

14. SPORTING CODE PROPOSALS

14.1 Volume CIAM General Rules, Section 4A (CIAM Internal Regulations)

a) **A.10.2 Effective date of rule changes** **Bureau**

Amend sub-paragraph h) as shown below:

h) Proposals **shall not be placed on the Plenary Agenda** if they seek to reverse or nullify decisions on topics that have been voted on by Plenary ~~within the previous two years~~ **at the previous applicable Plenary Meeting** ~~shall not be placed on a Plenary Agenda.~~ **Proposals that were withdrawn may be reintroduced.**

Reason: To clarify the rule that was meant to prevent failed proposals being re-introduced or successful proposals being overturned at the very next applicable meeting.

This proposal was referred back to the Bureau for further consideration

b) **A.14 Aeromodelling Scholarship** **Education Subcommittee**

Transferred from 2020 Plenary Meeting, and will be put forward if appropriate (see note below). Amend sub-paragraph A.14 e) as follows:

e) Payment

- i) The FAI will transfer the Scholarship award of ~~2,000~~ **2,500** Euros to the awarded student, or his/her parents or his/her guardians after all valid receipts which justify the full amount of the Scholarship have been submitted.

Reason: To keep the value and status of the scholarship we must follow the changes of value of money over time. The amount of 2,000 Euros has stayed the same since the scholarship was first started and it's quite a few years back in time. So we think 2,500 is a good amount to keep the same status of the Scholarship today as when it started.

Technical Secretary Note: In 2020, this proposal was withdrawn by the Education S/C Chairman and was not included for approval by the Plenary. The reason for withdrawal was because of the current situation with COVID-19 and so many events cancelled or postponed; the CIAM financial situation was not as it was when the proposal was submitted. The delegates attending the meeting unanimously recommended to consider this proposal when appropriate.

Proposal is unanimously recommended. Exact date for Implementation to be defined by the CIAM Bureau

14.4 Volume CIAM Records

a) 4.5.3 Homologation Requirements (Space Models)

Serbia

Amend the section of 4.5.3.1 as shown below:

4.5.3.1. The competition flight card of the submitted record attempt shall be marked, "Record Attempt." ~~Tracking station angular~~ **Record attempt result** data must be entered in ink.

In addition see the following proposal b)

Unanimously recommended by the SM S/C meeting and by the CGR volume meeting

b) Forms: Application for record confirmation – Space Models

Serbia

*In this suite of forms, available from the 'Documents' section of the CIAM website, delete pages 4 & 5 (Table V Sheet 1 & 2) and replace with a single page form. Refer to **Agenda Annex 7a: Space Altitude Record Attempt Form**.*

Reason: Electronic altimeters have been used for altitude measurements in space models altitude classes S1, S2 and S5 for last ten years. Triangulation Method is not being used anymore because of slow procedure and limited accuracy of calculated altitudes in comparison with electronic measurements. Therefore it is necessary to change this form in relation with present situation.

Unanimously recommended by the SM S/C meeting and by the CGR volume meeting

c) Forms: Record Dossier Check Form – Space Models

Serbia

*In this suite of forms, available from the 'Documents' section of the CIAM website, amend the above form. Refer to **Agenda Annex 7h: Record Dossier Check List**.*

Reason: CIAM Sporting Code 4 was reorganized several years ago. So all paragraphs on aeromodelling and spacemodelling records were moved from Volume ABC Section C and Volume Space Models Chapter 14 to a new Volume CIAM Records. However, reference paragraphs in the Record Dossier Check Form - Space Models were not renumbered and that is necessary to do now to allow interconnection between this form and homologation requirements and homologation data defined in Volume Records, which should be submitted to CIAM for confirmation of records.

Unanimously recommended by the SM S/C meeting and by the CGR volume meeting

14.5 Volume Section 12 – Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) Class U

Technical Secretary Note: Because there may be record attempts in 2021, the Technical Secretary requests early implication of all UAV proposals.

Chapter 1 – Definitions

a) 1.8 Other Definitions Bureau

Add word for additional clarification as follows:

- 1.8.3 Operator in Command - The individual, **team** or organisation responsible for the function and safety of the UAV in flight.

Reason: Clarification

Unanimously recommended by the meeting

Chapter 3 – Records in Class U

b) 3.3 Holder of Records Bureau

Add a reference for clarification as follows:

- 3.3.1 The record will be held by the Operator in Command of the UAV.

Refer 1.8: Other Definitions

1.8.3 Operator in Command – The individual, team or organisation responsible for the function and safety of the UAV in flight.

Reason: Clarification

Unanimously recommended by the meeting

Chapter 4 – Rules For World Records

Bureau

c) 4.4 Other Rules

Add an additional rule as 4.1 and renumber the following rules accordingly:

4.1 FAI Sporting Licence

- 4.1.1 At the very least, the FAI Observer, who certifies the application for a World Record, must hold a valid FAI Sporting Licence. A Sporting Licence shall only be considered issued and valid, if the holder is listed on the FAI Sporting Licence database by the NAC that is issuing the particular Sporting Licence. The holder of the Sporting Licence shall declare this on the certification.**

Refer to the FAI Sporting Code General Section Chapter 5 (5.2) for additional requirements for FAI Observer/s and Chapter 7 for additional requirements for setting World Records.

Reason: Clarification

Unanimously recommended by the meeting

d) Chapter 6 – Record File

Bureau

Amend the location of the form required for the dossier:

- 6.2.1 Each record file shall contain all flight certificates **and information** necessary to establish full details of the record. The ~~certificate~~ **official form: Record Claim Statement for UAV shall be used and can be downloaded from the Documents section of the CIAM website <http://www.fai.org/ciam-documents>** ~~in Annex 3 of the Sporting Code, Section 2, shall be used.~~

Reason: Correction and consequential addition for the new form (see below).

Unanimously recommended by the meeting

e) Form – Record Claim Statement for UAV

Bureau

New form:

Add a new form to the Documents section of the CIAM website to assist groups setting UAV records with their documentation.

The proposed form is shown in **Annex 7j – Record Claim Statement for UAV**

Reason: Necessary addition

Unanimously recommended by the meeting

A.5.2 Technical Meetings

On the first day, **in case of a physical meeting**, there will be preliminary Technical Meetings held by the Chairmen of the appropriate Subcommittees. **In case the Plenary is decided to be organized using electronic means, these meetings may be organized in a longer period but always before the Plenary Meeting session. The CIAM Bureau may also decide to host these meetings using electronic means even if the Plenary is going to happen physically.** These Meetings shall consider items in the Agenda for the purpose of discussion and briefing of all those present and shall, through the Subcommittee Chairman, make their recommendations thereon, together with the recommendations resulting from voting in the Subcommittee proper, to the Plenary Meeting.

Unanimously recommended by the meeting.

