# S10 Editor's report
# Proposed Section 10 amendments 2018

S10 Editor
Barney TOWNSEND (GBR)

S10 Committee
Jose-Luis ESTEBAN (ESP)
Richard MEREDITH-HARDY (CIMA President of Honour)
Rob HUGHES (GBR)

15/11/2018

# S10 Editor's report, October 2017

Notes:

- A few minor editorial changes / updates to S10 have been made during the year as delegates have pointed them out. These are of a grammatical or punctuation nature and do not affect the meaning or implication of the text. Where they have been made will be indicated within the 2019 publication of S.10

- 18 S10 amendment proposals were received, either through the CIMA WIKI or directly to S10 Editor by email.

- Proposals in this document have been reordered from those uploaded to the CIMA Wiki; they are presented here in order of their occurrence in S10.

- Competition Directors must use the model local regulations and model task catalogue unless changes are approved by CIMA. This ensures a satisfactory standard of task setting and avoids numerous problems.

- The voting guide for Sub-Committee Chairmen has been included in this report to help the Microlight and Paramotor Sub-Committee Chairmen.

- Sub-Committee Chairmen; please fill out the enclosed voting sheet

# Sub-committee voting guide

For sub-committee Chairs

**1. Votes must follow FAI rules**
Paramotor and Microlight sub-committees shall vote on S10 proposed amendments, according to a decision taken during the CIMA 2013 plenary. These votes therefore have to be conducted according to FAI statutes and by-laws.

**2. Votes are limited to S10 amendments**
Votes are limited to S10 proposed amendments according to the list provided by the S10 Editor. Any new items must receive 2/3 majority support before being discussed. Any issue affecting CIMA in general must be raised during a plenary session and be voted on accordingly.

**3. Eligible votes only**
Only those who are eligible to vote will have their votes counted. SC Chairmen must ensure that only valid votes are counted. These will include (for example):

- NAC Delegates
- NAC Alternate Delegates if the Delegate is not present
- NAC Voting Representatives if neither the Delegate nor the Alternate is present.
- Proxies, if they have been accepted by the FAI office.

The FAI representative can confirm who is eligible and will provide country panels which should be distributed to eligible voters.

**4. Record all decisions**
All votes (and any amendments or other relevant comments) must be recorded. The SC Chairmen should ask someone to act as a meeting secretary and take Minutes. Any votes not recorded in Minutes are not valid. These Minutes shall be published and distributed to CIMA Delegates before the start of the Plenary sessions.

The Minutes can be short - just a list of the votes. Any further amendments or clarifications should be included in the Minutes. The Minutes should be sent out via the CIMA email lists as soon as the meetings have finished.

Barney Townsend
November 2018

# Proposal 1

## Proposal from

Aleksei SITNIKOV (RUS)

## Proposal title

Changes to Section 10 1.3 “DEFINITION OF A MICROLIGHT OR PARAMOTOR AIRCRAFT“

## Existing text

S.10

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 65 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 300 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 375 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 330 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 405 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 450 kg for a landplane flown with two persons
- 495 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 560 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.

## New text

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 85 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 350 kg for a landplane flown solo (for WL1 only)
- 425 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships (for WL2 only)
- 400 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 500 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 430 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 530 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 500 kg for a landplane flown with two persons (for WL2 only)
- 550 kg for a landplane flown with two persons

- 600 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 600 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.

## Reason

Due to the fact that microlight aircrafts are built with different technology and materials being more aerodynamic and having more power and speed than 20 years ago, with new instruments and equipment on board which provide us a safer flight, and because now most of the aircrafts are over the MTOW and not participating at microlight sport competitions because of that, it is imposed to change to MTOW limit by increasing it in the existing text legislation.

# Proposal 2

## Proposal from

Molnar ENDRE LUCIAN (ROM)

## Proposal title

Changes to Section 10 1.3 “DEFINITION OF A MICROLIGHT OR PARAMOTOR AIRCRAFT“

## Existing text

S.10

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 65 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 300 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 375 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 330 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 405 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 450 kg for a landplane flown with two persons
- 495 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 560 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.

