category for the challenge that it provides us and those pilots thinking of moving up to a higher category.</p>																
2022-25	Snaps at the top of looping lines in Intermediate	37.2.25 Sub-Family 9.9 Positive Flick (Snap) Rolls [Table of allowable figures. Only full snap on horizontal line allowed for Intermediate Unknown, tagged with footnote 1] Footnote: 1) Only at the apex of a Looping Line.	Does this include 1/2 loop up, or just full loops?	<p>You asked whether the footnote to rule 37.2.25 means that it's OK to put a full snap at the top of a 7.2.1.1 half-loop, or only a full loop. I tracked down the source of that footnote, a rule change that took effect in 2020:</p> <p>Sadly, the proposal is even less clear than the footnote: "at the apex of a looping figure" vs. "at the apex of the loop".</p> <p>If forced to decide, I'd say that the apex of a looping line could include a half-loop up. But a) that's not really my call unless I'm serving on a contest jury, and b) it's probably something we should clarify in next year's rule book. So I've cc'd Rule Committee Chair Barrett Hines and Sequence Committee Chair Michael Lents. (You're welcome, guys!)</p>																
2022-26	Advanced rolls max. rotations	<p>24.6.2 Rolls are restricted as follows:</p> <p>b) Advanced</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. A minimum of 2 and a maximum of 3 snap rolls. ii. Rolls are not permitted following spins. iii. Unlinked rolls are permitted, but only on straight horizontal lines with a maximum of 10 stops per line. <p>c) Unlimited</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Maximum of 6 snap rolls, only 4 of which may be from the same sub-Family (9.9, 9.10). ii. A minimum of one snap roll must be a vertical climbing maneuver (9.9.1, 9.9.6, 9.10.1, 9.10.6). iii. Unlinked rolls are permitted, but only according to the following table: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Line Direction</th> <th>Total Rotation</th> <th>Max Stops</th> <th>Type</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Horizontal</td> <td>720°</td> <td>10</td> <td>Any</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vertical up</td> <td>450°</td> <td>4</td> <td>Aileron Only</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vertical Down</td> <td>360°</td> <td>3</td> <td>Aileron Only</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>45° Up (see exception below)</p> <p>540° 4 Aileron Only</p> <p>.....</p>	Line Direction	Total Rotation	Max Stops	Type	Horizontal	720°	10	Any	Vertical up	450°	4	Aileron Only	Vertical Down	360°	3	Aileron Only	Limit Advanced Rolls to 720 degrees ma	The current Rule Book limits horizontal rolls to a total of 720° in Unlimited Unknowns, but places no such restriction on Advanced Unknowns. I looked through the 2019 Rule Book (last version from the Brian Howard era) and didn't find anything similar, nor was there any related proposal in the list of approved rule changes for 2020 (attached).
Line Direction	Total Rotation	Max Stops	Type																	
Horizontal	720°	10	Any																	
Vertical up	450°	4	Aileron Only																	
Vertical Down	360°	3	Aileron Only																	

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-27	Reduce Advanced Power Free Program to 12 Figures	23.2.1 Free Sequences are limited to the maximum number of figures and Maximum Total Figure K-Factor as shown below. Category Maximum # of Figures c) Advanced 14	The Advanced Free Program shall have a maximum of 12 figures with a Maximum Total K-Figure Factor of 300.	The 2021 Advanced Power Known has 9 figures with a figure K of 288 for an average of 32k/figure. The 2021 Advanced Power Free is allowed 14 figures with a figure K of 300 for an average of 21.4. The Average K Value for the Free Program is no longer consistent with the Known Program. Reducing the allowable figures to a maximum of 12 will more closely align the Known and Free Programs. The addition of 2 figures for the Advanced Power Free Program did not improve the safety of the sport. Additionally, to be competitive Advanced Pilots are now including numerous Sportsman figures in their Advanced Free Programs in pursuit of the highest possible percentile score. This reduces the value of the Free program as a useful judging metric in separating and ranking the field of Advanced in pilots at a contest. The free program is an important part of the IAC regional competition flight program. It is intended to allow pilots to display creativity and showcase their aircraft in the best possible manner. Unfortunately, the rule change to increase the allowable figures to 14 has created a situation where Advanced Pilots are creating Sportsman figures with 1 or 2 Advanced Figures flown to achieve the highest possible score. It makes for a dull Advanced Free Program both from the cockpit and the judging line. Finally, it diminishes the accomplishment of reaching the Advanced level of Aerobatic Competition.
