



*Fédération  
Aéronautique  
Internationale*

---

# Minutes

of the  
**Annual Meeting**  
of the  
**FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)**

held in Oberhausen, Germany  
**on 6th and 7th November 2010**  
at the Tryp-Centro Hotel

**Ver. 1.0 / 17 December 2010**

*Maison du Sport International  
Av. de Rhodanie 54  
CH-1007 Lausanne  
(Switzerland)  
Tél. +41 (0)21 345 10 70  
Fax +41 (0)21 345 10 77  
E-mail: [sec@fai.org](mailto:sec@fai.org)  
Web: [www.fai.org](http://www.fai.org)*



FAI Awards 2009-2010 to Members of the Aerobatic Community:

Leon Biancotto Diploma – The British Aerobatic Association.

Paul Tissandier Diplomas – Alejandro McLean (ESP)  
Ivar Dyrdal (NOR)

**3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 and 18 of October, 2009**

**3.1 Matters Arising**

Correction: Item 18.1 – the correct spelling is Osmo *Jalovaara*. Apologies to Mr. Jalovaara.

**3.2 Approval of Minutes**

There were no objections to the Minutes.

a)

**Decision** : The Delegates approved the Minutes of the Meeting

**4. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

Alan Cassidy stated that he is Chairman of the Catalogue Sub-Committee and the producer of a commercial software product used in aerobatic competition.

**5. FAI Report**

Mr. Heuer called on Mr. Stéphane Desprez for his report.

This was his first attendance at the CIVA Plenary, and he has been attending many other ASC's meetings. He reported on the following:

- The new President of the FAI is Dr. John Grubbström of Sweden. His background is in Ballooning.
- Financing – for 2011 and beyond, FAI will consolidate all ASC accounts into FAI financial reports. A working group has been established to work out the process for this switch (FAI Financial Reporting Task Force).
- The Executive Board is also working on updating/changing the Bylaws of FAI.
- The workload of FAI headquarters has increased 120% resulting in staff overload because there has not been a corresponding increase in their numbers. Restructuring is in progress to address this situation.
- The FAI Headquarters is also moving into a new building that is in the centre of the Sports Industry in Lausanne.
- The Secretary General has embarked on a program to enhance the branding of the FAI and thereby increase its visibility and stature.

**6. Report from the President of CIVA – (Agenda Item 4.1) – Michael R. Heuer**

FAI Diplomas were presented to James Black and Karl Berger in recognition of their positions as President and Vice-President of Honour. Osmo Jalovaara and Jiri Koblirle will also be so honoured.

MH read and highlighted some items from his report to CIVA.

Four FAI events were held in 2010 with a total of 190 entries:

- 9<sup>th</sup> WAAC; Poland
- 7<sup>th</sup> EAC; Czech Republic
- 1<sup>st</sup> WAGAC & 10<sup>th</sup> EGAC; Finland

In this 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of CIVA it was noted that a total of 83 FAI World and Continental Aerobatic Championships have been held since 1960.

Use of Contest Scoring Software (ACRO) has led to better judging analysis than ever before with continuing upgrades. Our “open government” approach to contest data and judging analysis (FPS, RI, JPD...) is now CIVA policy.

The President proposed permitting organizers to offer the option to Teams to book their own accommodation. This to be discussed later in the meeting.

Important to maintain and update CIVA web sites. “Championships Results” still states it is “Under construction” on the CIVA homepage. Improvements have been promised, however in the meantime, for results of Championships, go to [www.civa-results.com](http://www.civa-results.com). Some domain names have been reserved for temporary/future use by CIVA. They are:

- [www.civa-safety.com](http://www.civa-safety.com)
- [www.civa-news.com](http://www.civa-news.com)

President’s Proposals (See Agenda 13.1.)

- New classifications for Proposals to be created (Normal, Safety, and Expedited)
- Travel Allowances (TA’s) – see “President’s Report” document for complete discussion. 2010 was the first year the TA program was introduced. Amount paid to Judges and Jury based on total Sanction Fees received from that event. Judges and Jury asked to submit their expenses on standard CIVA forms (also copies of all receipts for travel.)
- In accordance with FAI’s branding policies, a new logo for the FairPlay System (FPS) now appears on all scoresheets generated by ACRO.

## **7. Report from the Vice President of Finance (Agenda Item 5) – L.G. Arvidsson**

The financial report submitted in the Agenda packages was explained:

- Two columns – Euros and US\$ (reflects amounts before and after FAI/CIVA made the conversion to Euros)
- We expect a considerable amount coming in from the sanction fees of the “Special Events” for next year.
- The money that goes into the TA’s (Travelling Allowance) for Officials, depends on how much CIVA receives from any one Championship.
- Largest amount of expenditure is towards the purchase of FAI Medals. However for 2010, we still have enough medals to cover all or most of the championships.

CIVA must continue to spend wisely, and to maintain judges seminars, and funding for CIVA Officials.

**Decision:** CIVA accepted the report and Budget for 2011.

**8. Reports on the 2010 World Advanced Glider Aerobatic Championships & European Glider Aerobatic Championships (Agenda Item 6)**

**8.1 President of the International Jury – Michael Heuer**

**Decision:** The report was accepted by CIVA.

**8.2 Contest Director – Kari Kemppi**

**Decision:** The report was accepted by CIVA.

**8.3 Chief Judge – Philippe Kuchler**

Discussion:

JG – Would like it noted that the reason for not being able to reach Jami before the second program, was that the organizers changed the Competition schedule after he had made travel arrangements. Because of the World Cup in South Africa, changing his flight departure was impossible.

KB – Thanked the organizers for the care he received when he fell ill during the championship. “If you must become ill in a foreign country, Finland is the place to be”.

PK – Stated that he wanted to qualify his statement that the Finnish Judge (an invited judge), even though he hadn't judged gliders before, was probably one of the best judges.

JG – The system works for bringing new judges into the fold.

**Decisions:** The report including the amendments were accepted by CIVA.

**9. Reports on the 2010 World Advanced Aerobatic Championships (Agenda Item 7)**

**9.1 President of the International Jury – L-G. Arvidsson**

Discussion:

AC – requested that International Jury's report and Chief Judge's report be amended to state that there were no “protests”, but one “complaint” that was dealt with by the International Jury.

Recommendations: See “Urgent Proposals” re: sealing of radios; two frequencies; positive confirmation from the chief judge to enter the box.

**Decision:** Report accepted by CIVA

**9.2 Contest Director – Stanislav Bajzik**

MH – requested the Contest Director's report – None Received.

**Decision:** None made.

**9.3 Chief Judge – John Gaillard**

Discussion:

See # 9.1 above.

Recommendations: See "Urgent Proposals" – CIVA to also approve the Flight Director of Championships.

**Decisions:** Report accepted by CIVA.

## 10. Reports on the 2010 European Aerobatic Championships (Agenda Item 8)

### 10.1 President of the International Jury – Michael Heuer

Discussion:

Programme 4:

Matthieu Roulet (MR) – Wondered how the pilots were chosen to fly Programme 4.

MH – There were so many changes to the list given at registration, of which pilots were going to fly or not.

MR – Situations change for the pilots as the competition progresses.

MH – Makes a difference to other pilots when last minute changes are made, and they are requested to fly Programme 4.

Elena Klimovich (EK) – No matter, pilots are still waiting for results of previous programmes, to see who will qualify.

Jury Figures for Unknown (Programme 3):

EK – Were physically challenging. This report recorded that Programme 3 was not popular because of this. It is noted that this programme was not flown, due to time constraints.

60% Rule:

MR – How is this rule applied?

AC – When it was written, thought it was clear. Will rewrite so that it is not so ambiguous.

Sporting Code Section 6, Part 1, 1.3.1.1. c):

*The International Jury will disqualify from participation in Programmes 2, 3 or 4 any pilot who gains less than 60% of the total score available in the Known Compulsory Programme and less than 60% of the total score available in the Free Programme, these two results being considered separately.*

Recommendations:

See "Urgent Proposals" re: Radio phraseology for pilot recall; and sealing of radios.

**Decisions:** Report accepted by CIVA.

### 10.2 Contest Director – Tomas Korinek

MH: Thanked the Czech Republic and Tomas Korinek for taking over the organizing of this event. This was the third year in a row the Czech Republic had organized an FAI Aerobatic Championships.

**Decisions:** Report accepted by CIVA.

### 10.3 Chief Judge – Nick Buckenham

Discussion:

Nick Buckenham (NB) – Emphasized the need to allow live video streaming. Rules need revising.

EK – Concerning an email sent to delegates by Lyudmyla Zelenina, the Judge from Ukraine – this letter was not meant as a complaint, but to offer suggestions, for handling accommodations, etc. for

judges at Championships. At this contest, she moved a number of times before a suitable hotel was obtained. She would like to know how much the Travel Allowance would be, before making travel plans. Also, even though CIVA Rules state that Judges should receive tangible recognition, such as Diplomas, none were given. These make it easier in some countries to obtain visas for travelling to Championships.

Tomas Korinek (TK) – Reminded, that in Bulletin #1, etold that there would be a problem finding rooms, and that an early request for accommodation was a must. However, none were received. Then, at the time of arrival, everyone wanted single accommodation. It would be easier on organizers if all Teams made their own arrangements for accommodation.

MH & PK – Teams could make arrangements for their competitors, and thereby, decreasing entry fees, but the organizers still make the arrangements for the Jury and Judges.

EK – It would be helpful that the organizers make available a list of various hotels in the contest area.