## New text

1.3 DEFINITION OF A MICROLIGHT OR PARAMOTOR AIRCRAFT

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 85 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 400 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 500 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 400 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 500 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- **600 kg** for a landplane flown with two persons
- 600 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 600 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.

## Reason

Due to the fact that microlight aircrafts are built with different technology and materials being more aerodynamic and having more power and speed than 20 years ago, with new instruments and equipment on board which provide us a safer flight, and because now most of the aircrafts are over the mtow and not participating at microlight sport competitions because of that, it is imposed to change to mtow limit by increasing it in the existing text legislation.

# Proposal 3

## Proposal from

Petr Jonas (CZE)

## Proposal title

Section 10 “DEFINITION OF A MICROLIGHT OR PARAMOTOR AIRCRAFT“

## Existing text

S.10

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 65 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 300 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 375 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 330 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 405 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 450 kg for a landplane flown with two persons
- 495 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 560 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.

## New text

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 83 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 400 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 500 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 430 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 550 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 600 kg for a landplane flown with two persons
- 650 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 560 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) ~~may be increase by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a~~ parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is

deployed.

## Reason

As far as I am aware, after the MTOW will be raised to 600kg, the 5% addition will no longer be applied, so the limit will be 600kg including the parachute system. I believe if we are raising limit for 2seaters significantly, the limit for one-seater class should not stay as it is, especially because AL1 is nowadays almost a dead class. The limit for 2seater flown solo should also go up, to allow the new types that will be certified for 600kg to be flown solo. I propose to subtract 100kg for the second seat and set the limit to 500kg.

# Proposal 4

## Proposal from

Tormod VEIBY (NOR)

## Proposal title

DEFINITION OF A MICROLIGHT OR PARAMOTOR AIRCRAFT

## Existing text

S.10

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 65 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- 300 kg for a landplane flown solo
- 375 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 330 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo;
- 405 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.
- 450 kg for a landplane flown with two persons
- 495 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons
- 560 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.

## New text

1.3.1 A one or two seat powered aircraft whose minimum speed at Maximum Take Off Weight (MTOW) is less than 65 km/h 83 km/h, and having a MTOW of:

- ~~300~~ 400 kg for a landplane flown solo

- ~~375~~ 500 kg for a landplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.

- ~~330~~ 450 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown solo

- ~~405~~ 550 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane specifically designed to be flown with two persons but flown solo in championships.

- ~~450~~ 600 kg for a landplane flown with two persons

- ~~495~~ 650 kg for an amphibian or a pure seaplane flown with two persons

- ~~560~~ 600 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons

- 650 kg for an autogyro flown with two persons intended to be operated on water

Note. These definitions also apply to foot-launched Microlight and Paramotor aircraft.

~~1.3.2 The MTOW described in 1.3.1 (except for autogyro flown with two persons) may be increased by 5% if the aircraft is equipped with a parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed.~~

1.3.2 The installation of a rescue parachute system designed to bring the entire aircraft to the ground if it is deployed is highly recommended.

Such installation of a parachute system is defined as weighing nothing, for the purpose of control weighing in a competition.

## Reason

After the MTOW will be raised to 600kg, the 5% addition will no longer be applied, so the limit will be 600kg including the parachute system. There is a real risk that the usage of parachute rescue systems will diminish unless there are some incentive for them to remain, or at least not punish their installation.

As we are raising limit for 2seaters significantly, the limit for one-seater class should not stay as it is. The limit for 2seater flown solo should also go up, to allow the new types that will be certified for 600kg to be flown solo.

It is proposed to subtract 100kg for the second seat and set the limit to 500kg.

# Proposal 5

## Proposal from

Barney TOWNSEND (GBR)

## Proposal title

Clarification of rules for backtracking

## Existing text

S.10

4.24.5

During a navigation along a leg, competitors must not backtrack along the track line against the direction of the task. Backtracking is defined as flying with an angle of greater than 90 degrees in respect to the intended flight direction. This limitation is extended to the corridor defined by the width used to score gates in the task.