		23.2.1 Free Sequences are limited to the maximum number of figures and Maximum Total Figure K-Factor as shown below. Category Maximum # of Figures c) Advanced 14	c) Advanced 12	Fourteen figures in Advanced Free sequences produce lower K values for each figure, often at the K values of Intermediate figures. Lower K value figures are less challenging for Advanced pilots and are contrary to the purpose of the category. Fourteen figure sequences cause less differentiation between pilots, are boring for most Advanced pilots, and are unlikely to change the outcome between the top pilots. The higher number of lower K figures could also cause a safety issue by enticing pilots to fly in Advanced when they are not ready for Advanced Unknowns.
2022-28	Eliminate Free Program from Advanced and Unlimited, fly two Unknowns instead	Numerous	TBD	It is felt that free program is not very useful in differentiating scores in the upper categories. It would be possible to provide competitors with two Unknowns instead.
2022-29	Remove Quarter Clover from all Power categories	23.5.2 In addition, the Quarter-Clover, while normally a glider figure, may be used in Sportsman and Intermediate Free Sequences. 24.5.1 The figures utilized in the design of the Unknown Sequences must be taken only from Allowable Figures for Unknown Sequences. Exception: The Quarter-Clover, normally a glider figure, is allowable in Intermediate Unknown Programs.	Strike 23.5.2 and the exception in 24.5.1	The Quarter Clover is a glider figure but is allowed in the Sportsman and Intermediate categories. This is super annoying because it creates the need for special treatment in the rule book. People worked very hard to make the rule book cleaner and this figure taunts that effort. It even looks a little bit like a face that is sticking its tongue out at us - I hate you Quarter-Clover. It also really bugs me that we recently added it to the Unknowns for Intermediate.
2022-30	Remove unneeded families from Family-Specific Grading Criteria	28.10 Family 7.3 – Three-Quarter Loops (aka "Goldfish") 28.10.1 These figures are simply ¾ loops with 45 degree entry and exit lines. 28.10.2 The 45 degree lines may be of any length. 28.11 Family 7.4.1-7.4.2 – Full Loops 28.11.1 Loops are judged in accordance with the rules on Looping Lines. There are no special rules for Full Loops. Clarification: A simple full loop, perfectly flown on a windless day, is exactly circular, beginning and ending at the same altitude. 28.18 Family 8.4 and 8.8 – Humpty Bumps and Double Humpty Bumps 28.18.1 There is no requirement for any of the radii to be equal. 28.18.2 There is no requirement for any of the line lengths to be equal.	Remove 28.10 Remove 28.11 Remove 28.18	There is a slew of figures families covered in this section that are unneeded. I included these only to avoid confusion for people transferring their thinking from the old rule book. The point of this section is to include only those families with special consideration.
2022-31	Remove requirement to explain grade of 0.0	26.2.2 The judge must state the reason for the zero, regardless of type, in the Remarks column.	The judge must state the reason for a Hard Zero in the Remarks column.	It's often challenging for Judges and recorders to keep up with every detail of a competition flight, especially when there are a lot of deductions. Requiring the judging to articulate and record a specific reason – or reasons – for a 0.0 mark only increases their workload and can impact the judging of the next figure. The only benefit of the current rule is to help determine whether a judge assessed an 0.0 that should have been HZ, or vice-versa. But the rules already allow the Chief Judge to call a conference if there is a mix of 0.0 and HZ marks, providing a backstop against that sort of mistake.