**Decisions:** Report accepted by CIVA.

## **11. Recommendations for Rules Changes for the Year 2011 (Agenda Item 9)**

### **11.1 Report of the CIVA Rules Sub-Committee – Michael Heuer**

#### **France - Proposal #1**

Unknown figures: Consistency ( all categories)

- Delete rule 9.6.1.1.
- Fig. 7.10.4 to be removed.
- Section 9 Fig. 2.1.3, 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 to be authorized also in Yak52 (while governed by rules 4.3.4.1 and 4.3.4.4).

Discussion:

AC – Add 'blue' annotation to figures.

#### **France - Proposal #2**

Additional roll reference in Unknown Programmes (all categories)

- Add ref. 9.8.3.1 (horizontal 2x8) to the list of permitted figures for Unknown Programmes.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to both proposals**

#### **France - Proposal #5**

Additional roll reference in Unknown Programmes, or Editorial (Unlimited)

- Either delete rule 9.18.1.1., hence allow fig. 9.2.3.8 in Unlimited or clarify rule 9.1.3.1

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to delete rule 9.18.1.1.**

#### **France - Proposal #6**

Additional figure in Unknown Programmes (Advanced)

- The 7.5.2 loop will be an allowed Advanced Unknown figure with either no rolls or a 9.1.3.4 roll. The outside loop to be included with an accompanying note that says: "Only 9.1.3.4 allowed in 7.5.2."

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **France – Proposal #7**

Editorial (Advanced)

- Add in rule 9.17.1.1 to clarify:
- c) 9.1.2.6 not allowed

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Russia – Proposal #2**

4.3.6.1. The organizers must allow sufficient time between programmes such that no competitor shall be required to fly Free or Freestyle programmes less than *four* hours, Unknown programmes less than six hours after landing from his/her previous flight.

Comments: Original proposal was for 'three' hours. The Rules S-C changed the requirement as above.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Russia – Proposal #3**

**Make second Unknown (Programme 3) a Free Unknown. (Advanced and Unlimited)**

Discussion:

AC – Has been mandated by his country's pilots to vote against this proposal, which is contrary to his vote in Sub-committee. They feel that there is more of a challenge to a Compulsory Unknown, and therefore, should keep the programmes as is.

Vote: For – 15; Against – 8; Abstain – 2

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Russia – Proposal #6.3 Unknown Figures (Unlimited)**

Allow not linked aileron rolls on the 45 degrees lines up. There can be up to 540 degrees of overall rotation with number of stops not more than 4.

See Russian Proposal and/or Summary of Conclusions.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Russia – Proposal #6.4 Unknown Figures (Unlimited)**

See Russian Proposal and/or Summary of Conclusions.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Russia – Proposal #6.5 (Unlimited)**

For Free Unknowns, allow combination of an aileron (first) and snap (second) rolls on 45 degrees lines up, set from the positive attitude with 45 degrees attitude change. No cross attitude or knife edge attitude snaps allowed.

The overall rotation of not more than 540 degrees with not more than 3 stops is allowed.

See Russian Proposal and/or Summary of Conclusions.

Discussion:

MR – Unclear of meaning. Perhaps wording change is needed.

AC – Snaps on the 45 degree up line can only be from wings level, with the lower co-efficient, no pitch down snaps (away from ground), and no snaps from knife-edge.  
Martin Vecko (MV) – Feels this proposal favours the higher powered aircraft. Objects to the proposal.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Russia – Proposal #6.6 (Unlimited)**

List of figures where the combinations in 6.5 are allowed:

See Russian Proposal and/or Summary of Conclusions.

Discussion:

AC – Are all 45 degree lines in one figure of 7.27 – 7.30 involved?

EK – It is possible, but there are other restrictions imposed in selecting unknown figures for Programmes 2 and 3.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**South Africa – Proposal #1**

Yak 52 Category

That Regulation 4.3.3. Programme 1 – The Free programme be modified as follows:

- 4.3.3.1. – Yak 52 Maximum Figures 12 – Maximum Total K 180
- 4.3.3.6. Versatility Yak 52 – Family 9.9 & 9.10 – At least one

That Regulation 4.3.4. Programmes 2 & 3 – The Unknown programmes be modified as follows:

- 4.3.4.1. – Yak 52 – Programme 2 – Minimum K 12 – Maximum K 20
  - Programme 3 – Minimum K 15 – Maximum K 25
- 4.3.4.4. – Yak 52 – Family 9.9 – Minimum one - Maximum two

Section 9 – List of Figures for Programmes 2 & 3

That the following figures be eliminated for Yak 52:

- 9.6 Family 2.1 to 2.8 – 9.6.3.3 (quarter outside rolling circle)
- 9.17 – 9.1.1.3 (three-quarter upward roll)
- 9.1.2.6 (one and half roll on 45 degree line up)
- 9.17 – 9.1.4.4 (full roll on 45 degree line down)
- 9.1.5.2. (half roll down on vertical line)
- 9.19 – 9.4.1.2 (2/4 on vertical up)
- 9.4.5.2 (2/4 on vertical down)
- 9.20 – 9.8.3.4 (eight point roll)
- 9.21 – 9.9.2.4 (full flick on upward 45 degree line)
- 9.9.3.6 (one and half flick on horizontal line)

Discussion:

MV – We are lowering the level of Yak 52 Championship. Should we really have this category for a World Championship? Feels that it is a degradation of the title of “World Champion”

JG – Many Yak 52 pilots feel that has it stands, this category is too difficult, and that this is the reason there haven't been many pilots competing. Would like to see more pilots and more countries involved.

MH – Need to expand. If it stays like this only a small number of countries enter. Is it better to name a World Champion if 15 countries enter, or 5? We must adapt the category to make it feasible for more countries to compete.

EK – The aircraft is getting older, but the pilots are improving. Need to adapt to the aircraft, and the availability of Yak 52s.

- Should have competition with only one type of aircraft.

Pavol Kavka (PK) – We have Unlimited, Advanced and Yak 52 categories, wonders how many more categories we will introduce in order to adapt – Sportsman?

JG – The Advanced category was introduced to encourage more competitors. This has proven successful. Hope to do the same with the Yak 52 category.

AC – Noted that there is no restriction on pilot qualification. So, an Unlimited or Advanced pilot to enter a Yak 52 Championship, thus increasing the numbers competing.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

### **United Kingdom – FAI Sporting Code, Section 6, Part 1**

#### **1.3.1.2.**

The qualification for succeeding programmes will be as follows:

Programme Q: No pilot shall continue in the competition unless the pilot is, in the judgement of the International Jury and Board of Judges, capable of safely flying the remaining programmes. Any pilot disqualified under this rule will be so informed by the International Jury before the start of Programme 1.

Comments:

This wording is already present in 1.3.1.1. (U and A).

Note: 1.2.7.4 will be reviewed to make it clear that the Chief Judge has the authority to recall a pilot for safety reasons without delay or consultation with the Board of Judges. To be discussed in Urgent Proposals.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **5.2.2.2. a) (A & Y52) – Editorial.**

...A competitor flying lower than 100 metres will be disqualified (from the current programme) for causing a dangerous situation.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **5.3.3.1. b) – Clarification of principle (Gliders and Power)**

when rolls are superimposed on a turn or loop (Rule 5.3.1.8), the roll is finished but 90° or more of the turn or loop still remains to be flown **or the turn or loop is finished but 90° or more of the roll remains to be flown.**

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **Revisited:**

Discussions:

EK – Statement concerning looping manoeuvres does not seem correct.

AC – The terms “turn and loop” are in the existing rules, and also the 90 degrees deviation applied to them both. There wasn't any change to the rule, just a clarification. To take out “loop” from the statement would change the rule.

MH – AC has noted the request for further clarification.

Vote: For – 20; Against – 4; Abstain – 1

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **5.3.3.1.g)**

any part of the figure was not visible as it was flown in or behind cloud. If the figure was visible to a majority of judges then the CJ should instruct ~~average of their~~

~~grades may be given by the~~ unsighted judges to revise their mark from "HZ" to "A".

Discussion:

PK – What happens if all but one judge sees the figure and all the others give an “A”.

JG – Then a zero is applied.

AC – Whatever the scenario, the majority rules.

Will be applied in the proper place in Glider regulations as well.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**6.4.1.3.**

Should a competitor fly a figure at a location, inside or outside the performance zone, such that the accuracy of the flight path or attitude cannot reasonably be determined, a downgrade of 2 points should be applied for each element of the figure that cannot be properly assessed.

Discussion:

MV – Wonders why this should apply for figures that are inside the box.

AC – Applies to those that are too high/too close. Example a looping figure, could not judge if the loop is round. At the moment there isn't any criteria to apply for consistency.

EK – What about 'crossbox' looping figures that are in many programmes, does that mean they will all be automatically downgraded by 2 points?

AC – Possibly, nothing is perfect, but at least this has judges all starting with a set value.

Debby Rihn-Harvey (DRH) – Perhaps the judges should be positioned further away from the box.

PK – Feels this is fairer. Should not see a figure that is flown at the back of the box receive a range of scores from 1.5 to 5.0.

Comments: several delegates still wondered about figures containing, 45 degree lines; 'P' loops; loops; etc., that are placed on the 'Y' axis, and how this would affect the 2 point reduction.

AC – There are many things that one has to consider when designing a Programme, example the wind affects the placing of figures. So, choose the 'Q' programmes, for instance, that don't have such figures occurring on the 'Y' axis.