Also, in

Annex 3, 1.11.9 Collision Avoidance

During a navigation **along a leg**, competitors must not backtrack along the track line against the direction of the task. If there is a need to backtrack, competitors must leave the track line and fly back well clear of it before rejoining the track line at an earlier point. Backtracking is defined as flying with an angle of greater than 90 degrees in respect to the intended flight direction. This limitation is extended to the corridor defined by the width used to score gates in the task.

## New text

4.24.5

During a navigation along a leg, competitors must not backtrack along the track line against the direction of the task under any circumstances. Backtracking is defined as either re-joining the active track line at a point prior to the point where you departed from it or flying with an angle of greater than 90 degrees in respect to the intended flight direction within a~~. This limitation is extended to the~~ corridor defined by the width used to score gates in the task. In tasks with more than one possible active track line (e.g. Cog wheel navigation with unknown legs), all track lines shall be considered as active.

Also, in

Annex 3, 1.11.9 Collision Avoidance

During a navigation along a leg, competitors must not backtrack along the track line against the direction of the task under any circumstances. ~~If there is a need to backtrack, competitors must leave the track line and fly back well clear of it before rejoining the track line at an earlier point.~~ Backtracking is defined as either re-joining

the active track line at a point prior to the point where you departed from it or flying with an angle of greater than 90 degrees in respect to the intended flight direction within a~~. This limitation is extended to the~~ corridor defined by the width used to score gates in the task. In tasks with more than one possible active track line (e.g. Cog-wheel navigation with unknown legs), all track lines shall be considered as active.

## Reason

The current wording and definition of backtracking do not prohibit the repeat flying of the track line by a competitor in order to gain competitive advantage, provided that they fly to a previous point on the track line whilst remaining outside the corridor. Similarly, in tasks with more than one possible active track line, it does not prohibit a competitor flying more than one track line successively provided that they fly between the tracks whilst remaining outside the corridor. This was illustrated at the EMC, where a competitor flew the whole of the second half of a cog-wheel on the inner track after missing a turnpoint photograph that would have sent them to the outer track. Upon realising the error, he flew to a point outside the corridor defined by the width used to score gates before turning, flying back to the outer track, and completing the task on the correct track. The jury accepted a protest against this behaviour but only because he strayed inside the corridor during his flight between the two active tracks and put other competitors at risk.

# Proposal 6

## Proposal from

Igor PUGACH (UKR)

## Proposal title

Amendment of Section 10 paragraph 4.30.1

## Existing text

S.10

4.30.1 The order in which competitors shall take-off shall normally be left free within an open window period, unless the specific requirements of the task dictate that it should be ordered, in which case it will be given at the briefing. Take offs shall normally be made from the marked deck.

## New text

4.30.1 The order in which competitors shall take-off shall normally be left free within an open window period, unless the specific requirements of the task dictate that it should be ordered, in which case it will be given at the briefing. Take offs shall ~~normally~~ always be made from the marked deck. Failure to take off from the deck shall be penalized.

## Reason

This is a very simple (although indirect) way to check compliance to the FAI definition of a microlight in that part which sets the minimum speed of 65 km/h. Direct way of checking compliance to this minimum speed rule (by measuring it in flight and making all necessary corrections for air temperature, pressure, etc.) is rather complicated and was never used during the competitions. True microlights ARE capable of taking-off from the 100 metre deck in standard atmospheric conditions. The "hot" speedsters who sacrifice wing area (and the minimum speed of 65 km/h) for high speed performance are NOT capable of doing this and therefore are NOT microlights as their minimum speed in fact exceeds 65 km/h.

# Proposal 7

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Section 10 - 4.31.5 Short Take-Off and Landing within a deck

## Existing text

S.10

4.31.5 Take-offs and landings by Microlights in all tasks shall be completed within a 100 x 25 m landing deck, or for the task “Short take off and landing over obstacle”, within a deck 150 m x 25 m. Aircraft not capable of taxiing unaided from the deck after landing score zero. Landing provisions in the case of an emergency shall be specified at briefing. Failure to comply with instructions regarding emergency shall incur a penalty.

