



CIG Rules

13.06.2014 12:15

Von Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de <Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>
An Hamilton, David <david@davidhamiltonsurveyors.co.uk> Geißler,
Konrad <Geissler-Kaufering@t-online.de> Grushina, Irina
<igrushina1@rambler.ru> Monks, David <david@djm-electrical.co.uk>
Berlo, Jacques <jacques.berlo@econophar.be> Schöffler, Pit
<pitschoeffler@gmx.de> Sheveleva, Olga <shevelevao@mail.ru>

Dear friends,
during rules discussions with Belarus colleagues I got indication of some problems with R44 helicopters under crosswind conditions from the left side.
I consulted German and Swiss R44 pilots, instructors and engineers and got confirmation about critical situation and some flight control risk for R22 and R44 helicopters under considerable crosswind from the left side.
Our existing rules in para 5.2.6 describe the first 90° turn in direction of competition's area center, what means left crosswind for the first and right crosswind for the second competitor. This was in the sence of safety, because the helicopters will face each other.

But the regulation will produce the contrary.
This will lead to a disadvantage compared with the second competitor having crosswind from the right side, what is in general not problematical.

>From safety reasons I suggest the CIG Bureau to modify para 5.2.6. The last two sentences should be crossed out and a new sentence to be inserted: "Performing the 90° turns, the first will be anti-clockwise and the second clockwise".
Confirmation could be given by CIG Commission during next Plenary Meeting.

Concerning free-style rules I hope to have ready the first draft within two months. After that I intend to circulate it to Russian, UK and Austrian Delegates for additional proposals and comments. But I am always open for ideas from everybody.
Time-table is to have ready the final draft latest in December and circulate it to CIG Delegates. Approval could be in March Meeting 2015.

best regards and pleasant week-end
Wolfgang

HELICOPTER CLUB OF GREAT BRITAIN



Ryelands House

Aynho

Banbury

OX17 3AT.

3rd August 2014

Mr. Wolfgang Perplies

Rules Committee.

Dear Wolfgang,

It was good to see you and your wife at the weekend, there is never enough time to catch up.

I write with regard to our conversation about an interpretation of a rule as requested by Olga Sheveleva, of Belarus, concerning the turns in the Precision Event. From our conversation, I believe you have been pressured to interpret the rule so that the manoeuvre is complete when the aircraft stops turning rather than when the required 360 degrees, (which is the requirement of the rules), is completed.

I have interpreted this rule differently to Olga for over 10 years and have, during the three previous World championships of which you were Chief Judge for two, stopped or slowed the rate of turn, mid turn, for both safety and convenience and have not incurred a penalty. But on every occasion Olga has either asked me why I did this or informed me she does not like me doing so.

Am I right in understanding that there will now be a new 'interpretation' of this rule? This would, in my opinion, be a significant rule change, which would need to be put to a CIG meeting, and goes far beyond an 'interpretation'. To add a 'no stopping' requirement would be a clear rule change, and would create a problem for judges to decide what was a 'stop' or merely a slow turn. Wind could obviously create a 'stop' without the pilot's intention, for example. If the word continuous were to be used, the turn would be carried out in that way, but it is not. There is no instruction or specific penalty for it to be so.

If this logic were applied to the rest of the event then any stop mid course of any form would stop the clock time for the overall event. Only an exact "zero zero" landing would qualify!

Any proposed rule change must be discussed at our CIG meetings, in accordance with established procedures, where the full ramifications and problems of any proposal can be discussed properly. We must guard against unauthorised rule changes 'by stealth'.

There seems to be a trend to get rules clarified, implemented or changed outside of CIG meetings, and this is wrong. This is now the third time a rule has been clarified, implemented or changed because of people's opinions, which has directly affected my flying plans and I am now concerned this is becoming an unfair tactic.

So I think we must respect what is written (and not written), in the rules as they are, and not be influenced by opinion outside of a CIG meeting. Wolfgang, as you are aware I have been innovative in my approach to helicopter sports but always within the scope of the rules. Many other competitors are also very innovative and in some cases not even within the scope of the rules! I accept that sometimes due to language differences one has to enter the spirit of the rules. As you are aware, I asked for clarification on a rule regarding the positioning of the chains for the Precision Event and conceded my view purely for the reason entering into the spirit of the event.

I believe everything I have been stopped from doing through others requesting rule interpretation is stifling innovation and is doing nothing but regress our air sport.

Innovation should be encouraged, it is the only way the sport can progress. My flying has always been carried out within the rules. Every other competitor, if they so chose, could adopt the same methods as they are not exclusive to me, I only thought of them first.