Vote: For – 18; Against – 2; Abstain – 5

Will be applied in the proper place in Glider regulations as well. – 6.4.1.2.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**7.5.1.1.**

It is required that all Judges [are accompanied by an experienced](#) Judge's Assistant, [with whom they have worked before](#), together with a writer (who may, subject to availability, be supplied on request by the organizers). Judges who do not provide [experienced](#) Assistants will be excluded.

The Sub-committee did not recommend this proposal. However it is proposed to change it to read as follows:

It is required that all Judges use an experienced Judge's Assistant. Judges who do not provide such an Assistant will be excluded.

Discussion:

Need definition of "experience"

MH – Too many possibilities for exclusion if we write too many rules. We do not receive thousands of applications for Assistant judges to sort through. An example: If we had applied the requirement "with whom they have worked before", the USA Assistants in Pendleton, who stepped up to help Judges, would not have been able to meet this requirement.

JG - The Judges that they assisted either did not have an assistant, or as with one judge, his assistant had never seen an aerobatic competition.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

9.7 Unknown Figures (for Unlimited only)  
Family 2.9 to 2.20 List of Figures for Programmes 2 and 3  
Add: 2.19.1 and 2.19.2

See Proposal and/or Summary of Conclusions.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

### **CIVA Regulations Part 3, World Air Games**

#### **4.3.3.1**

The Timed Free Programme shall have a duration of four (4) minutes from the third wing-dip. (cross-reference to be provided) Only figures completed by this time limit will be graded. A combination will be taken as one figure. There will be no limit to the number of figures flown, but no figure shall exceed 80K.

Comments:

Previously, 5 minute sequences have proven highly fatiguing to pilots and impaired judgement at the risk of safety.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **Investigative Proposals:**

##### **Box Positioning and Line Infringements.**

Recommendation:

It is recommended a Working Party of the Judging Sub-Committee be charged with investigating currently used systems (viz. Far / Far Far / Near, grid based etc.) and any other potential solutions that may come to light. The Working Party should report in 2011 on the practicalities and value of each with a view to recommendation of a preferred solution that CIVA should adopt, provided one sufficiently worthwhile is found. Judges should henceforward annotate their Form A with figure position observations to support the validity of their positioning mark.

**Decision (Unanimous): CIVA AGREED to the recommendation of forming a Working Group, and to include representatives from GASC, RSC and JSC.**

The intention would then be to consider elimination manual line judging from 2012 onwards.

Vote: For – 20; Against – 5

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

Discussion:

MR – Why do we want to take away the one objective view point. If a 'working group' is formed should include representatives from all Sub-Committees (GASC, RSC and JSC)

DRH – Disagrees with the elimination of boundary judges. It is a challenge for pilots to keep the sequence within the boundaries of the box. Should still be some form of boundary penalties, and not transfer it to positioning scores which would make it just another subjective point. Need to maintain the objectivity of boundary judges.

JG – The Working Group should also look into the newer technology available. This would be better than sometimes Organizers do not get qualified boundary judges, which is worse than no judges at all.

EK – Still keep the WG to establish guidelines and criteria for positioning scores.

MH – CIVA needs to establish the Terms of Reference for the WG.

MR – Requests that the proposal be divided into two, and each be voted on separately.

(See Decisions above)

### **United States – Proposal #1**

To make changes to ensure a non-ambiguous interpretation of the regulations concerning direction of flight on the X and Y axes.

Discussion:

Several questions were raised.

DRH – Too many ambiguities. USA withdraws the proposal

**Decision: WITHDRAWN**

### **URGENT PROPOSALS**

**World YAK 52 Aerobatic Championships (Held over from 2009 for Discussion) – Matti Mecklin, President, International Jury**

#### **Proposal #1 – Add missing information 1.3.1.2. Programmes “Y52”**

**Proposed Change (in bold):**

1.3.1.2. Programmes “Y52”

a) The Known Programme: The Known Compulsory Programme

Programme 1: The Free Programme

Programme 2: The 1st Unknown Compulsory Programme

Programme 3: The 2nd Unknown Compulsory Programme

b) The final results of all completed programmes will count toward the Championship.

**c) The Known Programme is a qualification flight.**

**Any pilot scoring less than 60% of the total possible score will not continue in the competition unless the pilot is, in the judgement of the International Jury and Board of Judges, capable of safely flying the remaining programmes.**

d) The qualification for succeeding programmes will be as follows:

Programme 1: All qualified competitors

Programme 2: All qualified competitor

Programme 3: **A mandatory cut of 25% of the competitors, without respect to gender, will be introduced on the basis of the combined final results after Programmes Known, 1 and 2, subject to Jury discretion.**

Discussion:

MR – Already discussed in British proposal.

EK – Cut of 25% of competitors for Y52 is not reasonable. There are too few entries in Y52 that with this value there would not be enough competitors flying Programme 3.

AC – Adopt the wording of the British proposal and apply to Y52 proposal.

MH – Will draft new wording before taking a vote.

MH – Will resume with Proposal #1 in “Other Business”

AC – In collaboration with EK new wording as follows:

Programmes

a) Programme Q (U, A), or

**The Known Programme (Y52):** The Known Compulsory Programme

Programme 1: The Free Programme

Programme 2: The Free Unknown Programme

Programme 3: The Unknown Compulsory Programme

Programme 4 : The Final Freestyle Programme (U only)

b) **The Known Compulsory Programme** will be a qualification and training flight. The final results of Programme Q will **only** count toward the Championships if, due to bad weather etc., Programme 2 has not been flown by all qualified pilots. **The Known Programme (Y52) will always count towards the final results. After the Known Compulsory Programme, no pilot shall continue in the competition unless the pilot is, in the judgement of the International Jury and Board of Judges,**

capable of safely flying the remaining programmes. Any pilot disqualified under this rule will be so informed by the International Jury before the start of Programme 1.

c) The International Jury will disqualify from participation in Programmes 2, 3 or 4 any pilot who gains less than 60% of the total score available [in the Known Compulsory Programme](#) and less than 60% of the total score available [in the Free Programme](#), these two results being considered separately.

d) For Programme 3, a mandatory cut of 25% of the remaining competitors, without respect to gender, will be introduced on the basis of the final results after Programmes 1 and 2. If there is insufficient time to complete the championships due to weather problems or unforeseen circumstances, the International Jury is authorised to introduce an additional cut of the competitors, without respect to gender, up to a maximum of 50% of the combined standings after Programmes 1 and 2.

e) The decision on the number of competitors who will fly the Final Freestyle Programme will be made by the International Jury in consultation with the organisers, but will be not less than 10 pilots nor, usually, more than 20. Priority in selection will be given to those pilots entered by NACs for this programme only. The Jury shall then select at least 9 pilots, regardless of gender, in their order of ranking in the programmes so far completed. In this part of the selection process, no more than 3 pilots will be selected from any one NAC. If the selected field does not include 3 female pilots, then female pilots shall be added, in rank order regardless of their NAC, to make the total of female pilots up to 3 and the total of all pilots up to a maximum of 23.

f) In Unlimited, Programme 4 shall have priority over Programme 3. Thus, if weather forecasts indicate that all programmes may not be completed before the end of the contest period, the organisers, in consultation with the International Jury, shall direct that Programme 4 be flown before Programme 3.

Programmes "Y52" Delete

Renumber as 1.3.1.2.

#### **Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### **Proposal #2 – Lower time limit between each programme**

Proposed Change (in bold):

4.3.2.6. Programme ~~2~~ 3, Compulsory Unknown

a) The International Jury will select one of the submitted sequences for use and will insure all figures are as drawn by the NAC s submitting them, e.g. entry/exit directions are as drawn.

b) The International Jury may alter the selected sequence, if necessary for safety reasons.

c) Programme ~~2~~ 3, after being approved by the Chief Delegates or their representatives, will be announced to competitors by the International Jury not less than **12** hours before the time at which each programme is to be flown.

Discussion:

MR; EK – Not enough time should the sequence be chosen and distributed for example at 9pm. Would this also apply to all power categories.

MH – This would have to be for all categories, why would Y52 need less time?

MH – Vote to reduce the time limit from 18 to 12 hours, in all categories.

Vote: For – 1; Against – 16; Abstain – 8

#### **Decision: CIVA Disagreed with the proposal**

#### **Proposal #3 – Time between Unknown Flights & Proposal #4 – Lower altitude infringement**

**Decision: WITHDRAWN** – Already proposed and accepted.

#### **Proposal # 5 – No hand drawing accepted. More detailed Free Unknown**

**procedure. Time between Unknown programs to be shortened to 12 hrs**

**Proposed Change (in bold):**

4.3.2.7. Programme 2, Free Unknown

- a) The International Jury will publish all the sequences proposed by the NACs. At least one linking figure, up to a maximum of four, must be included in each sequence. The K factors for the linking figure(s) shall be modified so that they share equally an aggregate of 24K.
- b) All these **sequence proposals must contain complete pages of all three Forms. A, B and C. Computer file must be submitted. Currently acceptable file formats are Microsoft Visio using Aresti software and Olan.** Sequences must be checked by the International Jury and if necessary corrected at least 24 hours before the start of the programme.
- c) **The Jury selects one of submitted sequences or creates one as a default one.**
- d) At least **12** hours before the commencement of Programme 2, each competitor shall notify the Organizer which of the alternative proposals he/she will fly. **In case a pilot fails to notify the Jury about his/her selection of the sequence, he/she is supposed to fly the default/jury version.**
- e) At least 1 hour before the start of Programme 2, the Organizer shall provide each NAC with a list of the Free Unknowns chosen by each competing pilot.