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-32	Change criteria for rolling turns	<p>28.6.5 There must be a constant rate of roll. If the rate of roll changes, deduct no more than one (1) point per variation.</p> <p>28.6.6 If the rate of roll stops (aside from any brief pause when changing roll directions), deduct one (1) point.</p> <p>28.6.7 For a rolling turn with rolls in alternating directions, the aircraft must change direction of roll at a wingslevel attitude. If the roll direction reverses before or after the wings-level attitude, deduct one (1) point for every five (5) degrees of bank angle error at direction reversal.</p> <p>28.6.8 The turn and the rolls must finish at the exact same time. If the turn and rolls do not finish at the same time, deduct one (1) point for every 5 degrees of roll remaining at the completion of the turn, or turn remaining at the completion of the roll.</p>	<p>Item #1: Insert new 28.4.3: 28.4.3 (new) If the rate of turn ceases, deduct 2.0 points.</p> <p>Item #2 Replace 28.6.6 and 28.6.7 with: 28.6.5 There must be a constant rate of roll. If the rate of roll changes, deduct no more than one (1) point per variation. 28.6.6 If the rate of roll stops entirely (except during a reversal of roll direction), deduct 2.0 points. 28.6.7 Any reversal of roll direction must be performed with wings-level. If the roll direction reverses before or after the wings-level attitude, deduct one (1) point for every five (5) degrees of bank angle error at direction reversal. 28.6.8 Any pause during a reversal of roll direction should be brief. If the pause is long, deduct no more than one (1) points.</p> <p>Item #3 I do not propose that we adopt this method.</p> <p>Item #4 Change 28.6.8 to: 28.6.8 The turn and the rolls must finish at the exact same time. If the turn and rolls do not finish at the same time, deduct one (1) point for every 15 degrees of roll remaining at the completion of the turn, or one (1) point for every 5 degrees of turn remaining at the completion of the roll.</p>	<p>While I present these changes together for coherency, they could be considered separately. The IAC rule book and the CIVA rule book differ in how rolling turns are judged:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In both rule books there is a penalty for a change in the rate of turn, but in CIVA there is also a penalty for complete stoppage in the rate of turn. 2. In both rule books there is a penalty for stopping the roll, but in CIVA: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The penalty is twice as high. b. The penalty is distinguished from the necessary pause when changing directions. 3. In the CIVA rule book there is a penalty for failing to be aligned with a box axis during the appropriate intermediate point of a roll. In the IAC the judge is to note only the rates at which the turn and roll occur. 4. In the IAC rule book any failure to align the aircraft with a box axis upon the exit from a rolling turn is penalized at the excessive 1 point for every 5 degrees. In CIVA the penalty is a more reasonable 1 point for every 15 degrees. This is significant because the IAC method encourages pilots to finish the roll slightly before the turn is complete to avoid very costly error.
