



Academy of Model Aeronautics

5161 East Memorial Drive, Muncie, Indiana 47302
(765) 287-1256 – Voice • Competitions Fax (765) 286-3303
www.modelaircraft.org

AMA Competition Regulations Rules Change Proposal Form

Please complete this form and click on the SUBMIT button at the bottom of the page. This will send the proposal to the Competition Department at AMA HQ. A copy will then be sent to the appropriate Contest Board Chairman. The current issue of the Competition Regulations must be referenced.

Proposal Number: RCA24-02

Received Date: 12/13/2022

Revised Date:

Version Number:

Proposal Type: Basic

Applicable Competition Regulations this proposal relates to: RC Aerobatics

Give Brief Summary of the Proposed Change:

This change seeks to eliminate the AMA RC Pattern Judging Guide, and adopt the F3 R/C AEROBATIC AIRCRAFT MANOEUVRE EXECUTION GUIDE in its place

State exact wording proposed for the Competition Regulations. List paragraph number where applicable. Example: Change "quote present rule book wording" to "exact wording required".

1. Replace "AMA RC PATTERN JUDGING GUIDE" with "AMA Precision Aerobatics Judging"
2. Replace all sections of the AMA RC Pattern Judging Guide, A-E with "Judging for AMA and F3A Aerobatic maneuvers will be performed according to the F3 R/C Aerobatic Aircraft Manoeuvre Execution Guide, as found in Volume F3 Radio Controlled Aerobatics, of the FAI Sporting Code. The Guide will be periodically updated by the FAI and its agencies, whose latest version can be found at the website: <https://www.fai.org/>, under "Commissions", "Aeromodelling (CIAM)", and "Sporting Code".

State logic behind proposed change, including alleged shortcoming of the present rule(s).

The world is becoming smaller. When AMA Pattern was 4x the size it is, and global communication did not include the internet, there was a place for dual criteria for judging precision aerobatics. Neither are the case now. The community is small and globally tight knit, and there is little tolerance for maintaining two systems that accomplish the same goal, and isolate US pilots from the rest of the world.

The most basic performance task of a judge is to be consistent. Having two judging standards introduces variability when judges are unaware of the differences, and inaccurate apply downgrades. The judging task is difficult enough to perform with a single standard.

Judges who are 'quizzed' on the subject almost always demonstrate that they are unaware of the differences in the lower classes and cannot name the differences in upper classes. While most do not participate in judging clinics, the task of familiarizing judges with a single standard becomes much easier with only one.

A regular effort to align or justify the different standards does not exist. Another level of maintenance for the AMA to review the guides and decide whether adjustments are necessary is as unlikely as it is unnecessary.

The two standards can also change independently from time to time, which doubles the effort of changing the guidance provided by US judging trainers, and judging seminar hosts.

The progression of pilots through the classes is not helped in any way by requiring them to change their maneuver execution to a new standard; this is the purpose of scaling the sequence difficulty. There is a lot of mobility between AMA and FAI classes, which technically requires them to alternate their execution. While there are 13 distinct differences between the standards (in list form, below) the remainder of the standards are largely the same. This demonstrates that the purpose of the two standards is also the same.

1. Flight direction
2. Landing direction
3. Announcing: "Box", "Take-off", "Landing"
4. Speed of flight
5. Downgrade for box infractions
6. Downgrade for missing lines between maneuvers
7. Downgrade for missing lines between elements of a maneuver
8. Downgrade for changing roll rate
9. Downgrade for loop segmentation
10. Downgrade for missing points on point rolls
11. Roll Direction changes (bounce or pause)
12. Definition of Snaps
13. Definition of Stall turn

When polled and surveyed in the US, pilots are almost universally in favor of a single standard, once they are familiarized with the fact that there are differences.

If this proposal is for a new event, include all event test data/information here. Please provide information on what testing of this new event has taken place to include number of participants and number of contests.

State effect, if any, on current AMA records:

None

Note: The Contest Board Chairman may, in coordination with the submitter of the proposal, at any time prior to submitting a proposal to the contest board for Final Vote, edit proposal wording to increase clarity and to avoid ambiguity, provided the proposal intent is not changed.

Submitter Information:

AMA Number: 3010

Tim Pritchett
740 Baldwin Orchard Drive
Inman, South Carolina. 29349
tjpritchett@aol.com
8648711902