Discussion:

MH – Since CIVA agreed to changing all Unknowns in Advanced and Unlimited, to a Free Unknown, any wording from this proposal would be incorporated into those categories.

Several concerns in changing the time frame from 18 to 12 hours to decide which sequence a pilot wishes to fly.

MR – Should remove the burden for the Jury of selecting/creating a default sequence. If a pilot doesn't choose a sequence, then he/she is disqualified. Twenty-four hours from the time the sequences are published, is plenty of time to decide.

AC – Then all that needs to be changed is the wording for the computer format (b), and to delete (c) above – and any reference to the default/jury version

MD – Request that files submitted also have a back-up version in 'pdf' format – easier for the organizers.

Jurgen Leukefeld (JL) – State that it should be "In digital and readable form".

**Decision:** CIVA AGREED to the proposal. Add "In digital and readable form"

4.3.2.7. Programme 2, Free Unknown

- a) The International Jury will publish all the sequences proposed by the NACs. At least one linking figure, up to a maximum of four, must be included in each sequence. The K factors for the linking figure(s) shall be modified so that they share equally an aggregate of 24K.
- b) All these **sequence proposals must contain complete pages of all three Forms. A, B and C. Computer file must be submitted. Currently acceptable file formats are Microsoft Visio using Aresti software and Olan.** Sequences must be checked by the International Jury and if necessary corrected at least 24 hours before the start of the programme.
- ~~c) The Jury selects one of submitted sequences or creates one as a default one.~~
- d) At least ~~12~~ **18** hours before the commencement of Programme 2, each competitor shall notify the Organizer which of the alternative proposals he/she will fly. ~~In case a pilot fails to notify the Jury about his/her selection of the sequence, he/she is supposed to fly the default/jury version.~~
- e) At least 1 hour before the start of Programme 2, the Organizer shall provide each NAC with a list of the Free Unknowns chosen by each competing pilot.

Proposals must be in digital format and readable form.

## **Proposal #6 – Level of Disqualification**

### **Proposed Change (in bold):**

4.6.1.1. Aircraft must pass a technical inspection of the wing attachment units. Only those aircraft with the reinforced wing and a G-limit of +7/-5 are allowed. They must be equipped with checked and sealed accelerometers. Any pilot exceeding the +7/-5 g-limit **will be disqualified from the current programme.**

Discussion:

AC – Change the wording from “checked” to **calibrated**. Checked could mean that the accelerometer was looked at, and not actually set, or anything done about it.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the proposal, with the amended wording.**

## **Russia – Proposal #2**

Remove 9.4.5.2. (vertical downward 2x4) from the List of Figures for Programmes 2 and 3 for Yak-52.

Discussion:

Part of SA proposal – and approved.

## **11.2 Report of the CIVA Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee (Jerzy Makula)**

### **Czech Republic – Proposal #3 (flick rolls to 7.2.1.; 7.4.2.; 7.2.2.; & 7.4.1.)**

Errors were found in this proposal after the Plenary, it has been sent back to GASC to clarify its intent.

### **Germany – Proposal #3 –Direction of Flight**

**5.3.3.1.** Add the following text:

"After a directional deviation of 90° or more on the Y axis, although it is non-directional, the original direction must be re-established before the next figure is flown."

### **United States – Proposal #1 – Direction of Flight**

4.2.3.2. Add the following paragraph following the current text:

"The direction of flight on the principal (X) axis is determined by the alignment of the X axis, the "prevailing **official** wind" direction set by the International Jury, and the drawing of the Forms B/C. The secondary (Y) axis is non-directional, however; i.e., the competitor shall have the option to determine the direction of flight on the secondary axis whenever an option exists."

**5.3.3.1(b)** Add the following new subparagraph to the list of Hard Zero (HZ) marks and re-label existing subparagraphs accordingly:

b) Any figure, or part of a figure, flown in the wrong direction on the main (X) axis. The secondary (Y) axis is non-directional.

Discussion:

ME – Should we be looking at including both of these proposals together. Also, ‘glider aerobatics’ do not have “interruptions”, but “repositioning” figures. 4.2.3.2. is more an editorial change.

MR – USA has already withdrawn their proposal from the ‘power’ 4.2.3.2..

MH – Does USA also wish to do this for ‘glider’?

DRH – US withdraws 4.2.3.2.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the above proposal**

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the GASC's report to this point. "Diverse" needed to be decided separately.**

**Diverse**

The GASC recommends that CIVA agrees to eliminate Continental Championships, and to have World Glider Aerobatic Championships (Advanced and Unlimited) [every year](#).

Discussion:

MH – If approved will need to change Section 6.

AC – Asked the Secretary General if he is aware of any conflict between Sec. 6 and the General Section.

MH – There's a philosophical argument that it would devalue the title of World Champion.

AC – Also if we eliminate "Continental" Championships, then that would exclude the Americas, Asia-South Pacific or the South African Championships from being held in alternate years.

JM – Organizers are more interested in a World Championships than an European/Continental one. Also, a World Championship, gives more pilots, example, the younger ones, a chance to compete.

SD – No legal problems. Just need to change Section 6. FAI doesn't believe World Championships should be held on a yearly basis. The reason that organizers want to hold a World event, is most likely because of the value of the title that is created by not having it so frequently. In order to be the best of the best, you need time to achieve that goal. Shouldn't make an emotional decision for 2011, based on one organizer wishing to host a World event.

ME – 3.5.6.2. General Section – "should" be approximately every 2 years, it doesn't say "must".

SD – Could be other ways of encouraging younger pilots, perhaps label it as a "World Cup". Should really take more time to reflect on this proposal.

Eltonas Meleckis (EM) – Consider this one case at a time – have it for one year only – let Poland organize World event for 2011.

Vote: For – 15; Against – 0; Abstain – 10

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Urgent Proposals:**

**7.3.1.2.** The awarding of penalties for infringements of upper and lower height limitations is decided by majority vote of the judges. In the case the required simple majority could not rise from a vote within the Board of Judges, the Chief Judge shall have the casting vote; a two-thirds majority being required for the penalty of disqualification ( CIVA 4.2.4.3)

Delete:

"a two-thirds majority being required for the penalty of disqualification ( CIVA 4.2.4.3)"

**5.2.1.6.** Infringements of the lower and upper height limits will be estimated by the Judges and will be penalized only if a simple majority has recognized the violation and duly recorded this on their marking sheets. In case the required simple majority could not rise from a vote within the Board of Judges, the Chief Judge shall have a casting vote. If an HMD is in operation, the official video should be checked to verify audible outputs from the HMD receiver. An infringement of the lower 100 m level must be agreed by at least a two-thirds majority of the Judges. Which figures will be given penalties will be determined by the Chief Judge at the end of a flight.

Delete:

An infringement of the lower 100 m level must be agreed by at least a two-thirds majority of the Judges.

Delete: **4.2.4.7.** Disqualification (for the current programme) for grave infringements of the lower height limit shall be decided by the Board of Judges.

**4.2.2.2. (c)(ii)**

100% agreement among the participating teams' Chief Delegates (no abstentions).

Replace: 100% by 2/3

Discussion:

PK – At the WAGAC/EGAC one competitor was well below height limits, but judges did not record this, even in a simple majority. The HMD was not in use, financial constraints.

JG – Are these proposals also applied to Power?

MH – Proposals are from the GASC, but if CIVA agrees, would also be extended to Power Aerobatics so there is consistency throughout.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**Known Compulsory's for "Unlimited and Advanced" Gliders to be discussed with Power 'Q' programmes**

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the GASC report.**

### 11.3 Report of the CIVA Catalogue Sub-Committee (Alan Cassidy)

Of the proposals submitted by Delegates for changes in the CIVA Regulations for 2011, only one was referred to the Catalogue Sub-Committee for discussion and recommendation. This was a proposal from France to add some more basic figures to the Aresti System (Condensed).

AC sought comments from other **remaining** members of the Catalogue Sub-Committee, and these were **in accord unanimous** in suggesting that these complex figures would not add anything of significant benefit to Family 8. Views expressed included that of Family 8 being already the largest Family with a great number of figures available for choice in Free and Known Programmes, but which were seldom, if ever, used.

The resulting recommendation of the Sub-Committee to plenary is **not** include these new basic shapes in Family 8 for 2011.

Discussion:

MR – Disagrees with the wording "unanimous". Would like to know the actual vote of the members of the SC

AC – For: 2, Against: 3.

MR – Requests that the above statement be reworded.

See above paragraph for wording.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED with the Sub-Committee's report, and the rewording change.**

### 11.4 Report of the CIVA Judging Sub-Committee (John Gaillard)

#### 1. Judge Selection Procedure:

Discussion:

MH – A joint meeting was held yesterday of the JSC and Rules SC, to discuss several suggestions for changes.

JG – Judges will be selected based on the average of their RI's for 3 years - now it's 5 years. At the moment Glider judges have data for the last 2 years, so it will be necessary for the judges at Glider Championships (in 2011) to be approved by the Judging Sub-Committee and the CIVA Bureau.

- The RI results will include the 'Q' programme – starting from 2011.
- All data will be considered – Unlimited, Advanced and Y52 together – Gliders separately.
- Also listed the RI for each contest.
- Selection of Judges will be first those who have a RI average below 5.

ME – Wonders how one gets to be an invited Judge. Feels that it is impossible to get on the list.