(note: CIAM Bureau will consider ways to introduce live broadcasting of the physical meetings and possible participation even from distance)

A.6.1

The Bureau is composed of a President, three Vice Presidents, ~~one of whom shall assume the duties of Treasurer~~, a Secretary, a Technical Secretary, plus the Chairmen of the permanent Subcommittees.

One of the Vice Presidents shall assume the duties of Treasurer. The other two depending on the circumstances will assist the President and the Bureau with duties such as S/C Chairmen coordinator, CIAM annual events coordinator or any other task that will be agreed in order to improve CIAM Bureau performance and effectiveness.

If none of the Vice Presidents can act as Treasurer, then Bureau may appoint a Treasurer who will not have any voting rights at Bureau.

Unanimously recommended by the meeting

14.6 Section 4 Volume F1 - Free Flight

a) F1.1.2 Provision of Timekeepers

F1 Subcommittee

Add a new sentence to F1.1.2 a) as follows:

- a) In Free Flight events, provide each starting position with two timekeepers in Championships. **At Open Internationals each starting position should be provided** or with at least one timekeeper for other contests, **but if the organisers are unable to provide official timekeepers they must announce this in advance in a bulletin.** For fly-offs an additional timekeeper must be provided (i.e. three for Championships, at least two for other contests). All timekeepers must have binoculars. Each starting position must be equipped with at least one tripod for supporting binoculars.

Reason: This emphasises that organisers should provide at least one time keeper at each starting position. However, some competition organisers do not manage to meet this basic need and it is important that competitors know in advance if there will be no official timekeepers. They can then make a decision in advance of whether to attend the event.

TM amendment

F1.2.1 Timekeepers

Modify F1.2.1.(b) to read

Competitors may act as timekeepers for flights of other competitors

Technical Meeting conclusion:

ACCEPT – UNANIMOUS

b) F1A - Gliders

Netherlands (Switzerland & Germany)

Amend three paragraphs 3.1.4, 3.1.5, and 3.1.12 which all pertain to the same **safety** issue.

3.1.4. Definition of an Official Flight

- b) The duration achieved on the second attempt. If the second attempt is also unsuccessful under the definition of any of 3.1.5.a, 3.1.5.b, 3.1.5.c, 3.1.5.d, or 3.1.5.e **or 3.1.5.g**, then a zero time is recorded for the flight.

3.1.5. Definition of an Unsuccessful Attempt (add a new paragraph 'g')

- g) **The competitor falls during the process of releasing of the model from the cable to the extent that parts of the competitor's body other than the feet come into contact with the ground (jumping allowed).**

3.1.12. Organisation of Launching

- a) The competitor must be **standing, walking or running** on the ground **when releasing the model from the cable** and must operate the launching device himself (jumping allowed).

- b) All freedom of action and movement is permitted to allow the best use of the cable, except throwing of the launching device.
- c) The model must be ~~launched~~ **released to initiate tow** within approximately 5 metres from the starting position marker.

Reason: More and more F1A sportsmen can be seen throwing themselves to the ground when launching their models to generate additional line pull, model speed and therefore altitude of the model to increase flight performance. Tests have shown that line pull can exceed 40 kgf during this stage. The risk of the towline breaking is the highest during this falling down stage as the line pull is highest of all tow phases. This high line pull reduces the impact of the body on the ground. However if the towline breaks and, as one but frequently both hands are holding the towline, the sportsman cannot break the fall with the hands. The head, which is one of the heaviest part of the human body, will hit the ground hard. This may lead to injury like concussion etc., in particular if the head hits a hard object like a stone, rock, dried clay or road, which are commonplace on most of the fields where competitions are flown. Several injuries (head, shoulder, elbow, back) have already been reported by sportsmen. This proposal forces the sportsmen to stand up during the launch, thereby preventing injury. Bonus effects: Since the launch altitude will be reduced by up to 10 metres, flight performance is reduced. No changes in model design are required.



Supporting Evidence:

Allard van Wallene, the author of this proposal, measured the tow line pull during the falling down launch technique in 2-3 m/s wind speeds to be well over 40 kgf by using a spring scale and painters tape as a marker. The scale was attached to the end of the towline.



A picture of Michael Kosonoshkin all padded up (once bitten twice shy?) to avoid injury. As can be seen, both hands are used to pull the towline, which can therefore not be used to break the fall. If the towline would break at this moment, the body is thrown to the ground and the head will hit the ground hard leading to potential injury.



Here Per Findahl from Sweden can be seen in an edited photo showing him shortly before (right side) and shortly

after (left side) the release of the towline. A single hand technique is used, however the risk of injury is still present (hand/wrist/elbow/head); in particular when the towline breaks at this moment.

Photos: Malcolm Campbell

Withdrawn by the delegates.

c) F1B: 3.2.8 Classification **F1 Subcommittee**

Modify item (c) as shown below. All other items (a, b, d, e) in this paragraph remain unchanged:

- c) The organiser will establish a 7 minute period during which all fly-off competitors must **wind their rubber motor and** launch their model. ~~Competitors may use one rubber motor which was wound before the start of the 7 minute period and may wind additional rubber motors during the period.~~ Within these 7 minutes the competitor will have the right to a second attempt in the case of an unsuccessful attempt for an additional flight according to para 3.2.5. Starting positions will be decided by a draw for each fly-off.

Reason: When the flyoff period for F1A F1B F1C was reduced to 7 minutes, F1B flyers were given the option of winding a motor before the start of the 7 minute period. This has been difficult to control and has been open to different interpretations. It is proposed to forbid winding motors before the start of the flyoff rounds, in exactly the same way that winding motors is not allowed before the start of the basic official flights. While this gives a reduced launch period compared to F1A and F1C, there is no relationship between the classes and the rule will be uniform for all F1B flyers.

F1 Subcommittee opinion: Accept, 11 for, 2 against

Technical Meeting: For: at least 9 of the 22 delegates Against : 1

d) F1.3.1, F1.4.1, ANNEX 1, ANNEX 3 **Poland**

The below changes and the following proposal (e) all relate to the proposal to run first-class events for Juniors in the class F1C instead of in the Junior class, F1P.

F1.3.1 Processing of Free Flight Model Aircraft - Class F1A, F1B, F1C, F1E, ~~F1P~~ ...

- c) Before the start and during the contest, the competitors have the right to have launching cables (F1A) and motors (F1B) and swept volumes of motors (F1C, ~~and F1P~~) officially checked.

F1.4.1 Team Classification

Team Classification at all Free Flight Championships will be made according to the scheme described in C.15.6.2.a (ii). As a clarification of the application for free flight, the initial classification is based on the score in the regular flights and the next stage

is based on the sum of the individual placing of team members (including flyoffs for F1A, F1B, F1C, F1E, ~~F1P~~ or counting more flights in F1D).

3.6 Class F1P Model Aircraft with Piston Motors should be transferred to the Provisional Rules and given number 3.P.

Annex 1. Classes

The following separate classes are recognised for World Cup competition: F1A, F1B, F1C, F1E, F1Q, F1A Junior, F1B Junior, ~~F1P Junior~~ and F1E Junior. 2. Competitors.