2022-33	Lighten up stall turn pivot penalties	<p>28.8.3 During the pivot, the aircraft's CG may displace by up to one-half wingspan without penalty. The penalty for any additional displacement, either laterally or vertically, is one point per half wingspan.</p>	<p>Change 28.8.3 to: 28.8.3 During the pivot, the aircraft's CG may displace by up to one wingspan without penalty. The penalty for any additional displacement, either laterally or vertically, is one point per wingspan. The diagrams will also have to be modified.</p>	<p>In the IAC we allow one half wingspan of CG movement during the pivot. Beyond that we deduct 1 point for every half wing span of "flyover" error. CIVA allows for a full wingspan of CG movement and deducts 0.5 points for each half wingspan. Our method is unnecessarily punishing of pilots who make flyover errors. It encourages late kicking of the rudder which puts new pilots closer to the danger of a tailslide or inadvertent spin.</p>
2022-34	Change penalties for inserting a line between a loop and a roll	<p>27.11.2 If the pause between the roll and Looping Line is substantially more than necessary, deduct at least one (1) point.</p>	<p>27.11.2 If there is more than a brief line between the roll and Looping Line, deduct between 0.5 points and 3.0 points depending on the length of the line. 27.11.3 (new) If the line is greater than the radius of the Looping Line, HZ the figure.</p>	<p>In the IAC we have a rule that specifies a deduction of at least 1 point for putting a line between a looping element and a roll. In the CIVA rules, there is more guidance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 points for a visible line. 2. 2 points for a line up to half the looping radius. 3. 3 points for a line up to the full looping radius. 4. PZ if the line exceeds the looping radius. <p>While this seems a bit too detailed and wordy, I think using the radius as a guidance is clever.</p>
2022-35	Mandate a penalty for a flat spot in a loop	<p>27.10.4 There are no standardized deductions for observed changes in the radius of Looping Lines. A judge must, therefore, develop a consistent and objective method for grading them. Example 1: deduct 1 point for each just-visible variation in the radius and 2 points for each major deviation from a constant radius. Example 2: For Looping Lines of 180° or greater, use the first quarter of the loop as the basis for evaluating the remainder of the loop. For each remaining quarter: a visible variation from the first quarter results in a 1-point deduction; a 1:2 variation results in a 2-point deduction; and more than a 1:2 variation results in a 3-point deduction. These are just two examples. Other methods are equally acceptable, as long as those methods meet the standards of objectivity and consistency of results.</p>	<p>Change 27.10.4</p>	<p>The IAC rule book does not mandate a penalty for a flat spot in a loop. However:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CIVA has a mandated 2.0 penalty. 2. The IAC has a 2.0 penalty for a flat spot between connected looping lines (e.g. reversing loops) 3. The IAC has a mandated penalty for performing an integrated roll on a straight line. <p>I wonder if a 2.0 points penalty was mandated at one time and dropped?</p>

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-36	Reduce penalties for "over and back" on a roll stop	None	Insert new 27.8, wording TBD	<p>It is very common for pilots to misjudge the amount of force needed to return the control stick to center at the conclusion of a roll. An error here causes an overshoot. If the pilot corrects the overshoot rapidly, this is commonly called an "over and back" error.</p> <p>In the IAC rules the penalty for an overshoot that is held is the same as the penalty for an overshoot that quickly returns the correct orientation. Either way it is 1 point for 5 degrees.</p> <p>The actual number of degrees of error for a visible overshoot is hard to determine because it happens so quickly. A 15 degree "over and back" is not very visible but should result in a 3 point downgrade. A 30 degree "over and back" should result in a 6 point downgrade. From my testing of judges using the "judges roll trainer" at jimbourke.com, I've noticed that judges grossly underestimate errors in roll. Many times competitors are making large over and back errors, even beyond 45 degrees, with only one or two points of penalty. CIVA recognizes this and treats this issue differently. It specifies a deduction of only 0.5 points for a small error and 1.0 points for a large error.</p>