JG – If on the FAI International Judge's list, the NAC may nominate a Judge. The applicant must submit data from as many recent contests as possible – National, International.

2. Policy on Judges entry fees & travel expenses:

It is recommended that CIVA should consider the entry fees by invited judges to be part of a development policy to extend the International Judge data base even further by suitable candidates actually participating in Championships with the more proven judges (this has worked out extremely well in Poland this year) and as such the WPGA Reserve Fund held by the FAI should be used for this purpose, as this would be actively be a practical Development Programme.

This would ensure the use of funds accumulated by CIVA at the WPGA on the basis of its active support to be put to good use in the very arena where most of these funds were accumulated by CIVA providing judges and officials to WPGA competitions. The amount in the reserve fund should be sufficient for at least seven to ten years support and would be money well spent in developing judging excellence.

MH – As noted the WPGA Reserve Fund is held by the FAI. CIVA would have to make a proposal to the EB to release funds for this project.

EK – Would Judges know what percentage they will be receiving in TA expenses, before the event?

LG – With at least two Special Events next year, there should be enough funds for 100% of the Judge's TA.

JG – The Bureau is to set guidelines to govern how the amounts will be distributed, for example, based on the cost of the cheapest airfare.

MH – All judges were emailed the current guidelines for TAs. Presently, the percentage is dependent on the number of contestants at a competition. So, naturally, the larger the number of pilots, the higher the amount of sanction fees, and the percentage given to the judges, assistants, and jury. Uncomfortable to say that at all Contests, 100% of TAs will be promised. The programme we have today is much better than the system of a set stipend (500\$US) that we had before. Wasn't fair to those who had long distances to attend.

PK – Agrees with EK, that before the judges accept a position at a contest they should have some firm amount of the TA. Also, would ask the Bureau, to insure that whatever payments are assessed, come as soon as possible, not like this year, when it was paid months after the contest.

MH – The Bureau promises, that the information on the expense guidelines will go out as soon as possible, most likely at the time of invitation for judges.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED that the Bureau make a proposal to the FAI EB to use some of the WPGA Reserve Fund toward establishing a CIVA Judge's Training Programme.**

4. CIVA International Judges List:

It is recommended that the distinction between Gliding and Power Judges, be removed from the International Judging list.

Discussion:

MR – Would this mean that there is no requirement for Glider Judges to have experience judging power aerobatics, and vice versa.

JG – The basic process of judging aerobatics is the same. It would be up to the Chief Judge to give a thorough briefing, related to any differences. Doesn't see a majority of crossover of judges.

Hans – Wonders how new judges would be brought into the CIVA List, feels that by increasing the number of available judges (ie by removing the 'P' and 'G'), it would be the same judges all the time, without any chances for new judges. Also, this could mean that a Chief Judge would also be in a 'crossover' situation.

JG – In the past 3 to 5 years, there have been many judges (at least 5, by just checking the list) who were at competitions as 'invited' judges, who gained a RI of less than 5, and would therefore be on the list of CIVA Judges. Also, remember, that the Chief Judge for a contest is voted on by CIVA.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

## 5. Change of procedure for Perception Zeroes (Soft Zeroes)

### **For judges:**

- All fundamental CIVA rules and judging criteria remain unaltered.
- Two minor changes are required from judges and/or assistants on their Form-A's, as follows.

\* When a pilot fails to meet the relevant perception criteria for a manoeuvre and the judge awards a zero, this should be written as "PZ" on the Form-A. The judge must also state the reason for applying the PZ in the same way as already required for HZ's.

\* In circumstances where a judge cumulates more than 45° but less than 90° of error in a figure or assesses more than 9.5 downgrades, the grade given should be "0.0" to signify that all ten marks have been lost.

The chief judge should subsequently check that PZ's are applied only to manoeuvres where a perception error has been seen, and that a plausible reason has been given. The CJ has no other input regarding the presence of PZ's; they are subjective decisions made by individual judges and there is no requirement to review or "Confirm" them.

### **For the scorer:**

- When the scorer enters the marks a perception zero will be stored in the database as "PZ" to distinguish it from normal zeros (0.0) and hard zeros (HZ).
- On all published materials the letters PZ will indicate that a perception zero has been applied, to distinguish it from a normal zero (0.0) and a HZ (a hard zero).

### **Within the FairPlay System:**

During the results calculation process:

- PZ's will be evaluated in exactly the same way that SZ's have been in the past, being set to a numeric value of 0.0 when FPS processing starts. Apart from this, the entire numeric / statistical calculation process remains unchanged.
- In any figure where one or more PZ marks are rejected as statistically unacceptable and replaced by a Fitted Value (FV), a flag is set to identify each PZ rejection for reference by the subsequent Judge / RI calculating process.
- The re-calculation of past events using the new system will therefore provide unchanged / identical results, the ability to handle 'old' SZ's remaining as before.

During the RI calculation process:

- Raw marks will be figure-grouped as they are now.
- Any AV's (Averages) that have been requested are as usual set to 'Missing'.
- In any figure where the outlier calculation process has flagged the rejection of a PZ, the judges' raw PZ will also be set to 'Missing'.
- Fitted Values are calculated and used to replace all missing data.
- Judge / Pilot scores are calculated as now for subsequent comparison with the panel FPS results, and continue to provide the basis for determining the RI for each judge.

Because unreliable PZ's have been removed and replaced by FV's, the RI for any judge whose PZ is rejected will remain unaffected.

Discussion:

JG – This would only effect changes of judge’s RIs, not pilot’s marks or scores.  
EK - Agrees with this proposal, gives a judge more opportunity to give scores more freely.  
However, a judge could use the PZ too often, example, for all snap rolls. The Chief Judge must discuss the situation with that judge.  
JG – Agrees, the CJ must be watching the score sheets for any discrepancies.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED and accepted the Judging Sub-Committee’s report.**

## 11.5 Urgent Proposals from Championships (Delegates & Officials)

(Received within ten days of Championships – Concerning safety)

### European Aerobatic Championships

#### From the International Jury

UP -1 Rule: 1.2.7.4. Recall of Pilots

Additional text should be added to this section to make it clear that the Chief Judge has the authority to immediately recall a pilot for safety reasons. The radio phraseology “Land, Land, Land” should be added to 4.2.1.8.

“Land, Land, Land” should be transmitted after “Break , Break, Break”.

Will be applied in the proper place in Glider regulations as well.

Discussion:

MR – Is it really necessary to have two phraseologies. Too much confusion, and lack of understanding. Just have “Break, Break, Break”.

JG – Once we have the words set in the rules, we should all know what they mean, as in the case of “Break, Break, Break”.

AC – International law that in order for a pilot to fly outside of his/her country, they must be sufficiently fluent in English.

MH – Amend the proposal. See statement in blue above. Will be announced during every briefing.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

UP - 2 Rule: 4.2.1.2. & 4.2.1.6. Radios

Eliminate requirement to seal radios on Safety Frequency as this is obsolete and does not permit use of radio on two frequencies for ATC and Safety.

Discussion:

AC – Against the proposal, too many chances of having too many controllers, ATC, Chief Judge, and anyone else who might get on a frequency. Also, there are many pilots who forget to switch over to the safety frequency, and risk disqualification. Could have one frequency, but don’t seal it.

MH – It would be up to the organizers if they wanted more than one frequency. The proposal is that we no longer have to seal radios.

Pavol – Should only have one frequency – Safety

Vote: For - 24; Against – 0; Abstain – 1

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

#### From Russia

UP – 3 & 4 Withdrawn

UP – 7 Additional Safety Figures

Enlarge the list of allowed safety figures with:

- a stall turn from inverted to inverted (5.1.2.)
- a humpty-bump from inverted to inverted (8.1.2. or 8.3.2.)

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**From the Chief Judge**

UP – 10 Radio Frequencies

1.4.4.3 and 4.2.1.6 must surely be revised, and a broader review of the Section 6 wording to expressly forbid any communications to/from the pilot other than with the CJ or ATC is required, on pain of disqualification.

Discussion:

AC – Have already agreed to eliminate the sealing of radios, so the proposal should be amended to delete 1.4.4.3 and reword 4.2.1.6 to reflect this change.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**World Advanced Glider Aerobatic Championships & European Glider Aerobatic Championships**

**From the Chief Judge**

UP – 11 Safety Frequency instructions and wording

Add paragraph 4.2.1.4:

“Once airborne, and before entering the Performance Zone, a pilot may call the Chief Judge on the safety frequency, saying: “Number x, radio check”. The Chief Judge must respond to this call if he hears it.”

Add paragraph 4.2.1.5:

“The standard phraseology in the event that a break is required for safety reasons will be the Chief Judge saying “Break, break, break”. The pilot has to stop his sequence immediately and listen for further instructions on the safety frequency. If the pilot disregards the announcement or the further instructions by the chief judge, he gets disqualified for this program.”

Discussion:

MH – The intention is to have the wording the same in both Glider and Power.

PK – At the Championship, had to invent his own phraseology.

ME – Change the wording “may” to “should” or “must”.

MR – Should have the Chief Judge initiate radio communication.

JG – Agrees. In Poland he insisted that the Chief Judge was the one to establish radio communication with the pilot, and that the pilot acknowledged the radio check. If there was no radio communication the pilot must land.

MH – Amend the proposal that the Chief Judge initiates the radio call.

PK – To do this properly, would need extra people at the CJ's station.

MR – We would then also change the wording in Power 4.2.1.7.

EK – Need to clear when a pilot will be disqualified.