All competitors in the specified open international contests are eligible for the World Cup. Only Junior competitors are eligible for the F1A Junior, F1B Junior, F1E Junior and ~~F1P Junior~~ World Cup.

Annex 3.A2.1.....

This guide is applicable to World and Continental Championships in classes F1A, F1B, F1C and ~~for Junior Championships at which F1P is flown in place of F1C.~~ Organisers of Championships should note the administrative advice given in the CIAM General Rules on the organisation of Championships. For organisers of FAI Open International events, appendix A gives changes and comments appropriate to Open Internationals for classes F1A, F1B, F1C, ~~F1P~~ and also F1G, F1H, F1J, F1Q, and F1S.

Annex 3.A2A.2.....

~~Note that under World Cup rules (Volume F1 Annex 1 para1) F1P models may be flown alongside F1C in World Cup Open Internationals. The F1P models are flown to their class rules except that the maximum flight time must be the same as the F1C flights. The F1P results are included with the F1C results for F1C World Cup scoring and also count for F1P Junior World Cup for junior flyers.~~

Reason: Unification and clarification of regulations for juniors competing in the free-flying model class with an internal combustion engine drive. F1P is currently practiced by the juniors only.

The consequence of this proposal is running the first-class events for Free Flight for Juniors in the class F1C instead of F1P. Juniors could compete in more competitions for the Word Cup and develop their skills under the supervision of elders (just like in the other classes).

F1 Subcommittee opinion:

Reject, 2 for, 8 against

Technical meeting:

Reject, 3 for, 12 against

e) F1C: 3.3.2 Characteristics of Model Aircraft with Piston Motor(s) Poland

Make the following addition to the section as shown below as a consequence of the acceptance of the previous proposal:

Maximum duration of motor run: 4 seconds from release of model

Additional requirements for models flown by Juniors:

Gearing between engine shaft and propeller is not allowed.

Variable geometry (e.g. folding wing) and/ or variable airfoil camber (e.g. flaps) is not allowed.

Fuel to a standard formula ... etc.

Reasons:

1. Class F1P does not allow a smooth transition to F1C class (from junior to senior in fact).
2. Class F1P with its technical rules is an archaic one. Result - a small number of juniors compete in competitions especially in EChs and WChs - 16 juniors F1P only (6 countries) in 2018 FAI F1 Junior WChs for Free Flight Model Aircraft.
3. During the course of juniors there is no need to build from a scratch or to invest in other models (just replace an engine and readjust a model) - to increase a number of young players competing.
4. Currently, the clubs and F1C competitors have a large amount of good equipment (shorter tail booms, larger fins), built in the 90s, which is suitable for use by juniors.

F1 Subcommittee opinion:

Reject, 2 for, 8 against

Technical meeting: Reject, 3 for, 12 against

f) F1D: 3.4.2 Characteristics of Indoor Model Aircraft France

No changes are proposed to the existing section; however an addition at the end of the section is proposed to allow half motor in F1D Open Internationals for Cat1 and Cat 2. The addition is:

For Open Internationals (not Championships) in category 1 (less than 8m) and category 2 (from 8 to 15 m) sites, the organiser may specify that the rubber motor (0,4g) must be replaced by a rubber motor of 0,2g and a spacer (free length but minimum weight 0,2g). This must be announced in advance in the competition bulletin.

The reduced motor and the spacer are to be checked before or after the flight as in F.1.3.2.

Reason: This possibility is already used by all F1D participants for training at World Championships in order to make more test flights during training days.

This reduced motor gives the opportunity to run an FAI contest in one day if the number of participants is low and the flying area large enough (hand-ball gym).

Opportunity to fly FAI events in low ceiling where steering may be done by fishing poles.

The idea is to have many open international events in order to stimulate F1D activity, and later on start an F1D World CUP

TM Amendment

The meeting amended the proposed addition to clarify that the weight of rubber was a maximum value with the modification shown by underlined bold:

For Open Internationals (not Championships) in category 1 (less than 8m) and category 2 (from 8 to 15 m) sites, the organiser may specify that the rubber motor (0,4g) must be

replaced by a rubber motor of **maximum weight** 0,2g and a spacer (free length but minimum weight 0,2g). This must be announced in advance in the competition bulletin.

The reduced motor and the spacer are to be checked before or after the flight as in F.1.3.2.

F1 Subcommittee opinion: Accept, 7 for, 1 against

Technical meeting: Accept, 9 for, 2 against

g) Annex 1 – Rules for Free Flight World Cup **F1 Subcommittee**

Modify item (c) and (e) as shown below. All other items (a, b, c, d, f, g) in Paragraph 4 remain unchanged.

4. Points Allocation

- c) The number of points awarded is 500 for the winner and linearly decreases to zero for the highest place competitor receiving no points. For the competitor in place P this is expressed by:

$$\text{points} = 500 * [1 - (P-1)/H]$$

The points calculated are rounded up to the nearest whole number of points.

Additional points are awarded for the top three places subject to the requirement (b) to be in the top half of the results. Place 1 receives 75 extra points, place 2 receives 50 points and place 3 receives 25 points.

- e) Each competitor awarded placing points is also eligible for one bonus point for each competitor they have beaten in the competition. The number of people beaten by someone in place P is (N-P). ~~The winner is awarded an additional 25% bonus points, that is he receives 1.25*(N-P) points, rounded up to the nearest whole number of points.~~

Reason: The new scoring system introduced evenly graduated points from first place down to half way down the results. In a large competition this results in only a few points difference between the top places. The proposal makes a clearer reward for people placing on the podium of any event.

F1 Subcommittee opinion: Accept, unanimous

Technical meeting: Accept, unanimous

h) Annex 1 – Rules for Free Flight World Cup **F1 Subcommittee**

Modify item (a) and (e) as shown below. All other items (b, c, d, f, g) in Paragraph 4 remain unchanged.

- a) The only competitors considered for the calculation of World Cup points are those who ~~completed a flight in the first round of~~ **have recorded a time on at least one official flight during** the competition. The number of these competitors is denoted by N and the place of an individual in this list is denoted by P.

- e) Each competitor awarded placing points is also eligible for one bonus point for each competitor they have beaten in the competition, **but counting only the competitors with a flight time in round one of the competition**. The number of people beaten by someone in place P is (N-P). The winner is awarded an additional 25% bonus points, that is he receives $1.25*(N-P)$ points, rounded up to the nearest whole number of points.

Reason: Originally a limitation was introduced to calculate bonus points counting only the competitors who had flown in the first round. This was to prevent any additional bonus points being accrued if extra competitors were introduced during the competition. The rules were later simplified to count only the competitors who had flown in the first round for the basic points as well as the bonus points.

Using this current system can be considered to penalise competitors who had made no flight in the first round compared to those with a zero score later in the competition. It is proposed to return to the consideration of the score in the first round only for the award of bonus points.

