

# Scale Technical Meeting Minutes 2013

Report by: Narve L. Jensen, Chairman

## Present:

Name	Country	Title
Peter Gutknecht	SUI	Subcom Member
Graham Kennedy	GBR	Subcom Member
Marius Conu	ROM	Delegate
Gerard Rutten	NED	Subcom Member
Johan Ehlers	RSA	Subcom Member
Kevin Dodd	AUS	Delegate
Narve L. Jensen	NOR	Subcom Chair/Delegate

## MINUTES - PROPOSALS

Note: i) Copy and paste a blank table if there are more proposals than there are tables provided; delete those tables that are not required.  
ii) Add the proposal agenda paragraph number and proposal title in the first blank cell.

Page 79	Class: F4G		
a)	6.8.1	Submitted by:	NOR
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? <b>YES / NO</b> (delete as appropriate) ( If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined <b>red</b> ):		
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 16	Against: 2 Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 6	Against: 0 Abstain:
	Comments (if necessary):		

Page 79	Class: F4H		
b)	6.9.	Submitted by:	GBR
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? <b>YES / NO</b> (delete as appropriate) ( If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined <b>red</b> ):		
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 3	Against: 15 Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 0	Against: 6 Abstain:
	Comments (if necessary):		

Page 79	Class: F4H		
b) mod	6.9. Modified in Subcom	Submitted by:	MOD
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? <b>YES</b> (delete as appropriate) ( If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined <b>red</b> ):		
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 16	Against: 2 Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 6	Against: 0 Abstain:
	Comments (if necessary):		

## CLASS F4H – R/C STAND-OFF SCALE MODEL AIRCRAFT (PROVISIONAL)

### 6.9.1 General Characteristics

The General Characteristics of the model shall be the same as F4C. (Para 6.3 refers).

### 6.9.2 Eligibility

Any model which has previously been placed in the top five (5) in a Continental or World Championship F4C competition during the last 6 years, including repaints and rebuilds, will **NOT** be permitted in F4H. The requirement for the competitor to have constructed his own model (rule 6.1.9.4.e) is not applicable to Stand-Off Scale; however the surface finish (colour and markings) on the model must have been applied by the competitor.

### 6.9.3 Declaration

The competitor must complete and sign the Declaration Form at ANNEX 6E.1 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.  
Note: The declaration must be consigned by the Competitors NAC to be valid.

#### **6.9.4 Static Judging**

Three Static Judges shall be appointed. The final static score shall be the sum of the individual judge's 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.

Each of the following items will be awarded a mark out of 10 by each Judge in increments of half a mark.

##### **6.9.4.1 Scale Accuracy.**

This is 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.

##### **6.9.4.2 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 constructed in its entirety by the competitor (Own design, from drawings or a traditional kit). A model which is built from a modern kit might score a little less, depending upon the extent of prefabrication. An ARTF model will score close to zero (unless evidence is presented of extensive modification by the competitor).

##### **6.9.4.3 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.

##### **6.9.4.4 Colour and Markings complexity**

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

##### **6.9.4.5 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.

#### **6.9.5 Static judging K - Factors**

Scale Accuracy – top view	K = 6
Side view	K = 6
Front view	K = 6
Originality of model Design & Construction	K = 5
Colour and Markings Accuracy	K = 10
Colour and Markings Complexity	K = 5
Realism	K = 12
Total	K = 50

#### **6.9.6 Documentation**

The documentation requirement is the minimum considered necessary to fully assess the outline from 3 aspects, the colour, the markings and the realism. As with all scale

aeroplanes 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 item of static judging for which there is no documentation will result in a Zero score for that item.

#### 6.9.6.1 Photographic evidence:

A minimum of one (1) photograph or printed reproductions and a maximum of five (5) 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 (within the maximum of 5 total) can be used to support the three aspects if the outline needs clarification.

#### 6.9.6.2 Drawings:

Three view drawings are required and will be used by the judge as the basis for judging outlines. Drawings must conform to the requirements of rule 6.1.9.4(b). Photographs take precedence when discrepancies exist between the drawings and the chosen subject.

#### 6.9.6.3 Proof of colour and markings:

This may be in the form of colour chips or 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.

#### 6.9.7 Flying Schedule

The Flying Schedule shall be the same as F4C (Paragraph 6.3. refers)

#### 6.9.8 Final Scoring

Add points earned in 6.9.5. to the average score of the two best flights under 6.9.8. If the competitor has achieved only one flight, the points awarded for that flight will be divided by two.

If for any cause beyond the control of the organisers (e.g. ABR-B.11.1.) less than three official rounds can be flown, the scoring shall be completed as follows:

- a) If two rounds are flown, the average of the two flights as in 6.3.9. is used.
- b) If only one round is flown, the single flight score of that one round is recorded.
- c) The scores in an official round can be recorded only if all competitors had equal opportunity for a flight in that round.

---ooo000ooo---

Page 79	Class: F4H			
c)	6.9.2.	Submitted by:	NOR	
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? <b>YES / NO</b> (delete as appropriate) ( If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):			
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 16	Against: 2	Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 0	Against: 0	Abstain:
	Comments (if necessary): Proposal withdrawn by the NOR Delegate			

<b>Page 80</b>	<b>Class: F4H</b>		
<b>d)</b>	<b>ANNEX 6E</b>	<b>Submitted by:</b>	<b>GBR</b>
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? <b>YES / NO</b> (delete as appropriate) ( If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined <b>red</b> ):		
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 12	Against: 6 Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 6	Against: 0 Abstain:
	Comments (if necessary):		

<b>Page 80</b>	<b>Class: F4H</b>		
<b>e)</b>	<b>ANNEX 6F</b>	<b>Submitted by:</b>	<b>GBR</b>
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? <b>YES / NO</b> (delete as appropriate) ( If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined <b>red</b> ):		
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 12	Against: 6 Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 6	Against: 0 Abstain:
	Comments (if necessary):		

## MINUTES – OTHER ITEMS

The Technical Meeting discussed the F4B trophies for individual and team that was idle since F4B no longer is a championship class and decided that we would ask the CIAM Bureau to transfer these two trophies to the F4H class for team and individual.

---ooo000ooo---