Deck length shall be corrected for altitude at the rate of a 7% increase for every full 300m of elevation, rounding the result to the nearest integer metre. The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5).

## New text

4.31.5 Take-offs and landings by Microlights in all tasks shall be completed within a ~~100~~ 125 x 25 m landing deck, or for the task “Short take off and landing over obstacle”, within a deck ~~150~~ 190 m x 25 m. Aircraft not capable of taxiing unaided from the deck after landing score zero. Landing provisions in the case of an emergency shall be specified at briefing. Failure to comply with instructions regarding emergency shall incur a penalty.

Deck length shall be corrected for altitude at the rate of a 7% increase for every full 300m of elevation, rounding the result to the nearest integer metre. The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5).

## Reason

Provided of an approximately linear characteristic of the ratio between acceleration and needed takeoff distance in the phase short before takeoff, the deck extension for short-takeoff and landings has to be 25 meters (rounded down).

Calculation: 100m * 83 km/h / 65km/h = 127,69m

# Proposal 8

## Proposal from

Wojtek DOMAŃSKI (POL)

## Proposal title

13 - Classes representation in National Scoring for paramotors

## Existing text

*FAI Sporting Code - Section 10 – 2018*

4.34.12 The team score shall be computed from
a) the sum of the scores of the top three pilots of each country in each class in each task grouped together
in:

- Classes AL1, AL2, WL1, WL2, GL1 and GL2
- Each valid Paramotor class which has a minimum of 8 pilots.

b) a combined Nation Score for paramotor classes shall be computed from the sum of the scores of:

- top 3 pilots in PF1 class excluding any PF1f participant
- top 3 pilots in PL1 class
- 1 top crew in PF2 class
- 1 top crew in PL2 class
- 1 top female pilot in PF1f class

## New text

*FAI Sporting Code - Section 10 – 2018*

4.34.12 The team score shall be computed from a) the sum of the scores of the top three pilots of each country in each class in each task grouped together in:

- Classes AL1, AL2, WL1, WL2, GL1 and GL2
- Each valid Paramotor class which has a minimum of 8 pilots.

b) a combined Nation Score for paramotor classes shall be computed from the sum of the scores of:

- ~~top 3 pilots in PF1 class excluding any PF1f participant~~
- ~~top 3 pilots in PL1 class~~
- ~~1 top crew in PF2 class~~
- ~~1 top crew in PL2 class~~
- ~~1 top female pilot in PF1f class~~
- top N pilots in PF1 class excluding any PF1f participant
- top N pilots in PL1 class
- top N crew in PF2 class
- top N crew in PL2 class

- top N female pilot in PF1f class

where N equals:

- 1 if there are 8 or less pilots or crews participating in a class
- 2 if there are 9 to 16 pilots or crews participating in a class
- 3 if there is 17 or more pilots or crews participating in a class

## Reason

The current formula for a combined Nation Score for paramotor classes favours single-seat classes PF1 and PL1, three times over the two-seater classes PF2 and PL2 and the female class PF1f. That made sense at a time when the frequency in favoured classes few times outnumbered those less favoured. These proportions have changed. There was a time when PL1 class pilot number barely exceeded 10, PF2 reached 7 crews, and PL2 were close to none. After a time, in the last World Championships in Thailand, the PL1 class consisted of 25 pilots, PF2 was no one at all, and the number of PL2 crews increased to 15 (still scored with 1 crew only) in national scoring.

The proposed change bounds the number of pilots/crews included in the national classification (1, 2, or 3) to the number of actually participating in a given class. This proportional system is fairer and encourages more attendance in all classes.

# Proposal 9

## Proposal from

Igor PUGACH (UKR)

## Proposal title

Amendment of Section 10 paragraph 4.4.2

## Existing text

S.10

4.4.2 When flight recorders have been used in a task, the data from these shall whenever possible be collected by the organisation immediately as pilots leave the deck after landing. This may be either by collecting the flight recorders, to be returned to pilots at a later stage, or by downloading the data directly into a computer on the spot.