F1 Subcommittee opinion: Accept, unanimous

Technical meeting: Accept, unanimous

i) Annex 1 – Rules for Free Flight World Cup France

Additions are proposed for Paragraph 1 and 2.

Technical Secretary Note: *The proposal has been changed to include F1Q Junior which was added in January 2021.*

1. Classes

The following separate classes are recognised for World Cup competition: F1A, F1B, F1C, **F1D**, F1E, F1Q, F1A Junior, F1B Junior, **F1D Junior**, F1P Junior, F1Q Junior and F1E Junior.

2. Competitors

All competitors in the specified open international contests are eligible for the World Cup. Only Junior competitors are eligible for the F1A Junior, F1B Junior, **F1D Junior**, F1E Junior, F1Q Junior and F1P Junior World Cup.

Reason: This proposition suggests creating an F1D and F1D junior world cup based on the same principle as outdoor free flight classes. An indoor free flight world cup could revitalise the category. Not only will the competitors have more occasions to train but they could also challenge foreign flyers. Moreover, it will allow national competitors (not flying in the national team) to take part in an international event and ranking. For instance in France, only half of the F1D flyers take part in the world championships. Such a proposition could motivate them to compete on a worldwide scale.

Technical meeting: Accept, unanimous

j) **Annex 2 – A Guide for the Organisers of FAI Contests in the Outdoor Free Flight Classes** **France**

An additional section is proposed for this Annex; however the Technical Secretary will require guidance on its exact placement, should the proposal be accepted.

Self-timing

The organisers of international competitions counting for the World Cup may use self-timing under the following conditions:

The timing mode must be announced on the entry form.

The organiser must provide an official supervisor for four poles.

The organiser will respect the general rules of organisation in the articles above.

Role and power of the supervisor

The identifiable supervisor must be present at the start line at all times.

His mission will be to supervise the proper conduct of the self-timing of his four poles.

He can time the competitor of his choice unexpectedly and control false starts.

He will have the same powers as the timekeeper cited in the above article.

Reason: This proposal suggests to formalize and frame the self-timing already widely practiced in international competitions counting for the World Cup. Today the majority of international competition organizers can no longer mobilize a sufficient number of timekeepers; they resort to this type of timekeeping. But there is too much disparity between each competition and it would be good to standardize the practices.

F1 Subcommittee opinion: Refer Back to the S/C, 4 for, 9 against

14.7 Section 4C Volume F3 – Aerobatics

F3A – R/C Aerobatic Aircraft

a) 5.1.2 General Characteristics ...

USA

5.1.2 General Characteristics	Submitted by	USA
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2	Against: 18 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:		
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by USA Delegate	

b) 5.1.2 General Characteristics ...

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.2 General Characteristics	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? NO (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: 17	Against: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		

c) 5.1.2 General Characteristics ...

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.2 General Characteristics/Consequence of b)	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 17	Against: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		

d) 5.1.8 Marking

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.8 Marking/Consequence of b)	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 17	Against: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		

e) 5.1.8 Marking

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.8 m) Marking	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 20	Against: 0	Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):			

f) 5.1.8 Marking

France

5.1.8 b) Marking	Submitted by:	France	
Amended at the Technical Meeting? NO (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: 2	Against: 16	Abstain: 2
Technical Meeting:	withdrawn by French Delegate		
Comments (if necessary):			

g) 5.1.9 Classification

France

5.1.9 e) Classification	Submitted by:	France	
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 18	Against: 2	Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	recommended by the technical meeting with comment below		
Comments (if necessary): Current normalization (normalization introduced since 2018) had unintended consequences and needs to be reverted back to the traditional normalization UNTIL a better approach can be devised.			

h) 5.1.11 Organisation for R/C Aerobatics Contests

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.11 e) Organisation for R/C Aerobatic Contests	Submitted by:	F3 Aero	
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 19	Against: 1	Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):			

i) 5.1.11 Organisation for R/C Aerobatics Contests

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.11 f) Organisation for R/C Aerobatic Contests	Submitted by:	F3 Aero	
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 18	Against: 0	Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):			

j) 5.1.10 Judging

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.10 e, f) Judging	Submitted by:	F3 Aero	
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 20	Against: 0	Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):			

k) Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide 5B. 8.5 d), e)	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 0 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		

l) Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide 5B.8.9 a), b)	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 18	Against: 0 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

m) Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide 5B.8.10)	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 18	Against: 0 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

n) Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide 5B.8.4	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

p) Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide 5B.9	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

q) Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5B Manoeuvre Execution Guide 5B.11	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 0 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

r) **Annex 5G Unknown Manoeuvre Schedule ...**

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5G Unknown Manoeuvre Schedule 5G.2	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 19	Against: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

s) **Annex 5G Unknown Manoeuvre Schedule ...**

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5G Unknown Manoeuvre Schedule 5G.3	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 19	Against: 1 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

t) **5.1.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres**

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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):	The Subcommittee members selected the 25-schedule sequences from more than one proposed manoeuvre sequence. The manoeuvre sequences proposed to the Plenary are selected by a clear majority of the Subcommittee members.	
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

u) **5.1.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres**

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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):	The Subcommittee members selected the schedule sequences from more than one proposed manoeuvre sequence. The manoeuvre sequences proposed to the Plenary are selected by a clear majority of the Subcommittee members	
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

v) **5.1.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres**

F3 Aero Subcommittee

5.1.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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):	The Subcommittee members selected the schedule sequences from more than one proposed manoeuvre sequence. The manoeuvre sequences proposed to the Plenary are selected by a clear majority of the Subcommittee members	
Technical Meeting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

w) **Annex 5A – Aerobatic Description of Manoeuvres**

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5A Aerobatic Description of Manoeuvres	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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): The Subcommittee members selected the schedule sequences from more than one proposed manoeuvre sequence. The manoeuvre sequences proposed to the Plenary are selected by a clear majority of the Subcommittee members		
Technical Meeting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		

F3M – R/C Large Aerobatic Aircraft

x)

5.10.11 c) Classification	Submitted by:	France
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 12 Against: 0 Abstain: 7		
Technical Meeting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		

F3P – R/C Indoor Aerobatic Aircraft

y)

F3P - R/C Indoor Aerobatic Aircraft 5.9.13 Schedule of Manoeuvres	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 17 Against: 0 Abstain: 1		
Technical Meeting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		

z) Annex 5M – Indoor Aerobatic Description of Manoeuvres

F3 Aero Subcommittee

Annex 5M - Indoor Aerobatic Description of Manoeuvres	Submitted by:	F3 Aero
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (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: 17 Against: 0 Abstain: 1		
Technical Meeting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		

14.8 Section 4C Volume F3 - RC Pylon

F3D

a) 5.2.14 Radio Equipment

F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 12	Class F3D			Submitted by:	S-C
a) 5.2.14 Radio Equipment					
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 15	Against: 0	Abstain: 1	
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0	Abstain: 1	
Comments (if necessary):					

