

### Detailed Reasons for New F4H Rules

#### Reasons:

A more detailed explanation of what is wrong with the existing F4H rules is as follows:-

#### Para 6.9.1 - Specification.

There is no "Model Aircraft Specification" for F4C. It is assumed that this is a reference to the General Characteristics (para 6.3.1)

#### Para 6.9.2. - Documentation

Item 1 states that drawings should be, "limited to one 3-view or a set of scale drawings of normal size". This is a meaningless statement and the difference between these two is not known. Also "normal size" is not defined.

Item 2 states a requirement for "one photograph of the aircraft type" and that "Other photos are strongly suggested for maximum points". A suggestion is not a requirement and rules for any class should not contain suggestions.

This requirement for a 3-view drawing and one photograph is contrary to the accepted practice for Static Judging of Scale accuracy. The Class F4 Judges Guide at paragraph 6A.1.10.1 states, "photographs are the prime means of determining the accuracy and realism relative to the full size aircraft and must always take precedence over drawings".

Item 3 states the documentation requirement for proof of colour, yet there is no documentation requirement for the markings. This is a serious omission since Markings Accuracy covers 20% of the static score.

#### Para 6.9.3 - Competitors Declaration

The Competitor has to declare that the colour and markings have been applied by the Competitor even though there is no documentation requirement for the markings.

Para 6.9.3. also states that "No other declaration is required" which is in conflict with Competitors Declaration form ANNEX 6E.1

#### Para 6.9.4 - Judging for Fidelity to Scale and Craftsmanship

The static judging distance for F4H is not stated anywhere in the Volume F4. Although widely understood to be 5 metres this distance is not stated in any Technical Rules for Flying Scale Competition and is only stated in the Judges Guide for certain aspects of F4C Static Judging.

Item 3 "Markings Accuracy" - There is no stated requirement for photographic or printed documentation of the actual full size aeroplane which has been modelled, in the absence of which it is impossible to judge this aspect. Surprisingly, this aspect can account for 20% of the total static score.

Item 4, "Craftsmanship on colour and markings." - There is no guidance for judging this aspect but it seems reasonable to assume that it means how well the colour and markings are applied. It is not possible to assess how the colour and markings are applied from a distance of 5 metres, e.g. you could not tell if the model was painted, or covered in heatshrink film, or whether the markings were painted or transfers or vinyl stickers. This aspect can account for 20% of the total static score.

Item 5 "Scale Details"; "limited to surface details and engine details" – It is not possible to assess Surface and Engine Details from a distance of 5 metres and for many prototypes the engine details are not visible where for others the engine can be part of the outline. This aspect can account for 20% of the total static score.

60% of the total static score can be awarded for items which are either impossible to judge or have no defined documentation requirement, yet strangely the Outline of the model is only worth 20%. This balance of K-factors is considered to be illogical and unsporting.

End of proposal