AC – Reword the rules to reflect what will occur if no response from pilot to “Break, Break, Break” and to “Land, Land, Land”.

JG – Must have two way radio communication, not sufficient or safe for just Chief Judge transmitting and the pilot responding by ‘wing rock’, for example.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the proposal with the amendment, that the Chief Judge will initiate the radio check. Also to the rewording of Paragraph 4.2.1.5. Glider and 4.2.1.7. Power re: disqualification.**

## **World Advanced Aerobatic Championships**

### **From the Chief Judge**

UP – 12 The Flight Director for all Championships to be approved by CIVA

Discussion:

MV – On what qualifications would the Flight Director be approved

MH – No guidelines written down, but should know who it is.

JG – When a NAC bids for a competition, the Contest Director is named along with his qualifications, so too, should the FD, and for example state that he speaks English. The situation in Poland, was that the FD could not speak the language, and was controlling the take-offs, without knowing what was going on in the box.

Comment – The NAC should be the one to appoint the FD, someone whose is experienced with ATC in their own country. Not necessary to be certified as an ATC.

JG – That's exactly what happened in Poland, and it was not successful.

AC – Agrees, the FD must speak English. Also, know the conditions of the Competition, know the difference between a sequence ending and an interruption. He controls the competition traffic, not the ATC/Tower. The Tower controls all other traffic around the airfield, and both the FD and ATC communicate with each other. The Tower is to give priority and the right of way to the competition A/C which are on the Safety Frequency.

Vote: For - 23; Against - 0; Abstain - 2

### **Decision: CIVA AGREED**

UP – 13 Procedures for the entry into the Performance Zone to be approved by CIVA

Discussion:

JG – Need to have some standardization, so that at each contest everyone knows the procedure. One contest will have a white signal flag, at another it will be red. The proposal meant for take-off/departure procedures, not entry into the box.

EK – Each site is different, and set rules would not always apply to every site. They shouldn't be put into the Rules.

AC – Instead of this being an UP, make it a Normal Proposal to be worked on over the next year, with wording for the rule, and to be submitted to the 2011 CIVA Plenary. Choose on Principle.

MH – In the mean time, over the 2011 Contest season, will pay close attention to the procedures. The Jury, Contest Director and Flight Director will meet and discuss the departure procedures and get them in advance and circulate them.

### **Decision: CIVA AGREED in principle to the proposal.**

### **Rejection of proposals:**

EK – Even though it was accepted by CIVA that the Sub-Committees would record the reasons that they reject some proposals, this is not happening. Would like it to be noted, and request that the SCs give the NACs the reason for rejecting their proposals.

Meeting adjourned at 17:27hrs

Meeting resumed Sunday November 7<sup>th</sup> at 0915hrs

Votes: 24 (Austria absent – in am)

**12. CIVA Known Compulsory Programmes for the Year 2010 (Agenda Item 10)**

**12.1 Advanced 'Q' Programme**

| Proposal | Vote 1 <sup>st</sup> | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3 <sup>rd</sup> |
|----------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| A        | 4                    |                 |                 |
| B        | 8                    | 10              | 12              |
| C        | 1                    |                 |                 |
| D        | 10                   | 12              | 12              |
| E        | 1                    |                 |                 |

**Decision: Tie broken by the President of CIVA. Proposal D from Norway adopted**

**12.2 Unlimited 'Q' Programme**

| Proposal | Vote | 2 <sup>nd</sup> Vote |
|----------|------|----------------------|
| A        | 4    |                      |
| B        | 9    | 15                   |
| C        | 11   | 9                    |

**Decision: Proposal B from United Kingdom adopted**

**12.3 Advanced and Unlimited Glider 'Q' Programmes**

As submitted by the Glider Sub-Committee

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the Proposals from the Glider Sub-Committee**

**11.6 Yak 52 Known Compulsory Programme**

Only one submitted – from Finland

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**13. Future Aerobatic Championships – Reports and Proposals (Agenda Item 11)**

**13.1 2011 World Aerobatic Championships (Bid from USA) – Item 11.1**

Proposal presented by Debby Rihn-Harvey (information presented included a video, PowerPoint presentation, a book and USB stick).

- Site – Sherman, Texas (US Nationals since 1973)
- Dates – June 14–27, 2011
- Contest Director – Mr. Bob Stark
- Technical Director - TBA
- Entry Fee – 1750 Euros (includes sanction fees) – pilots; 1500 Euros – other team members (based on 1 Euro = \$ 1.40 USD)

\*11 night accommodation (Double Occupancy) All Teams in same hotel  
(Could negotiate to have Single Occupancy at same rate)

\*3 meals per day

\*Avgas for competition flights

\*Smoke Oil for Programme 4

\*Ground transportation between hotel and contest site.

\*Opening and Closing Ceremonies and Entertainment

Committee set up to assist competitors in finding aircraft:

Many practice areas within one short flight of the contest site. Trying to get sponsorship to decrease entry fees.

Discussion:

DRH – The June dates are proposed because this time of year is the best weather (October is hurricane season). Also, have the most people available for volunteers. Will be able to practice in contest box, during one of the local contests before WAC.  
EK - Too early for the flying season in Europe – need to ship A/C to USA, cuts into practice time, and even if rent A/C, still decreases practice time, plus will need to start applying for a license now.  
DRH – Working with the FAA – willing to expedite procedures for obtaining licenses. Will also help in dealing with customs.  
DRH – Would also hold the World YAK 52 Aerobatic Championship at the same time. At least 4 Yak 52s will be available.

### 13.2 2011 World Aerobatic Championships (Bid from Italy)

Proposal presented by Paolo Zoppi (information presented was by PowerPoint).

- Site – Cervia-Pisignano Airport (Ravenna, Italy) Military Airport
- Date – August 11 to September 11, 2011 (End of tourist season – accommodation available)
- Contest Director – Dario Costa
- Team Leader – Irene Pasini
- Technical Director – TBA

Entry Fees:

Competitors: Single Room - 1750 Euros; Double Room - 1650 Euros; Triple Room - 1400 Euros

Other Team Members and Observers: Single Room - 1550 Euros; Double Room - 1350 Euros; Triple Room - 1200 Euros

Entry Fee Includes:

- Accommodation in Hotel, Milano Marittima Beach (Aug. 31 – Sept. 11, 2011)
- 3 meals per day
- Fuel and oil for competition flights
- Shuttle hotel – airfield
- Hangar space available free for competition aircraft

Deadline for subscription is May 31, 2011. Entries received after this date will be accepted if space available with extra fee:

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| • Between June 1 <sup>st</sup> & June 30 <sup>th</sup> 2011 | 10% surcharge |
| • Between July 1 <sup>st</sup> & July 31 <sup>st</sup> 2011 | 15% surcharge |
| • After August 1 <sup>st</sup>                              | 25% surcharge |

Discussion:

Airfield open for practice August 27<sup>th</sup>. Many airfields in surrounding area also available for practice.

Question from floor – Would Italy consider hosting the Yak 52 Championship?

PZ – Will have to consult NAC

Vote: No request for secret ballot

Italy - 14

USA - 10

**Decision:** The 2011 World Aerobatic Championships will be held in Ravenna, Italy – August 31 to September 11.

### 13.3 World Glider Aerobatic Championships & World Advanced Glider Aerobatic Championships (Bid from Poland)

Proposal presented by Marta Nowicka - NAC representative for the organizers.

- Site – Torun, Poland
- Date – July 26 to Aug. 7, 2011 (extended from original start date of July 28)
- Contest Director – Pavol Kavka (Slovakia)
- Technical Director – TBA

Entry Fees: Do **not** include hotel, meals or towing fees

- Competitors: 600 Euros
- Team members: 250 Euros
- Family members: 50 Euros

Towing Fees (based on price of fuel and are subject to change):

- Competition towing to 1250m: 55 Euros
- Training towing fee: 50 Euros

Discussion:

JM – Training will be available before the contest.

PK – Is it possible to align the Box to the runway (as proposed – considerable off angled)?

JM – Will try, but the corners will be difficult to mark.

**Decision: The 14<sup>th</sup> World Glider Aerobatic Championships & 2<sup>nd</sup> World Advanced Glider Aerobatic Championships will be held in Torun, Poland – July 26 to August 7, 2011**

#### 13.4 Other 2011 Championships

European Advanced Aerobatic Championships:

Discussion:

MH – So far there are no bids for this event.

**Decision: The CIVA Bureau is authorized to negotiate on any bids that are received after the Plenary.**

World YAK 52 Aerobatic Championships:

Discussion:

Russia will try to make a bid. Will give an answer in December.

**Decision: The CIVA Bureau is authorized to negotiate and decide on any bids that are received after the Plenary.**

#### 13.5 2012 FAI Championships

No bids were received. Will return to these events at next year's Plenary meeting.

**(Number of Voting Delegates: Back to 25)**

---

#### 14. List of International Judges (Agenda Item 12)

Refer to CIVA web site for complete list.

All 'P' and 'G' notations removed

**15. Other Business (Agenda Item 13)**

**15.1. Proposals of the President of CIVA (Michael R. Heuer) - Item 13.1**

Proposal #1 – FAI International Judges List

Already voted on and accepted

Proposal #2 – Rules Proposals for CIVA

CIVA proposals are categorized as follows:

- Normal Proposals (NPs): These are proposals submitted each year by Delegates in accordance with our normal rules process and deadlines. They are to be considered by Sub-Committees and recommendations made to plenary.
- Safety Proposals (SPs): Proposals to be submitted which relate to safety problems and merit consideration by plenary at CIVA's next meeting.
- Expedited Proposals (EPs): Proposals submitted as a result of experiences at Championships and which merit discussion by plenary at CIVA's next meeting. These would be minor changes which are either editorial in nature or of limited importance that full Sub-Committee consideration is not required. A simple "rule of thumb" would be that if discussion required a lot of time on the floor of the plenary, it should be an NP.