Recommended

b) 5.2.18 Timekeeping and Judging

F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 15	Class F3D			Submitted by:	S-C
b) 5.2.18 Timekeeping and Judging					
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (If "yes" then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):					
Add a sentence at the end of sub-paragraph d) as shown below.					
d) The judges' signals will be off as the aircraft reach midcourse between No. 3 and No. 1 pylons, or earlier. At the instant the model aircraft draws level with the No. 1 pylon the pylon judge will switch his signal on. When the model aircraft draws level with the No.1 pylon on the way back the signal is switched off. When a pylon cut has been made the signal will flash on and off five (5) times or another signal will be activated to inform the competitor about the pylon cut.					
<u>This system of signalling is the preferred one, but alternative systems with a fixed light duration and a separate pylon cut indication are allowed.</u>					
<u>The light has to be off when the model is between pylon #2 and pylon #3.</u>					
<u>The CD will inform the competitors which type of system is used.</u>					
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 14	Against: 1	Abstain: 1	
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0	Abstain: 1	
Comments (if necessary):					

Recommended as amended in technical meeting

c)

Page 18	Class F3D			Submitted by:	S-C
c) 5.2.20 Scoring and Classification					
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 7	Against: 7	Abstain: 2	
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 0	Against: 14	Abstain: 1	
Comments (if necessary):					

Proposal **withdrawn** by Sub Committee after discussion in technical meeting.

F3E

d)

Page 45	Class F3E		
d) 5.3.2.7 Augmented stability systems and similar		Submitted by:	France
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 11	Against: 5 Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 12	Against: 2 Abstain: 1
Comments (if necessary): The issue of policing these systems (CIAM General Rules B 1.1.e) needs future work.			

Recommended by majority in Sub Committee and Technical meeting.

SC chairman will discuss exact formulation of this rule to prevent overlap or inconsistency with General Rules B 1.1.e, also for F3D.

e) 5.3.3 Power source

The Netherlands

Page 45	Class F3E		
e) 5.3.3 Power source		Submitted by:	Netherlands
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red): <u>The maximum no load voltage must not exceed 21 Volts (max. tolerance +0.2 Volts). The minimum no load voltage shall be at least 18 15 Volts (max. tolerance -0.2 Volts).</u>			
b) In case the voltage is measured, this shall be done at the moment the preparation time for the pilot starts. After the measurement has been taken, the pilot is allowed 5 minutes preparation time before he is called to the start.			
c) If the model aircraft carries more than the allowed number of cells as power source for the motor or the voltage exceeds this voltage, <u>if the model aircraft power source for the motor exceeds this voltage range,</u> the competitor is disqualified from that heat.			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 11	Against: 5 Abstain: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0 Abstain: 1
Comments (if necessary): recommended as amended in technical meeting.			

Recommended as amended in technical meeting

f) 5.3.3 Power Source

F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 46	Class F3E		
f) 5.3.3 Power source		Submitted by:	Netherlands
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red): iii) Maximum weight of battery pack: 400 300 g. Delete rule.			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 9	Against: 3 Abstain: 4
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0 Abstain: 1
Comments (if necessary):			

After discussion in technical meeting it is unanimously recommended to make an amendment to this proposal by deleting the requirements for battery weight in 5.3.3.ii and 5.3.3.iii from the rules.

g) 5.3.9 Transmitter and frequency checks F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 48	Class F3E		
g) 5.3.9 Transmitter and frequency checks		Submitted by:	S-C
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 0
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0
Comments (if necessary):			

Recommended

h) 5.3.10 Race Course, Distance and Number of Rounds F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 48	Class F3E		
h) 5.3.10 Race Course, Distance and Number of Rounds		Submitted by:	S-C
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):			
Modify sub-paragraph a) as shown below.			
ii) In case of > 5m/s tail wind the course direction should be changed. if possible.			
iii) For cat.2 events, national or local competitions only: In case this is not possible due to physical or time constraints and when there is a strong tail wind (>5 m/s) the starter can decide a 180° change of take-off direction at least ten (10) minutes before the first heat of a round. This direction of launch shall be continued for that complete round.			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 14	Against: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0
Comments (if necessary): In the technical meeting it was considered reasonable for smaller competitions, where it is not possible to change the course direction, that the possibility of the reverse start method is maintained.			

Recommended as amended by technical meeting.

i) 5.3.14 F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 51	Class F3E		
i) 5.3.14 Timekeeping and Judging		Submitted by:	S-C
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 14	Against: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0
Comments (if necessary):			

Recommended

j) 5.3.10 F3E Course Layout The Netherlands

Page 49	Class F3E			Submitted by:	Netherlands
j) 5.3.10 F3E Course Layout					
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 7	Against: 5	Abstain: 4	
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 2	Against: 5	Abstain: 8	
Comments (if necessary):					

Supported by the Sub Committee by small majority

Not recommended by the technical meeting.

The SC CHAIRMAN proposes to refer the proposal back to the Sub Committee for further study.

There was a proposal by Bruce De Chastel to make a relatively small modification to the current rule for the starting lane, which can be taken into account.

The Netherlands delegate has withdrawn the proposal shortly after the meeting

k) 5.3.14 Timekeeping and judging

F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Page 51	Class F3E			Submitted by:	S-C
k) 5.3.14 Timekeeping and judging					
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):					
<i>Add a sentence at the end of sub-paragraph d) as shown below.</i>					
d) The judges’ signals will be off as the aircraft reach midcourse between No. 3 and No. 1 pylons, or earlier. At the instant the model aircraft draws level with the No. 1 pylon the pylon judge will switch his signal on. When the model aircraft draws level with the No.1 pylon on the way back the signal is switched off. When a pylon cut has been made the signal will flash on and off five (5) times or another signal will be activated to inform the competitor about the pylon cut.					
<u>This system of signalling is the preferred one, but alternative systems with a fixed light duration and a separate pylon cut indication are allowed.</u>					
<u>The light has to be off when the model is between pylon #2 and pylon #3.</u>					
<u>The CD will inform the competitors which type of system is used.</u>					
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 14	Against: 1	Abstain: 0	
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 14	Against: 0	Abstain: 1	
Comments (if necessary):					

Recommended as amended in technical meeting

l) 5.3.16 Scoring and Classification

F3 Pylon Racing Subcommittee

Add text to sub-paragraph e) as shown below.

Page 53	Class F3E			Submitted by:	S-C
l) 5.3.16 Scoring and Classification					
Amended at the Technical Meeting? (delete as appropriate) NO (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: 7	Against: 7	Abstain: 2	
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 0	Against: 14	Abstain: 1	
Comments (if necessary):					

Proposal **withdrawn** by Sub Committee after discussion in technical meeting.