Could I ask you reconsider your possible new interpretation of the rule regarding the Precision. If you feel changes are required then let us debate them at CIG and change the rules giving a clear year for implementation. This will avoid potential complaints that information is not distributed fairly to everyone concerned prior to a competition.

I understand at the German practice session at Nordlingen this year, your new interpretation regarding turns was discussed and that Irina Grushina was also aware of it. Ad hoc changes

to the rules could waste a whole years training at great expense for some crews. This can only be bad for our sport, one as you know I am so passionate about.

Your sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'D Monks', with a stylized, cursive script.

David Monks
Chairman



Re: WHC Rules and Regulations

14.05.2014 12:30

Von Ольга Шевелева <shevelevao@mail.ru>
An Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de <Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>
Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de <Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>

Dear Wolfgang,

Thank you for your detailed answers. I'll pass on this information to pilots and clubs I'm in contact with and hope this will reduce the number of questions you usually receive at event briefings.

I have another question concerning Precision. It's about the 360 turn. I've seen at previous championships some crews performing the turn in the following way: the first two thirds of the turn are done at a very high rotation speed, then they make a deliberate stop for several seconds and finish the turn at a normal rotation speed.

As I see it, this kind of turn doesn't look like a 360 turn, in fact these are two turns : 270 +90 degree turns.

What do you think of this?

Have a good day

Best wishes
Olga

Tue, 13 May 2014 18:27:29 +0200 от "Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de"
<Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>:

Dear Olga,

I am glad to hear from you and hope you are also well. I'll pass on this information to pilots and clubs i'm in contact with

Please receive my answers to your questions. I see, you attentive studied the new rules.

1. It is not extra mentioned, that the containers have to be placed as per Annex (like in Event 4 para 5.4.3) and there are no special measurements for the places of Containers.

The organizer has some flexibility in positioning the containers within the 40 metres squares. But it is selfunderstanding, that both courses must be equal.

2. You are right, the turning point has to be overflown directly or rounded from outside.

3. The penalties for 30 degree course changes are crossed out, because it was almost impossible to judge changes between 30 and 40 degrees. The MFO Points shall provide controlled air traffic movements in the vicinity of the airfield. Therefore

it is necessary to follow the given route and track to and from these points. Competitors who will fly circling or vary repeated the flight direction or approach the airfield from different direction will be penalized for other infringement with ten points.

4. The Annex 1 of Event 5.1 is an example. Dropping Zone can vary (after take off or after crossing line A). The box after line A is also variable according the given circumstances on the field. So line A and F can in special cases laid out edge-to-edge or very closed together.

5. Para 1.7 of chapter 2 will prevent manipulations in participation of crews in category 1 and 2 events.

The Regulation is valid from one WHC to the next.

Example:

The Pilot of a all German Crew is citizen of Germany and member of German Aeroclub like his crewmember. The Pilot lives and works more than 185 days of the year in Austria and is also member of Austrian Aeroclub.

The given crew cannot take part in WHC, because they reached place 8 in German qualification.

Using a trick they can take part in WHC.

The Pilot applies for sporting licence in Austria and will get it, because he is member of Austrian Aeroclub and resident of Austria.

The Crew could now be accepted as International Crew and in fact Germany has 8 crews.

The Pilot cannot now change representation of NAC within 3 years. That means for instance, taking part in WHC 2015 as International Crew (Austria / Germany) the next change of NAC is only possible after WHC in 2018.

The described situation can also come up with competitors from Russia, Belarus or other countries of former Soviet Union.

I hope I could give enough clarification to your questions.

best greetings
Wolfgang



AW: Definition of turns

15.05.2014 23:57

Von Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de <Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>
An Ольга Шевелева <shevelevao@mail.ru>

Dear Olga,
it is every time a pleasure to discuss problems with colleagues and friends.
I have one remark to Sergei's suggestion:
His suggestion assumes, that in every case the time gone until the intermediate stop will be less than 15 seconds. In the majority of cases it will be so and competitors would get 15 penalty points.
But it can also happen, that a competitor during turn suspects, that the time of turn could be shorter than 15 seconds. To prevent penalties he stops after 15 or 15.1 seconds and after another second continues the turn.
Both have interrupted the turn before reaching 360 degrees.
The first will get time penalties, the second not.
In any case the described manoeuvre will be an omitting a 360 degree turn, because the turn is interrupted before performing a wholly 360 degree circular movement.
best greetings also to Sergei. I very like to work together with him
Wolfgang

-----Original-Nachricht-----

Betreff: Re: Definition of turns

Datum: Thu, 15 May 2014 12:29:39 +0200

Von: Ольга Шевелева <shevelevao@mail.ru>

An: Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de <Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>

Dear Wolfgang,

Thank you for the answer.

I'm glad you share my concerns. It's obviously violation and crews should know about it to avoid penalty.