The President of CIVA has the authority to determine how each proposal is categorized and then route it through CIVA's system accordingly.

Discussion:

EK – Suggest that the date for the deadline for submission of 'Q' programmes, be set for a reasonable time after the competition season is finished. This would give time for competitors to be settled down, and be able to have time for composing the programmes.

MH – Proposal discussing at the moment is the categories of proposals. Will consider the suggestion.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

Proposal #3 – CIVA Sanction Fees

CIVA Sanction Fees are now charged as follows:

- 150 Euro per pilot at World Championships.
- 115 Euro per pilot at Continental Championships

The President proposed an increase in the Sanction Fees for Continentals to 150 Euro.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

Proposal #4 – Accommodation at Power Championships

Section 6, Part 1, paragraph 4.1.2.1 re-worded to permit organizers to offer the option to NACs to arrange their own accommodation. See "CIVA President's Report" for detailed discussion. If the organizers wish to continue to include accommodation in the Entry Fees, they would be free to do so.

Discussion:

MH – Accommodation for Officials will still be arranged by the organizers.

MR – Should have some Guidelines if the organizers do not include accommodation arrangements. To Confirm that there are sufficient hotels available; arrange for discounts at the hotels; if possible, pre-book a block of rooms at various hotels, with discounts if arrange by a certain date. Find and recommend a large hotel that could accommodate nearly all the participants

MV – Double or Single for Judges

MH – Not stated, but just as competitors, the judges prefer single accommodation.

MM – Should adopt the Glider system of hotel, meals, and fuel paid by the competitor.

MH – Only discussing the hotel costs, can deal with this at a later time.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED**

**15.2. Contest Scoring Programme Report - ACRO Nick Buckenham – Item 13.2**

Discussion:

EK – Thanked N. Buckenham for all the work he has done, and for the prompt response for results, even from the National level contests.

**Decision: CIVA accepted the Report as published.**

**15.3 Leon Biancotto Diploma for 2010 – Item 13.3**

The British Aerobatic Association nominates **Claude Bessiere** (France). The citation reads as follows:

*Claude 'Coco' Bessiere has been an dominant figure on the world aerobatic scene for the last 30 years. He joined the French Air Force aerobatics team in 1976 and was five times French National Champion. His career as a pilot competitor culminated in Yverdon, Switzerland, in 1990, when he won the title of overall World Champion.*

*He then dedicated himself to the transmission of his skill and knowledge to the upcoming generations, and has been the French National Team coach for the past 20 years. Arguably the finest aerobatic coach of his generation, certainly one of the most successful, Coco has the ability to inspire others to dream more, to learn more, to work harder and to give their very best; to become great. Using all these skills, he produced a string of further Unlimited World champions ((Xavier de Lapparent, Christine Genin, Patrick Paris, Eric Vazeille, Catherine Maunoury, Renaud Ecalte), and numerous World Champion Teams – let alone several additional World Champions in the Advanced category in the last decade.*

*The way Coco has been able to resource and develop younger pilots and bring them to the pinnacle of the sport is the envy of all other nations. Coco's dedication extends to his flight instructor life where, for instance, he gives improvement training to aerobatics instructors.*

*Coco epitomizes competition spirit in the noble sense, with a perfect mix of passion, inspiration, enthusiasm, commitment, determination, perfectionism, demand, and style. A friend of the whole paddock, Coco's actions lay down a philosophy for aerobatics, for high-level sports in general, and for way of life.*

*In the never ending search for perfection, Coco is perhaps the one who has approached it most, both as coach and as pilot.*

Vote that the award will be given for the year 2010: No secret ballot requested

For – 25 Unanimous

Claude Bessiere is the only candidate for the award. No objections.

**Decision: Claude Bessiere will receive the Leon Biancotto Diploma at the FAI General Conference (Belgrade, Serbia - 2011).**

**15.4. Other Business**

Proposal from Russia – Restrict Aircraft in YAK 52 Category to One Design

Discussion:

EK – Last Yak 52 competition, two aircraft were entered, Yak 52, and Yak52TD (retractable gear, modified engine). Should maintain the idea of Yak-52 competition, and restrict to one design.

Comments from Floor – Many modifications have been done to Yak-52, and Yak-52 TD.

MH – Discussions remind him of the Advanced category, if want stock A/C must define – two bladed prop only, and 360 hp engine. What do we restrict the aircraft to. In USA under license of experimental category, therefore it can be modified. Don't know how many Yak 52s in the US are totally stock/standard. Asked the Delegate from Russia to make a proposal of exactly what is wanted. These are not so easily defined restrictions, so many ways of interpreting them. Again, noting situations occurring with the Advanced category.

MH – Russian proposal: Yak 52

Airframe: Standard/Stock

Engine: 360hp

Propeller: Optional

Discussion:

Bernard Drummer (BD) – If eliminate aircraft will therefore be restricting the number of pilots who would be able to compete.

AC – The idea is that organizers are able to provide whatever type of Yak-52 that they have available, so that pilots who go to faraway places would have a level playing field, when they fly the aircraft provided.

MV – Decreases the sense of it being a World Championship.

Eltonas Meleckis (EM) – Has flown both types, found no difference between them.

PZ – Make this category into a Classic or Antique class, this would allow more aircraft to enter the competition.

JG – This was proposed last year – defeated.

Vote: For – 8; Against – 3; Abstain – 14

**Decision: Vote did not reach absolute majority proposal – FAILED.**

Spanish Delegation had been mandated to read a letter from the NAC of Spain – Ramon Alonso

Summarized:

The Aerobatic community has had many problems, and conflicts that have been on going for a long time within the Spanish Federation. In the past, the President had been able to handle these problems, but since his death, these problems have resurfaced, resulting in the absence of the Spanish in this year's aerobatic events.

The letter requested that the decisions of the NAC be respected and not incur interference from other bodies, such as CIVA.

## **15.5. Special Events For 2011 – Item 13.4**

LG – 2011 China will hold the 4<sup>th</sup> China International Airsport Fiesta. Location – Lie Woo, situated between Beijing and Shanghai. A meeting is planned to have a classic aerobatic and freestyle event – “China Aerobatic Challenge”. his event is supported by the Airsport Federation of China, not a private enterprise.

Request that CIVA empowers the Bureau to decide on the details, after the meeting with the Chinese Federation in January. Also, to endorse future events. For 2011, a minimum of one is planned.

Discussion:

AC – How many pilots?

LG – 6 to 8, but decision has not been made yet. Depends on the dates, and any conflict with WAC, and the transport of aircraft.

LG – In the future more airports are to be built, some, to be specifically for air sports.

SD – What involvement does the FAI have in this event?

LG – Would request that it be put on the Category One Calendar of Events. At the moment only Unlimited Aerobatics is involved, but, the Chinese Federation, would eventually included other air sports.

MH – Will co-ordinate with FAI and the EB that the event meets all the requirements of the FAI General Section.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED to the Bureau decide on the details of this event.**

“JK Formula” - Continue with this type of event for 2011.

Jurgis Kairys presented a proposal to continue with this event, to be included as a Category One Championship. Last year, because of financial constraints, held two demonstration events, one in Mamaia, Romania, the other in Riga, Latvia. Had approximately 200,000 people attending.

Tentatively, two events to be held next year with details such as contract with FAI, Branding, acceptance on the FAI Calendar, what pilots would qualify to be worked on, with FAI, CIVA and JK Formula organizers.

MH – Need these Special Events to help promote our sport, both financially, and with public interest.

Asked CIVA to empower the Bureau to work with J. Kairys and FAI to continue on with this event, and have it come under the FAI sanctioning, branding and signing of contracts.

Discussion:

EK – Would like to know how and by whom the pilots are chosen for these events. The NAC or JK?

MH – Like WAG, top pilots from the World events.

SD – Need to co-ordinate with FAI, CIVA and the promoter of these Special Events – dates, branding, pilot selection – all these details are part of the contract.

LG – These special events, two at least for next year, will boost our economy, so that we can support the Judges, and pilots of the classic competitions. In the selection of pilots for these events, must consider those that are also able to perform air show type of contest, so that spectators do not get bored.

Pavol – Can't get personal at the Plenary. Should attend the Informal Sessions before the Plenary, to discuss all the details.

JK – Would have, but was still in discussion with the promoters to confirm their intentions to conduct these events.

JG – There are many other promoters out there, that are “doing their own thing”, conducting events without coming for approval from FAI/CIVA. Jurgis Kairys has, and we should support his efforts.

MH – Agrees with JG. Has been in discussion with JK about this type of event since 2007. Appreciates the fact that JK has come to CIVA and wants to work within the FAI and CIVA. Has not been taking our pilots and working outside of CIVA.

AC – Agrees to work with Jurgis and FAI to formulate an agreement for this event.

MH – Because there are so many details to be worked out, it is why the Bureau needs to be able to decide on the event, after the Plenary.