14.9 Section 4C Volume F3 - RC Helicopter

F3N – RC Freestyle Aerobatic Helicopters

a) Annex 5F – F3N Manoeuvre Descriptions & Diagrams F3 Heli Subcommittee

Page 38	Class: F3N			
a	Annex 5F.1 F3N Manoeuvre Descriptions & Diagrams		Submitted by:	F3 Heli S/C
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):				
Original version: 1.25 Pirouetting globe K=9.0 MA enters in upright flight and then performs four pirouetting loops. During each loop, the flight path is changed in a way, that the next loop is rotated about 45° (seen from above) until a complete globe has been described. The MA exits the manoeuvre at the same altitude but in opposite direction to the beginning. During each loop, the MA there must perform at least two pirouettes <u>be at least 2 but not more than 6 pirouettes. The pirouettes should be distributed equally through the loop.</u>				
Amended version: 1.25 Pirouetting globe K=9.0 MA enters in upright flight and then performs four pirouetting loops. During each loop, the flight path is changed in a way, that the next loop is rotated about 45° (seen from above) until a complete globe has been described. The MA exits the manoeuvre at the same altitude but in opposite direction to the beginning. During each loop, the MA there <u>must perform at least two pirouettes</u> be at least 2 but not more than 6 pirouettes. <u>The pirouettes should be distributed equally through the loop.</u>				
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 13 Against: 0 Abstain: 0				
Technical Meeting Voting: For: - Against: - Abstain: -				
Comments (if necessary): Accepted unanimously				

b) Annex 5F – F3N Manoeuvre Descriptions & Diagrams F3 Heli Subcommittee

Annex 5F.2 – F3N Set Manoeuvre Drawings

Page 38	Class: F3N			
b	Annex 5F.2 F3N Set Manoeuvre Drawings		Submitted by:	F3 Heli S/C
Amended at the Technical Meeting? NO (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: 13 Against: 0 Abstain: 0				
Technical Meeting Voting: For: - Against: - Abstain: -				
Comments (if necessary): Accepted unanimously				

For both proposals early implementation date was requested – June 1st.

14.10 Section 4C Volume F3 - Soaring

F3B – Multi-Task Gliders

a) 5.3.1.3 Characteristics of R/C Gliders F3B

Germany

Page 39	Class: F3B		
a)	5.3.1.3 Characteristics of Radio Controlled Gliders F3B	Submitted by:	GER
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -		
	S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):	For: 10	Against: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 27	Against: 0 Abstain: 0
	Comments : Unanimously recommended		

b) 5.3.1.3 Characteristics of R/C Gliders F3B

Germany

Page 39	Class: F3B		
b)	5.3.1.3 Characteristics of Radio Controlled Gliders F3B	Submitted by:	GER
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -		
	S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):	For: 4	Against: 5
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 5	Against: 10 Abstain: 12
	Comments : Not recommended, Proposal afterwards withdrawn by the German Delegate		

c) 5.3.2.2 Launching

Germany

Page 39	Class: F3B		
c)	5.3.2.2. Launching	Submitted by:	GER
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -		
	S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):	For: 9	Against: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 15	Against: 6 Abstain: 6
	Comments : Recommended by majority		

d) 5.3.2.2 Launching

Germany

Page 40	Class: F3B		
d)	5.3.2.2. Launching	Submitted by:	GER
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -		

S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):	For: 11	Against: 0
Technical Meeting Voting:	For: 27	Against: 0 Abstain: 0
Comments : Unanimously recommended		

e) 5.3.2.2 Launching

Germany

Page 40	Class: F3B		
e)	5.3.2.2. Launching	Submitted by:	GER
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -			
S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):		For: 9	Against: 2
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 24	Against: 3 Abstain: 0
Comments : Recommended by majority			

f) 5.6.4 Re-flights

Germany

Page 41	Class: F3B		
f)	5.6.4. Re-flights	Submitted by:	GER
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -			
S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):		For: 8	Against: 2
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 25	Against: 2 Abstain: 0
Comments : Recommended by majority			

F3G – Multi-Task Gliders with Electric Motors

g) 5.G.2.6 Partial Scores

Germany

Page 41	Class: F3G		
g)	5.G.2.6. Partial Scores	Submitted by:	GER
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -			
S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>):		For: 11	Against: 0
Technical Meeting Voting:		For: 27	Against: 0 Abstain: 0
Comments : Unanimously recommended			

h) F3RES – 2-Axis Thermal Gliders

Germany

Page 42	Class: F3L?		
j)	RC Soaring class - RES	Submitted by:	GER

Amended at the Technical Meeting? No -
S-C Voting (<i>prior to the Technical Meeting</i>): For: 9 Against: 1
Technical Meeting Voting: For: 27 Against: 0 Abstain: 0
Comments : Unanimously recommended

Volume F9 Drone Sport begins overleaf

14.11 Section 4C Volume F9 – Drone Sport

F9U – Multi-Rotor FPV Racing

a) Annex C.1 – Racing Circuit

Russia

Page 43	Class F9U - RC Multi-rotor Drone Racing			
a)	Annex C.1 – Racing Circuit	Submitted by:	RUS	
S/C Voting (prior to the e-Technical Meeting): No vote				
Amended at the e-Technical Meeting? No				
<p>e-Technical Meeting recommendation: After exchanging on the topic, unanimous position of the e-Technical Meeting to <i>refer back</i> the proposal to the F9 S/C for further consideration. In that situation, the proposal will not be considered for the CIAM Delegates voting.</p>				

b) C.2 Racing Circuit or A.9 Responsibilities of the Event Organiser

Russia

Page 43	Class F9U - RC Multi-rotor Drone Racing			
b)	C.2 Racing Circuit or A.9 Responsibilities of the Event Organiser	Submitted by:	RUS	
S/C Voting (prior to the e-Technical Meeting): No				
Amended at the e-Technical Meeting? No				
<p>e-Technical Meeting recommendation: After exchanging on the topic, Russian Federation representative <i>proposed to withdraw</i> the proposal. In that situation, the proposal will not be considered for the CIAM Delegates voting. The S/C will continue to exchange on the topic for recommendations regarding simulators especially for the biggest FAI events (WDRC Grand Final and World Cup Masters Series events). The S/C is also encouraged to analyse the interest to introduce virtual competition (e-drone racing) within FAI and to do proposals how to proceed.</p>				

Volume S – Space begins overleaf

14.12 Section 4C Volume S – Space

Page 41	Class S10		Submitted by	SUI & UKR
a)	Part Thirteen: Class S10 Flex Wing Duration Competition			
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 9 Against: 6 Abstain: 2				
Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting				
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 57	Class S11		Submitted by	SUI
b)	S11/P Rocket Powered Aircraft and Spaceships Competition (Provisional)			
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 11 Against: 4 Abstain: 2				
Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting				
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 9	General		Submitted by	SUI
c)	1.3 Classification of Space Models			
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 9 Against: 6 Abstain: 2				
Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting				
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 11	General		Submitted by	CRO
d)	2.2 Propellant			
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 5 Against: 8 Abstain: 4				
Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting				
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 11	General		Submitted by	CRO
e)	2.4 Construction Requirements			
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 6 Against: 10 Abstain: 1				
Technical Meeting Voting: Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation				
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 11	General		Submitted by	SM S/C
n/a)	2.4 Construction Requirements			
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2 Against: 14 Abstain: 1				
Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting				
Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Proposer				