## New text

4.4.2 When flight recorders have been used in a task, the data from these shall ~~whenever possible~~ be collected by the organisation immediately as pilots leave the deck after landing or before they leave quarantine upon completing a task. This may be either by collecting the flight recorders, to be returned to pilots at a later stage, or by downloading the data directly into a computer on the spot.

## Reason

Words "*whenever possible*" must be deleted as they give freedom for ignoring this rule by the competition organisers on the pretext that it is impossible. Adding "*or before they leave quarantine upon completing a task*" will eliminate opportunities of competitors cheating by bringing later any other recorders with corrected tracks.

# Proposal 10

## Proposal from

Igor PUGACH (UKR)

## Proposal title

Amendment of Section 10 paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9

## Existing text

S.10

### 4.8 STATUS AND TIMING OF LOCAL REGULATIONS

4.8.1 Local regulations are the rules for a specific event prepared by the organisers. They must use the model document format in S10 A3 and any differences shall be listed separately and submitted to CIMA for approval at least one year before the event. The CIMA Approved local regulations and entry form shall be sent to NACs not less than 6 months before the event stating the amount of the entry fee and what it covers.

### 4.9 ENTRY FEE

4.9.1 As a minimum the following should be included in the entry fee:

- Use of airfield and task area during the event.

- One copy of official competition map for each pilot and team leader.

- Contest numbers, identity badges, opening and closing ceremonies, and all championship information.

4.9.2 The organisers may supply competitors with a document of supplementary information upon their arrival at the championships site. Any matter intended to have the force of a competition rule must have been approved, as a minimum, by the CIMA Bureau. Only minor matters may be approved by this method. Local regulations and supplementary information must not conflict with the general rules.

4.9.3 Teams wishing to take advantage of the official practice period shall be able to register and get all items mentioned in S10 4.9.1 at least the day before the first official practice starts.

4.9.4 Once competition flying on the first contest day has started, no rules or regulations may be changed. Any additional requirements within the rules needed during the event must not be retrospective.

## New text

### 4.8 STATUS AND TIMING OF LOCAL REGULATIONS

4.8.1 Local regulations are the rules for a specific event prepared by the organisers. They must use the model document format in S10 A3 and any differences shall be listed separately and submitted to CIMA for approval at least one year before the event. The CIMA Approved local regulations and entry form shall be sent to NACs

not less than 6 months before the event stating the amount of the entry fee and what it covers.

4.8.2 The organisers may supply competitors with a document of supplementary information upon their arrival at the championships site. Any matter intended to have the force of a competition rule must have been approved, as a minimum, by the CIMA Bureau. Only minor matters may be approved by this method. Local regulations and supplementary information must not conflict with the general rules.

4.8.3 Teams wishing to take advantage of the official practice period shall be able to register and get all items mentioned in S10 4.9.1 at least the day before the first official practice starts.

4.8.4 Once competition flying on the first contest day has started, no rules or regulations may be changed. Any additional requirements within the rules needed during the event must not be retrospective.

**4.9 ENTRY FEE**

4.9.1 As a minimum the following should be included in the entry fee:

- Use of airfield and task area during the event.

- One copy of official competition map for each pilot and team leader.

- Contest numbers, identity badges, opening and closing ceremonies, and all championship information.

~~4.9.2 The organisers may supply competitors with a document of supplementary information upon their arrival at the championships site. Any matter intended to have the force of a competition rule must have been approved, as a minimum, by the CIMA Bureau. Only minor matters may be approved by this method. Local regulations and supplementary information must not conflict with the general rules.~~

~~4.9.3 Teams wishing to take advantage of the official practice period shall be able to register and get all items mentioned in S10 4.9.1 at least the day before the first official practice starts.~~

~~4.9.4 Once competition flying on the first contest day has started, no rules or regulations may be changed. Any additional requirements within the rules needed during the event must not be retrospective.~~

**Reason**

Present subparagraphs 4.9.2, 4.9.3 and 4.9.4 seem to be relevant to paragraph 4.8 (Status of Local Regulation) and not to 4.9 (Entry Fee).

