PROPOSED NEW RULES FOR SCALE CLASS F4H

6.9 CLASS F4H - STAND-OFF SCALE RADIO CONTROL MODEL AIRCRAFT (PROVISIONAL)

6.9.1 Contest Rules
The General Characteristics of the model and the Flying Schedule shall be the same as F4C. The Static Judging requirements are as shown below.

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

6.9.3 Eligibility
The minimum requirement is that the surface finish (colour and markings) on the model must have been applied by the competitor. The requirement for the competitor to have constructed his own model (rule 6.1.9.4.e) is not applicable to Stand-Off Scale.

6.9.4 Declaration
The competitor must complete and sign the Stand-Off Scale Declaration Form at ANNEX 6E.3 certifying that he has applied the surface finish (colour and markings) to the model. The declaration also includes a questionnaire which is used by the Static Judges to assess how much the competitor contributed to the Scale Accuracy. If an incorrect declaration is subsequently revealed, the competitor may be disqualified from the contest. The competitor may also use photographs or sample material in support of the declaration.

6.9.5 Static Judging
A minimum of two Static Judges shall be appointed, one of which shall be named as the Chief Judge. The final static score shall be the average of the individual judges marks.
All static judging is carried out at a distance of 5 metres. This is measured from the centre line of the model to the judges seating position. The format for the static Score sheet is at ANNEX 6E.4.
6.9.5. Static Judging cont/…

Each of the following will be awarded a mark out of 10 by each Judge and the k-factors are listed below: -

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

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

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

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

Realism
This is a subjective assessment of how well the model captures the character of the

prototype as illustrated by the documentation; taking into account the surface finish, weathering and any detail that is noticeable at 5m.

Prototype Design Complexity

This is a subjective assessment of the difficulty in reproducing the shape, and intricacy of the prototype.

K - Factors

Scale Accuracy - Side View	K = 15
Front View	K = 15
Upper Plan View	K = 15
Originality of model Design & Construction	K = 15
Colour and Markings Accuracy	K = 10
Colour and Markings Complexity	K = 5
Realism	K = 20
Prototype Design Complexity	K = 5

6.9.6 Documentation

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

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

Photographic evidence:

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

Drawings:

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

Proof of colour and markings:

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

Reason: The existing rules for Class F4H are ambiguous, imprecise, incomplete, unworkable and un-sporting.

A more detailed explanation of what is wrong with the existing F4H rules can be see at Agenda Annex 7g.

Supporting data

The proposed revised rules, including the Judges Guide, Competitors Declaration and Score Sheet are refined versions of those used in a successful trial in the UK in 2011 and which will be incorporated into the UK R/C Scale programme in 2012.

End of proposal