2022-37	Judging CG trajectory during rolls	28.20.3 When executing any aileron roll, either the aircraft's CG trajectory (horizontal and Looping Lines) or attitude of the zero-lift axis (45 and vertical lines), must continue, during the rolling portion of the figure, to appear exactly the same as if there had there been no roll.	TBD	<p>I think we have problem with rule 28.20.3 as stated; it is ambiguous and misleading. Horizontal flight and looping elements are certainly based on the CI trajectory so expecting that to be seen (and measurable to the judges) during a roll on those elements is meaningful and measurable. Flight on 45 and vertical lines is based on the attitude of the ZLA of the wing as observed by the judge and is explicitly not based on the flight path of the CG. These are facts of judging. Rule 28.20.3 describes an impossibility of watching the ZLA of the wing as the plane rolls and so makes for ambiguity. The ZLA of the aircraft CANNOT be observed and judged unless the wings are horizontal. During a roll, the ZLA of the wing is constantly changing (must be zero at the knife edge for example to stay on heading), therefore this rule is flawed and ridiculous. If it is expected that the flight path of the aircraft's CG is expected to maintain the exact angle of flight (as compared to the horizon during the roll), this is absolutely not clear, and that is a dangerous implication since, flight path as compared to the horizon is absolutely not the grading criteria for 45 and vertical lines. Maintaining flight path on vertical and 45's is NOT required for Snaps so I see no need to possibly require it for Aileron rolls too.</p>
2022-38	No line between clarification	<p>26.7.1 If there is no discernible horizontal line between figures deduct one (1) point from each figure.</p> <p>28.12.2 All lines (Interior and any final line) must be of equal length. If they are not of equal length, deduct according to Variations in Line Length. Clarification: The final line of a Square or Octagon Loop must be drawn to the correct length on the level horizontal line at the end of the figure. This final line begins at the end of the first radius and ends when the aircraft departs straight and level flight. If any final line is seen, regardless of length, the No Line Between Figures downgrade does not apply. Example: If no final line is seen, a four (4) point deduction applies to the loop according to Variations in Line Length with a further downgrade of one (1) point on the subsequent figure for No Line Between Figures.</p>	Clarify	<p>The 2019 and 2021 Rule Books both state that the no-line-between penalty does not apply to a square or octagon loop as long as it ends with a horizontal line:</p> <p>2019: ... if any final line is seen, regardless of length, the "no line between" downgrade of 8.4.1(a) does not apply...</p> <p>2021: If any final line is seen, regardless of length, the No Line Between Figures downgrade does not apply.</p> <p>Both versions then provide examples that only mention a no-line-between deduction for the subsequent figure, rather than both figures:</p> <p>2019: For example, should the final line of the square or octagonal loop be completely missing, a four (4) point deduction would apply to the loop with a further downgrade of one (1) point on the subsequent figure for a missing horizontal entry line.</p> <p>2021: If no final line is seen, a four (4) point deduction applies to the loop according to Variations in Line Length with a further downgrade of one (1) point on the subsequent figure for No Line Between Figures.</p> <p>Yet rule 26.7.1 clearly states: "If there is no discernible horizontal line between figures deduct one (1) point from each figure."</p> <p>I have two questions here:</p> <p>First, are these examples just poorly worded, or are they meant to imply that the no-line-between penalty actually works differently for square and octagon loops? Occam's Razor suggests the former. If it's the latter, then we need language that's more explicit.</p> <p>Second, is it fair to assess a four-point penalty for the missing line and a point for no line between figures? I'm against double jeopardy. But if we stipulate that the examples are poorly worded then I don't see how that principle can overrule the plain language language in the rule book.</p>
2022-39	Define the penalty for prolonged pauses between unlinked rolls	None	<p>New (fits between 27.8.2 and 27.8.3)</p> <p>If the pause between the unlinked rolls is substantially more than necessary, deduct at least one (1) point.</p>	<p>Rule 27.8.2 states that unlinked rolls must have a brief pause between them, but no penalty is specified for extended pauses.</p> <p>This proposal mirrors the language and the penalty in Rule 27.11.2: "If the pause between the roll and Looping Line is substantially more than necessary, deduct at least one (1) point."</p>
2022-40	Clarify loop judging criteria	<p>28.11.1 Loops are judged in accordance with the rules on Looping Lines. There are no special rules for Full Loops.</p> <p>Clarification: A simple full loop, perfectly flown on a windless day, is exactly circular, beginning and ending at the same altitude.</p>	<p>28.11.1 Whole 'round' Loops (7.4.1.x and 7.4.2.x), are judged in accordance with the rules on Looping Lines. There are no family-specific grading criteria for Whole Loops.</p> <p>Clarification: Any whole round loop perfectly flown appears exactly circular, beginning and ending at the same altitude, but may have wind drifted to or away from the judges (27.10.3). Downgrade criteria for less than perfectly flown, is not specified (see 27.10.4).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> As worded, the rule contains ambiguous and actually confusing language, ie 'Special rules' and 'Simple loops'. The included phrase, 'on a windless day' implies that this rule does NOT apply on windy days! Reference to the prior rules enhances recognition to the (lacking) specified grading criteria.