**Decision: CIVA AGREED that the Bureau is empowered to settle the details.**

## **16. Elections and Appointment of Officials (Agenda Items 14 and 15)**

James Black advised that 25 Ballots were received

### **16.1 Officers of CIVA**

**For results:** See attached Document

**Rules Sub-Committee Chair.** Mike Heuer

**Rules Sub-Committee Members**

**For results:** See attached document

**Judging Sub-Committee Chair.** John Gaillard (RSA)

Judging Sub-Committee Members

**For results:** See attached document

**Catalogue Sub-Committee Chairman** Alan Cassidy (GBR)

Catalogue Sub-Committee Members

**For results:** See attached document

**Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee Chairman** Jerzy Makula (POL)

Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee Members

**For results:** See attached document

## **16.2 Appointment of Officials (International Jury and Chief Judges)**

### **2011 World Aerobatic Championships – Ravenna, Italy**

President, International Jury Michael Heuer (USA)

Members, International Jury Robert Chomono (FRA)  
L-G. Arvidsson (SWE)

Chief Judge Graham Hill (GBR)

### **2011 World Unlimited Glider Aerobatic Championships and World Advanced Aerobatic Championships – Torun, Poland**

President, International Jury Michael R. Heuer (USA)

Members, International Jury Manfred Echter (GER)  
Madelyne Delcroix (FRA)

Chief Judge Philippe Kuchler (SUI)

### **2011 European Advanced Aerobatic Championships – TBA**

President, International Jury L-G Arvidsson (SWE)

Members, International Jury Bob Chomono (FRA)  
Carole Holyk (CAN)

Chief Judge Nick Buckenham (GBR)

### **2011 World YAK 52 Aerobatic Championships – TBA**

President, International Jury L-G Arvidsson (SWE)

Members, International Jury     Anatoly Belov (RUS)  
Chief Judge                             Nick Buckenham (GBR)

### **Working Groups – No Change for 2011**

#### **Contest Organisation Group:**

Mike Heuer, Chairman (USA), John Gaillard (SA), Jerzy Makula (POL), Jurgen Leukefeld (GER), LG Arvidsson (SWE), Graham Hill (GB)

#### **FPS Development Group:**

Alan Cassidy, Chairman (GB); Steve Green (GB), Mikhail Mamistov (RUS)

#### **Strategic Planning Group:**

John Gaillard, Chairman (SA), Manfred Echter (GER), Osmo Jalovaara (FIN), LG Arvidsson (SWE), Don Peterson (USA), Mikhail Mamistov (RUS).

#### **Q Programme Analysis (Advanced)**

Claude Bessiere (FRA), John Morrissey (USA), Gerard Bichet (FRA), Martin Vecko (CZE), Mikhail Mamistov (RUS), Anatoly Belov (RUS), Sami Kontio (FIN).

#### **Q Programme Analysis (Unlimited)**

Claude Bessiere (FRA), John Morrissey (USA), Matthieu Roulet (FRA), Stanislav Bajzik (CZE), Mikhail Mamistov (RUS), Anatoly Belov (RUS).

### **17. Date and Place of Next Meeting - 2011**

Bid from Poland was presented. Location differs from the proposal last year.

Poland: Location – The Museum of Aviation, Krakow

Dates - November 5-6, 2011

Fees - 150 euros

Hotels - 45-65 euros (single) 65-85 euros (double) not guaranteed.

A 2/3 majority is required for the meeting to be held outside of Lausanne. For this vote that would be 16.

Vote: Poland - 22  
Lausanne - 0  
Abstain - 2

**Decision: CIVA agreed the 2011 Plenary Meeting would be held in Krakow, Poland**

**Dates –November 5 - 6, 2011.**

Mike Heuer thanked Jürgen Leukefeld and his Team for organizing the CIVA Plenary 2010.

**The meeting was adjourned at 1242 hrs. on Sunday, November 7, 2010**

The newly formed Bureau will meet in one hour.

Submitted for approval by  
Carole J. Holyk  
Secretary of CIVA  
December 17, 2010

Approved by  
Michael R. Heuer  
President of CIVA  
April 1, 2011

**CIVA ELECTION RESULTS 2010**

| <b>Officers of CIVA</b> |                    |     |    |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----|----|
| <b>President</b>        | HEUER, Michael     | USA | 24 |
| <b>Vice Presidents</b>  | GAILLARD, John     | RSA | 16 |
|                         | CHOMONO, Bob       | FRA | 13 |
|                         | KLIMOVICH, Elena   | RUS | 11 |
|                         | MECKLIN, Matti     | FIN | 12 |
|                         | ARVIDSSON, L-G.    | SWE | 23 |
|                         | CASSIDY, Alan      | GBR | 18 |
| <b>Secretary</b>        | DELCROIX, Madelyne | FRA | 14 |
|                         | HOLYK, Carole      | CAN | 8  |
|                         | BUCKENHAM, Nick    | GBR | 7  |

| <b>CIVA Rules Sub-Committee</b> |                    |     |    |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----|----|
| <b>Chairman</b>                 | HEUER, Michael     | USA | 24 |
| <b>Members</b>                  | ROULET, Matthieu   | FRA | 20 |
|                                 | CASSIDY, Alan      | GBR | 21 |
|                                 | KLIMOVICH, Elena   | RUS | 13 |
|                                 | THORESEN, Thore    | NOR | 14 |
|                                 | RIHN-HARVEY, Debby | USA | 21 |
|                                 | ECHTER, Manfred    | GER | 22 |

| <b>CIVA Judging Sub-Committee</b> |                   |     |        |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|
| <b>Chairman</b>                   | GAILLARD, John    | RSA | 18     |
| <b>Members</b>                    | MECKLIN, Matti    | FIN | 14     |
|                                   | BUCKENHAM, Nick   | GBR | 19     |
|                                   | CHOMONO, Bob      | FRA | 15     |
|                                   | HILL, Graham      | GBR | 11/7*  |
|                                   | MAMISTOV, Mikhail | RUS | 11/17* |
|                                   | ARVIDSSON, L-G.   | SWE | 21     |

| <b>CIVA Catalogue Sub-Committee</b> |                    |     |    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|----|
| <b>Chairman</b>                     | CASSIDY, Alan      | GBR | 22 |
| <b>Members</b>                      | HOWARD, Brian      | USA | 16 |
|                                     | DELCROIX, Madelyne | FRA | 17 |
|                                     | ECHTER, Manfred    | GER | 23 |
|                                     | GOLAN, Michael     | ISR | 7  |
|                                     | BELOV, Anatoly     | RUS | 13 |
|                                     | ROULET, Matthieu   | FRA | 18 |

| <b>CIVA Glider Aerobatics Sub-Committee (GASC)</b> |                    |     |    |
|--|--------------------|-----|----|
| <b>Chairman</b>                                    | MAKULA, Jerzy      | POL | 22 |
| <b>Members</b>                                     | GILHOUSEN, Klein   | USA | 16 |
|  | DELCROIX, Madelyne | FRA | 21 |
|  | ECHTER, Manfred    | GER | 23 |
|  | KAMINSKIY, Georgiy | RUS | 16 |
|  | HAVBRANDT, Pekka   | SWE | 15 |
|  | VAVRA, Premysl     | CZE | 18 |
|  | BERGER, Karl       | AUT | 16 |
|  | VIITASAARI, Jyrki  | FIN | 16 |
|  | HOUTMAN, Erik      | NED | 15 |
|  | HAPPS, Dick        | GBR | 17 |
|  | KÜCHLER, Philippe  | SUI | 20 |

**Contest Officials**

| <b>World Aerobatic Championships</b> |                 |     |    |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|----|
| <b>President, International Jury</b> | HEUER, Michael  | USA | 23 |
| <b>Members, International Jury</b>   | CHOMONO, Bob    | FRA | 18 |
|                                      | MECKLIN, Matti  | FIN | 11 |
|                                      | ARVIDSSON, L-G. | SWE | 19 |
| <b>Chief Judge</b>                   | HILL, Graham    | GBR | 10 |
|                                      | GAILLARD, John  | RSA | 9  |
|                                      | BUCKENHAM, Nick | GBR | 5  |

| <b>World &amp; European Advanced Glider Aerobatic Championships</b> |                    |     |    |
|---|--------------------|-----|----|
| <b>President, International Jury</b>                                | HEUER, Michael     | USA | 23 |
| <b>Members, International Jury</b>                                  | DELCROIX, Madelyne | FRA | 15 |
|   | ECHTER, Manfred    | GER | 16 |
|   | MECKLIN, Matti     | FIN | 12 |
|   | GILHOUSEN, Klein   | USA | 4  |
| <b>Chief Judge</b>  | KÜCHLER, Philippe  | SUI | 16 |

| <b>European Advanced Aerobatic Championships</b> |                 |     |    |
|--|-----------------|-----|----|
| <b>President, International Jury</b>             | ARVIDSSON, L-G. | SWE | 25 |
| <b>Members, International Jury</b>               | CHOMONO, Bob    | FRA | 24 |
|  | HOLYK, Carole   | CAN | 17 |
| <b>Chief Judge</b>                               | BUCKENHAM, Nick | GBR | 21 |

| <b>World YAK-52 Aerobatic Championships</b> |                 |     |    |
|---|-----------------|-----|----|
| <b>President, International Jury</b>        | ARVIDSSON, L-G. | SWE | 24 |
| <b>Members, International Jury</b>          | BELOV, Anatoly  | RUS | 21 |
| <b>Chief Judge</b>                          | BUCKENHAM, Nick | GBR | 21 |

Winner highlighted in yellow.

\* Second round of voting required due to tie vote.

Results certified by James Black, CIVA President of Honour and Elections Official.