Page 12	Class S5		
f)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of Class S5	Submitted by	SVK
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 5	Against: 9 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
	Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Slovakia	

Page 12	Class S5		
g)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of Class S5	Submitted by	POL
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 11 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
	Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Poland	

Page 12	Class S5		
h)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of Class S5	Submitted by	BUL
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 13 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
	Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Bulgaria	

Page 11	Classes S1,2,3,6,9,10		
i)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of subclasses S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9 and S10	Submitted by	SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 15 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
	Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Switzerland	

Page 11	Classes S1,2,3,6,9,10		
j)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of subclasses S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9 and S10	Submitted by	CRO
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2	Against: 14 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
	Comments (if necessary):		

Page 11	Classes S1,2,3,6,9,10		
k)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of subclasses S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9 and S10	Submitted by	UKR
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):		

<i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):</i>	
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 2 Against: 14 Abstain: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine

Page 11	Classes S1,2,3,6,9,10		
l)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of subclasses S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9 and S10	Submitted by	RUS
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):</i>			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 1	Against: 15 Abstain: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Russia	

Page 11	Classes S1,2,3,6,9,10		
m)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of subclasses S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9 and S10	Submitted by	BUL
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):</i>			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 1	Against: 15 Abstain: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Bulgaria	

Page 11	Classes S1,2,3,6,9,10		
n)	2.4.4 Minimum dimensions of subclasses S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9 and S10	Submitted by	ITA
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):</i>			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 3	Against: 13 Abstain: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Italy	

Page 12	General		
o)	2.4.7 Construction Requirements	Submitted by	CRO
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):</i>			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 2	Against: 14 Abstain: 1
Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 14	Space Model Motors		
p)	3.9 Modifications	Submitted by	USA
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):</i>			
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):		For: 9	Against: 5 Abstain: 3
Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	

Comments (if necessary):

Page 14	Space Model Motors		Submitted by	CRO
q)	3.10 Certification for FAI Contests			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2 Against: 13 Abstain: 2			
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting			
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 17	General		Submitted by	SUI
r)	4.1 World Championship Events for Space Models			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8 Against: 8 Abstain: 1			
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting			
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 17	General		Submitted by	UKR
s)	4.1 World Championship Events for Space Models			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2 Against: 14 Abstain: 1			
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting			
Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Ukraine				

Page 17	General		Submitted by	CRO
t)	4.2 Number of Models, Starts and Maximum Duration			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2 Against: 14 Abstain: 1			
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting			
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 18	General		Submitted by	USA
u)	4.3.4 Assisted Launch			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 11 Against: 5 Abstain: 1			
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting			
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 18	General		Submitted by	USA
v)	4.3.5 Launching Procedure			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8 Against: 7 Abstain: 2			
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting			
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 18	General	
----------------	----------------	--

w)	4.3.5 Launching Procedure	Submitted by	CRO
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 12 Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 18	General		
x)	4.3.7 Hazard	Submitted by	USA
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 11	Against: 5 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 18	General		
y)	4.3.8 Launch Site	Submitted by	USA
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 14	Against: 2 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 18	General		
z)	4.4.2 Model Marking and Identification	Submitted by	SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 11	Against: 5 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 18	General		
aa)	4.4.2 Model Marking and Identification	Submitted by	POL
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 13	Against: 1 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 19	General		
ab)	4.6.5 Disqualification	Submitted by	SVK
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):		
	Modify the following section by deleting text and replacing it as shown below:		
	<p>In the S4 and S10 classes, the model must reach a stable flight within 30 s from the moment of reaching the apogee of the model's first motion on the launching device, from the moment the model or any part of the model leaves the launching device otherwise the flight is disqualified.</p> <p>In S3, S6 and S9 classes, the recovery system must deploy correctly within 30 s from the moment of reaching the apogee of the model's first motion on the launching device, from the moment the model or any part of the model leaves the launching device otherwise the flight is disqualified.</p>		

S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 16	Against: 1	Abstain: 0
Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting after amendment		
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 19	General			
ac)	4.6.5 Disqualification		Submitted by	CRO
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 0	Against: 17	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):			

Page 20	General			
ad)	4.8 Timing and Classification		Submitted by	CRO
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8	Against: 5	Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):			

Page 20	General			
ae)	4.8 Timing and Classification		Submitted by	SVK
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 17	Against: 0	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):			

Page 20	General			
af)	4.8 Timing and Classification		Submitted by	SRB
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 12	Against: 5	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):			

Page 21	General			
ag)	4.9.1. Triangulation Method		Submitted by	SRB
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 15	Against: 0	Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):			

Page 22	General			
ah)	4.10.1. Special Contest Organisation Requirements		Submitted by	CRO
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 8	Abstain: 6
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):			

Page 22	General		Submitted by	SRB
ai)	4.10.7 Special Contest Organisation Requirements			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 13	Against: 0 Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 23	General		Submitted by	SRB
aj)	4.10.10 Special Contest Organisation Requirements			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 10	Against: 3 Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 50	Annex 2		Submitted by	SRB
ak)	5. Organisers' Tasks			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8	Against: 5 Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 50	General		Submitted by	UKR
al)	5. Organisers' Tasks			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2	Against: 11 Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:		Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation	
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 27	Class S3 and S6		Submitted by	SVK
am)	7.1 General			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 10	Against: 7 Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 27	Class S3 and S6		Submitted by	CRO
an)	7.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 13 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:		unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 27	Class S3 and S6		Submitted by	SUI
ao)	7.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2	Against: 14 Abstain: 1

Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Switzerland

Page 27	Class S3 and S6	Submitted by	UKR	
ap)	7.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 13	Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Ukraine		

Page 27	Class S3 and S6	Submitted by	ITA	
aq)	7.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 4	Against: 12	Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Italy		

Page 27	Class S3 and S6	Submitted by	RUS	
ar)	7.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 15	Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Russia		

Page 55	Class S6A/P	Submitted by	SUI	
as)	7.5. Class S6A/P – Streamer target time duration competition			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 6	Against: 7	Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation		
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 55	Class S6A/P	Submitted by	SUI	
at)	7.5. Class S6A/P – Streamer target time duration competition			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 6	Against: 7	Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation		
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 55	Class S6A/P	Submitted by	SUI	
au)	7.5.1 Purpose of competition			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 12	Against: 2	Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 29	Class S4	Submitted by	SUI	
av)	8.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 14	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Switzerland		

Page 29	Class S4	Submitted by	UKR	
aw)	8.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 16	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Ukraine		

Page 29	Class S4	Submitted by	RUS	
ax)	8.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 16	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Russia		