When we discussed the situation here, Sergei Drui suggested that judges should stop their stopwatches when a helicopter makes a full stop
and actually the crew may get penalty for time less than 15 seconds.

Or it's better to regard it as omitting a 360 turn as you say.

Thanks again for the clarification

With best regards
Olga

Thu, 15 May 2014 11:39:37 +0200 от "Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de"
<Wolfgang.Perplies@t-online.de>:

| Dear Olga,

I fully agree with you!

A hovering turn in helicopter flying is defined as a movement in a circular direction wholly or partly around the yaw axis or a point.

So the main criterion is moving around the axis. The Speed of movement can vary during

turn. It depends on the typ of helicopter or wind direction and vilocity. When moving stops the turn will counted to be completed. In the future the penalty for the action which you described from your observations will be 25 points for omitting any of the manoeuvres.
best regards
Wolfgang



WHC 2015

25.02.2015 23:29

Von Alan Norris <alan@norrpress.co.uk>

An wolfgang.perplies@t-online.de <wolfgang.perplies@t-online.de>

1 Anhang - 402,2 KB

Appendix.pdf

Dear Wolfgang

I hope you are well and the weather is not too cold for you, here in England we have a mix of cold, snow and rain very typical winter weather.

We have not had an opportunity to discuss by role as your deputy at the World Championship in Poland since we talked in Eisenach last year.

I know you have a FAI CIG meeting next month and you will also have a rules committee meeting to finalise the Championship rules so I wanted to make a comment on some things I witnessed at the Polish Championship last year in August.

I know Wolf Dietrich Tesar was writing a report for the CIG and we did have a discussion in Poland on some things we saw that I am sure he will mention in his report.

But as a general comment I think we will need to check all aspects of the championship equipment and the various courses pre the start of the event. I say this as there were some small things that I noticed that would have been an issue from a scoring point of view plus we need to learn from the problems arising from the Moscow event with regards to the dimensions of the freestyle course and ensure all of the courses for all the events are correct in Poland as per the rules.

For example just before the start of the slalom I noticed a small dome in the centre of the table which would have stopped the bucket being placed correctly and just before the start of the fender rigging I found that the containers were secured by filling with water and when the fender was dropped into the container it would have floated and the top of the fender would not have been below the top of the container (we replaced this with some builders blocks at the time).

I realise that this was the first time the Polish club had hosted a competition and none of my comments are meant as a criticism of the organisers, they did an amazing job and put on a great event. But to ensure the World event runs smoothly from a judging aspect it is important that the equipment is correct and laid out as per the rules.

On another point I would welcome your comments and clarification on something I observed at the Polish event and I have attached a PDF document to illustrate what I feel are some points that may need commenting on during the judges briefing to clarify the penalties relating to the rule that defines "The crew member is in the normal seating position".

1. I observed that a number of the competitors using the R44 had placed a protective cover over the co-pilots collective control (see attached Appendix 1) and I fully understand that this is for safety reasons to ensure the co-pilot does not interfere with the

pilot flying the aircraft.

But I clearly witnessed some crew members were taking advantage of this protective cover as an extension of their seat and would like to ask the question: Would this be an infringement under "Crew not staying seated or harnessed" and therefore incur a 50 point penalty ?

2. I also observed that a number of the R44s has a three point harness fitted that also allowed the crew member to position themselves in such a way that clearly did not conform to the rule " The crew member is in the normal seating position". This can be clearly shown in the photos in Appendix 2 and 3 of the attached document.

3. I would also appreciate your comments as to whether the three point harness infringes rule 9.6 of the General Rules and Regulations as the three point harness is not a standard factory fit on the Robinson R44 and I would also ask if this infringes "Crew not staying seated or harnessed" penalty as the crew member clearly is not fully seated ?

Also I wonder if either of these three points are in the spirit of the event but I know this is a hard and difficult thing to measure !!

I would be very interested in your comments and observations.

If you would like a meeting before August to discuss my role and how you would like me to do to assist you in Poland as well as any of the points raised I am happy to travel over to Germany for a meeting over a long weekend so please don't hesitate to let me know.

I am not sure when you plan to be at the airfield in Zielona Góra prior to the event but please let me know once you decide and I can make my travel plans to coincide with yours as I will be driving from England and I would also need to book a hotel in advance of the main Championship.

Just for information I stayed at the Qubus Hotel last August which I found to be a very well appointed hotel with a good restaurant on the very edge of Zielona Góra, walking distance to town and only 10 minutes' drive to the airfield.

I will be in America from tomorrow until the 8th March attending the Heli Expo event but I will be able to read my emails while away.

I look forward to hearing from you and working together.

Very best regards

Alan

Appendix 1



Appendix 2



Appendix 3