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-41	Tailslices should only be allowed to swing once past the vertical	28.9.4 Following the backwards slide, the aircraft must then pivot in the correct direction to a vertical down position. Clarification: The aircraft is allowed to swing past the vertical before establishing the downline.	28.9.4 Following the backwards slide, the aircraft must then pivot in the correct direction to a vertical down position. Exception: The aircraft is allowed to swing once past the vertical before establishing the downline.	The rule for tailslices says that the aircraft is allowed to swing past the vertical before assuming a vertical downline, but there is no aerodynamic reason for more than one swing past the vertical. I felt that "once" was probably implied in the old rule book but the wording in the new rule book doesn't make that implication. I had the word "once" in the rulebook through the member comment period but eliminated it at the last moment due to an objection. I assure the rules committee that "once" makes the most sense here from the standpoint of Unlimited pilots.
2022-42	Clarify glider unlinked snap roll rules	34.20.4.1 Glider snap rolls do not have to be centered on their Interior Lines. Gliders are only required to show a visible line before and after the snap roll.	Glider snap rolls and unlinked roll combinations that include a snap do not have to be centered on their Interior Lines. Gliders are only required to show a visible line before and after a snap roll or unlinked rolls that include a snap.	This rule currently states: "Glider snap rolls do not have to be centered on their Interior Lines. Gliders are only required to show a visible line before and after the snap roll." This does not directly address unlinked rolls that include a snap. Due to glider performance limitations, it makes sense to waive the centering requirement for unlinked snap roll combinations.
			Clarify	Looking back at the 2019 rule book adds words that provide the reason but not much toward the intent for unlinked rolls: 8.4.1(e) In gliders, the entry airspeeds for positive and negative snap rolls lie in a relatively narrow bracket. The pilot must be free, therefore, to determine the point on the line where the snap roll is initiated. Because of this, no deduction will be made for glider snap rolls not centered on an interior line, but there must be some line before and after the snap roll. This exemption from centering snap rolls for gliders, applies without exception to the judging criteria provided in this chapter for all Aresti figures. I didn't see anything else that would input into this discussion in the rest of the chapter as implied by the last sentence of the old rule. The CIVA rule uses different words but are really no clearer toward whether it is intended for unlinked roll combinations as well. It could be argued in either set of rules that the glider exception for centering snaps does not apply for unlinked rolls. We should thus clarify that aspect one way or the other. One could thus say that the downgrades you experienced last weekend were because you did not center the roll combination on the line, not because the snap portion wasn't centered. I tend think that centering should not be required any interior line for gliders anytime a snap is involved and this is the likely intent of the rules, but that point needs further discussion before we tweak any text.