# Proposal 11

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Section 10 - 5.2.1 Measurement

## Existing text

S.10

5.2.1 Weighing equipment. The scales used to establish the weight of an aircraft entering a competition, shall have an accuracy of not less than 0,2% when weighing up to 472.5 kg. The calibration of the scales shall have taken place within a year from the date of the weighing. All scales used shall carry a certificate indicating weighing accuracy and the time of the latest calibration of the scales. For records it is sufficient that the weighing rules of the airworthiness certifying body, of the country where the aircraft is registered, are followed.

## New text

5.2.1 Weighing equipment. The scales used to establish the weight of an aircraft entering a competition, shall have an accuracy of not less than 0,2% when weighing up to ~~472.5 kg~~ 600 kg. The calibration of the scales shall have taken place within a year from the date of the weighing. All scales used shall carry a certificate indicating weighing accuracy and the time of the latest calibration of the scales. For records it is sufficient that the weighing rules of the airworthiness certifying body, of the country where the aircraft is registered, are followed.

## Reason

In the near future we probably have to weigh microlight aircrafts with a weight of up to 600 kg.

# Proposal 12

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Removal of tasks from Microlight catalogue

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2.B1 SPEED TRIANGLE OUT-AND-RETURN

2.B2 SPEED TRIANGLE & TURNPOINT HUNT

2.B3 SPLIT SQUARE

2.B4 FUEL & SPEED TRIANGLE

2.B5 LIMITED FUEL TURNPOINT HUNT

2.B6 DURATION

2.B7 DURATION & SPEED

## New text

Removal of the following tasks:

~~2.B1 SPEED TRIANGLE OUT-AND-RETURN~~

~~2.B2 SPEED TRIANGLE & TURNPOINT HUNT~~

~~2.B3 SPLIT SQUARE~~

~~2.B4 FUEL & SPEED TRIANGLE~~

~~2.B5 LIMITED FUEL TURNPOINT HUNT~~

~~2.B6 DURATION~~

~~2.B7 DURATION & SPEED~~

## Reason

The tasks affected are either economy or speed tasks or both, combined with some other challenges. Considering the upcoming new types of microlights with changed weight and performance together with the older ones in one class, such kind of tasks are no longer useful and fair. The result of such a competition task depends almost only from the performance of the aircraft, but not from the pilots skill.

# Proposal 13

## Proposal from

Petr JONAS (CZE)

## Proposal title

Removal of maximum speed based tasks

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2.B1 SPEED TRIANGLE OUT-AND-RETURN

2.B2 SPEED TRIANGLE & TURNPOINT HUNT

2.B4 FUEL & SPEED TRIANGLE

2.B7 DURATION & SPEED

## New text

~~2.B1 SPEED TRIANGLE OUT-AND-RETURN~~

~~2.B2 SPEED TRIANGLE & TURNPOINT HUNT~~

~~2.B4 FUEL & SPEED TRIANGLE~~

~~2.B7 DURATION & SPEED~~

## Reason

The tasks affected are speed tasks. Considering the upcoming new types of microlights with changed weight and performance together with the older ones in one class, such kind of tasks are no longer useful and fair. The result of such a competition task depends almost only from the performance of the aircraft, but not from the pilots skill.

# Proposal 14

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Annex 4 - 2.C.1  SPOT LANDING

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2. C1 SPOT LANDING

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck 100 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the 100-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible.

## New text

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck ~~100~~ 125 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the ~~100~~ 125-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible.

## Reason

Provided of an approximately linear characteristic of the ratio between acceleration and needed takeoff distance in the phase short before takeoff, the deck extension for short-takeoff and landings has to be 25 meters (rounded down).

Calculation: 100m * 83 km/h / 65km/h = 127,69m

# Proposal 15

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Annex 4 - 2.C.2  SPOT LANDING – Timed

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2. C.2 SPOT LANDING – Timed

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck at a specific time, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck 100 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the 100-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible. Additional points may be scored if the scoring touchdown takes place at or near an exact full minute as indicated by the competition clock, eg 11:31:00 hrs is a full minute, 11:31 17 hrs is not.