2022-43	Specify a deduction for excessive altitude or distance	None	Add 27.15 as follows: 27.15 POSITIONING 27.15.1 Competitors must fly Figures at a distance and altitude conducive to grading. Judges may deduct points for figures, or portions of figures, that cannot be properly judged due to their position.	Currently the IAC has no penalty specified for flying a figure such that it cannot be properly judged. While we have penalties in place for altitude and altitude infringements, we have no penalty for competitors who abuse their positioning, intentionally or on accident, to create problems for judges. At first glance this may seem to be double jeopardy, but it's a separate issue. A figure can be out of the box entirely but still judgeable. A figure can be within the box but not judgeable. The penalties for high altitude flying are often neglected. Figures flown very high out of the top of the box can be hard to judge fairly. It is nearly impossible to adequately evaluate whether there is visible pitch in an avalanche begun at 3,500 feet. In some cases parts of a figure can be judged, but not all of it. Even if "high" calls were made more reliably they are not enough of a deterrent. The penalties for flight outside of the boundaries are not strong enough to punish competitors for bad positioning. A competitor who flies 3 box lengths out of the back of the box can hardly be judged at all. A competitor who flies directly overhead, but within the box, can't either. The Presentation does not have a high enough K value (nor should it) to fairly penalize this sort of error. Yet despite these challenges IAC judges are expected to grade each figure on their technical merits with no deductions for absurd positioning. Their only possible recourse is to call an "Average" but unless this Average is confirmed by the entire judge pool that won't help either. An extreme case that is allowed by the rules would be a free program flown entirely on the Y axis. In fact, I have witnessed this exact scenario and have seen the trouble it caused to the judge panel as they tried their best to apply fair figure criteria while also struggling to support the concept of Benefit of the Doubt. The scores this competitor received were unfair to everyone involved. In cases like this judges may decide to penalize the pilot's scores out of anger, but that's inappropriate. It would be much better for everyone to formalize the deduction instead to properly deter the behavior we do not like to see. A simple change will give judges the ability to deduct for flying in such a manner. I worded it to avoid specifying a 2.0 penalty for figure "elements" because the word "element" is not used in the Aresti way in the IAC rule book at this time.

Proposal Number	Synopsis	Current Rule	Change As Proposed	Proposer Change Rationale
2022-44	Better Presentation Grading	<p>29 Presentation</p> <p>29.1.1 The Presentation grade is based on the Grading Judge's overall impression of the Performance and has a possible range from 10.0 to 0.0 in 0.5 increments.</p> <p>29.2 Presentation Coefficient</p> <p>29.2.1 The Presentation "K" Factor increases with the difficulty of the category: Category Presentation K a) Primary 5 K b) Sportsman 10 K c) Intermediate 15 K d) Advanced 25 K e) Unlimited 40 K</p> <p>29.3 Grading Presentation</p> <p>29.3.1 The exact method used to determine the Presentation grade is left to the individual judge but shall include the following criteria: a) Balance on the X axis. b) Management of wind conditions. c) Control of distance and altitude for best viewing angle. d) Consistent pacing.</p> <p>29.3.2 While Presentation is intentionally subjective, judges must apply their methodology consistently to every pilot</p>	<p>Establish system to generate a more objective Presentation grade</p>	<p>The intention of the simple Left-Right-Near-Far system that we introduced a few years back is neither subjective nor to review 'Presentation' after the performance; the task was reduce the subjective qualities of the traditional memory-based system with an objective tool to measure 'Position'. Often far too little attention was paid to figure location during the sequence, then a kind of re-imagining thing done to guesstimate the Position grade. This usually equates to a whole figure mark, so it's quite important. Sound familiar?</p> <p>The key is - where should each figure be placed so you can judge it well? For want of a nail this is referred to as the 'Optimum' location, and while it's being flown or perhaps right after saying the ten-minus-downgrade part it's a breeze to appraise whether it is/was positioned well for easy judgement (i.e. at the optimum position) or a bit left of it (L), right of it (R), too near (N) or too far away (F). If the thing is seriously adrift then LL, RR, NN or FF does the job. These simple annotations go into a Position column on the form next to the grade, and when the pilot is eventually coasting away from the box -</p> <p>The judge has a positive record of recorded thoughts as to how the placement of each figure seemed, and can</p> <p>Take each letter as a half-point, add or subtract a bit (max 1.0) if it seems appropriate, deduct the total from the usual ten and there's your Position grade</p> <p>Importantly -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the Chief Judge can see that the judge has attempted to make the required assessments, and b) the pilot can work through the result and see where his/her figures were deemed ill-placed <p>Before we did this, like most judges my position mark was usually a bit up or down from 7.5 by some hazily determined amount. Now it's a cinch to be much more specific, on occasion close to ten because while determining appropriate figure downgrades I have not uttered many position letters at all, then there are flights where the truth is that many figures were not where you wanted them and the result is not far from zero, where it should really be.</p>