## New text

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck at a specific time, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck ~~100~~ 125 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the ~~100~~ 125-metre deck, as close to the start of the

deck as possible. Additional points may be scored if the scoring touchdown takes place at or near an exact full minute as indicated by the competition clock, eg 11:31:00 hrs is a full minute, 11:31 17 hrs is not.

**Reason**

Provided of an approximately linear characteristic of the ratio between acceleration and needed takeoff distance in the phase short before takeoff, the deck extension for short-takeoff and landings has to be 25 meters (rounded down).

Calculation: 100m * 83 km/h / 65km/h = 127,69m

# Proposal 16

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Annex 4 - 2.C3 POWERED PRECISION LANDING

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2. C2 POWERED PRECISION LANDING

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck 100 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the 100-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible.

## New text

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck ~~100~~ 125 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the ~~100~~ 125-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible.

## Reason

Provided of an approximately linear characteristic of the ratio between acceleration and needed takeoff distance in the phase short before takeoff, the deck extension for short-takeoff and landings has to be 25 meters (rounded down).

Calculation: 100m * 83 km/h / 65km/h = 127,69m

# Proposal 17

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Annex 4 - 2.C4 POWERED PRECISION LANDING – TIMED

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2. C4 POWERED PRECISION LANDING – TIMED

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck at a specific time, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck 100 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the 100-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible. Additional points may be scored if the scoring touchdown takes place at or near an exact full minute as indicated by the competition clock, eg 11:31:00 hrs is a full minute, 11:31 17 hrs is not.

## New text

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to touch down within a marked deck at a specific time, as close to the start of the deck as possible, coming to a halt in as short a distance as possible.

Summary

This task simulates a landing on an aircraft carrier deck, the deck being a deck ~~100~~ 125 metres long and 25 metres wide. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). The first 25-metre section of the deck is divided into five 5 metre strips which are scored from 250 to 50 points as shown. The remainder of the deck scores 25 points. In order to score the main wheels must touch down in a particular strip and the aircraft must come to a complete halt within the ~~100~~ 125-metre deck, as close to the start of the deck as possible. Additional points may be scored if the scoring touchdown takes place at or near an exact full minute as indicated by the competition clock, eg 11:31:00 hrs is a full minute, 11:31 17 hrs is not.

## Reason

Provided of an approximately linear characteristic of the ratio between acceleration and needed takeoff distance in the phase short before takeoff, the deck extension for short-takeoff and landings has to be 25 meters (rounded down).

Calculation: 100m * 83 km/h / 65km/h = 127,69m

# Proposal 18

## Proposal from

Michael KANIA (GER)

## Proposal title

Annex 4 - 2.C8 DECK LANDING

## Existing text

S.10 Annex 4

2. C8 DECK LANDING

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to land in a deck 100 metres long by 25 metres wide.

Summary

This task proves the short landing capability that is fundamental to the performance characteristics of a Microlight by demonstrating that the aircraft can land in 100 metres in still air at sea level. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). Where other local conditions, such as slope of the runway, will make a significant difference to landing runs the length of the deck may be adjusted accordingly.

## New text

Objectives

The objective is for the aircraft to land in a deck ~~100~~ 125 metres long by 25 metres wide.

Summary

This task proves the short landing capability that is fundamental to the performance characteristics of a Microlight by demonstrating that the aircraft can land in ~~100~~ 125 metres in still air at sea level. Deck length shall be adjusted according to the airfield elevation (S10 4.31.5). The width of the deck may be decreased to be adjusted to the width of the existing runway (S10 4.31.5). Where other local conditions, such as slope of the runway, will make a significant difference to landing runs the length of the deck may be adjusted accordingly.

## Reason

Provided of an approximately linear characteristic of the ratio between acceleration and needed takeoff distance in the phase short before takeoff, the deck extension for short-takeoff and landings has to be 25 meters (rounded down).

Calculation: 100m * 83 km/h / 65km/h = 127,69m