Page 29	Class S4	Submitted by	BUL	
ay)	8.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2	Against: 15	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Bulgaria		

Page 29	Class S4	Submitted by	CRO	
az)	8.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2	Against: 15	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 29	Class S4	Submitted by	ITA	
ba)	8.4 Sub-Classes			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 4	Against: 13	Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Italy		

Page 31	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	SVK	
bb)	9.1 Definition			
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 15	Against: 1	Abstain: 1

Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting
Comments (if necessary):	

Page 31	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	SVK
bc)	9.6 Stabilising Fins		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 10 Against: 6 Abstain: 1		
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 31	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	SVK
bd)	9.7. Plastic Model Kit Parts		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 9 Against: 6 Abstain: 2		
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 32	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	SVK
be)	9.11. Scale Judging		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):		
	9.11.1. A competitor who presents the following proper technical data may be awarded with points defined in the paragraphs below only for items documented in these technical data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • authentic, authorised drawing(s) of the prototype with at least ten dimensions and three cross sections, i.e. data which define colour of cross sections and markings on it; • workshop drawing of scale model that shows prototype and model dimensions; • at least one colour photographs of the whole prototype with clearly visible details of colour and markings; • at least three photographs of details and assemblies; • Flight profile - taken from official sources: official publications, magazines, books, specifications of the design bureau or developer of space rocket systems. • Drawing that indicates powered parts and separation joints • file containing all necessary technical data including data regarding the locations of the centre of gravity, centre of pressure, gross weight, burnout weight and/or calculated or measures flight performance of the model necessary for safety reasons. 		
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 11 Against: 2 Abstain: 4		
Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting after amendment			
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 32	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	RUS
bf)	9.11. Scale Judging		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 2 Against: 11 Abstain: 4		
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Russia, included in proposal be)			

Page 32	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	SVK
bg)	9.11. Scale Judging		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8 Against: 8 Abstain: 1		
	Technical Meeting Voting: withdrawn by Slovakia		
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 32	Class S5 and S7	Submitted by	UKR
bh)	9.11. Scale Judging		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 4 Against: 12 Abstain: 1	
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Ukraine	

Page 32	Class S7	Submitted by	UKR
bi)	9.11. Scale Judging		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 7 Against: 5 Abstain: 5	
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Ukraine as partially included in proposal be)	

Page 35	Class S8	Submitted by	SUI
bj)	11.2 Purpose		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 11 Against: 4 Abstain: 2	
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 36	Class S8	Submitted by	SUI
bk)	11.6 Sub-Classes		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3 Against: 11 Abstain: 3	
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Switzerland	

Page 37	Class S8	Submitted by	SUI & UKR
bl)	11.7 Class S8E/P Radio Controlled Rocket Glider Time Duration And Precision Landing Competition		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8 Against: 6 Abstain: 3	
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 37	Class S8	Submitted by	SUI
bm)	11.7.2 Specifications		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3 Against: 11 Abstain: 3	
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):		withdrawn by Switzerland	

Page 36	Class S8	Submitted by	UKR
bn)	11.6 Sub-Classes		
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):		

<i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):	
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 5 Against: 9 Abstain: 3
Technical Meeting Voting:	Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation
Comments (if necessary):	

Page 36	Class S8															
bo)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>11.6 Sub-Classes</td> <td>Submitted by</td> <td>RUS</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):</td> <td>For: 2 Against: 12</td> <td>Abstain: 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Meeting Voting:</td> <td colspan="2">Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Comments (if necessary):</td> </tr> </table>	11.6 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	RUS	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):			S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 2 Against: 12	Abstain: 3	Technical Meeting Voting:	Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation		Comments (if necessary):		
11.6 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	RUS														
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):																
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 2 Against: 12	Abstain: 3														
Technical Meeting Voting:	Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation															
Comments (if necessary):																

Page 36	Class S8															
bp)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>11.6 Sub-Classes</td> <td>Submitted by</td> <td>BUL</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):</td> <td>For: 1 Against: 13</td> <td>Abstain: 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Meeting Voting:</td> <td colspan="2">unanimously rejected by the technical meeting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comments (if necessary):</td> <td colspan="2">withdrawn by Bulgaria</td> </tr> </table>	11.6 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	BUL	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):			S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 1 Against: 13	Abstain: 3	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Bulgaria	
11.6 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	BUL														
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):																
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 1 Against: 13	Abstain: 3														
Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting															
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Bulgaria															

Page 37	Class S8															
bq)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>11.7.2 Specifications</td> <td>Submitted by</td> <td>UKR</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):</td> </tr> <tr> <td>S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):</td> <td>For: 5 Against: 9</td> <td>Abstain: 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Meeting Voting:</td> <td colspan="2">unanimously rejected by the technical meeting</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comments (if necessary):</td> <td colspan="2">withdrawn by Ukraine</td> </tr> </table>	11.7.2 Specifications	Submitted by	UKR	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):			S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 5 Against: 9	Abstain: 3	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine	
11.7.2 Specifications	Submitted by	UKR														
Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):																
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 5 Against: 9	Abstain: 3														
Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting															
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine															

Page 37	Class S8																								
br)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>11.7.3 Landing Area</td> <td>Submitted by</td> <td>UKR</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Modify the following section b) in 11.7.3. ‘Landing Area’ with the additions as shown below:</i></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p>b) A landing area consisting of the appropriate number of 10 metre landing circles, for the final, 3 metre circles, laid out square to the wind direction and with the marked landing tapes pinned down at the centre of each circle. The contest director is responsible for determining the direction and layout of the circles. Any changes of indicated landing area are forbidden during the round. The landing area must be located at a place on the field where there is no danger of collision with any person during the landing of the models.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p>c) <u>The location of the timekeepers timekeeping judges and pilots during landing near their landing circles is the responsibility of a specially appointed landing officer.</u></p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):</td> <td>For: 10</td> <td>Against: 6 Abstain: 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technical Meeting Voting:</td> <td colspan="2">unanimously recommended by the technical meeting after amendment</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Comments (if necessary):</td> </tr> </table>	11.7.3 Landing Area	Submitted by	UKR	Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):			<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Modify the following section b) in 11.7.3. ‘Landing Area’ with the additions as shown below:</i></p>			<p>b) A landing area consisting of the appropriate number of 10 metre landing circles, for the final, 3 metre circles, laid out square to the wind direction and with the marked landing tapes pinned down at the centre of each circle. The contest director is responsible for determining the direction and layout of the circles. Any changes of indicated landing area are forbidden during the round. The landing area must be located at a place on the field where there is no danger of collision with any person during the landing of the models.</p>			<p>c) <u>The location of the timekeepers timekeeping judges and pilots during landing near their landing circles is the responsibility of a specially appointed landing officer.</u></p>			S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 10	Against: 6 Abstain: 1	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting after amendment		Comments (if necessary):		
11.7.3 Landing Area	Submitted by	UKR																							
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):																									
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Modify the following section b) in 11.7.3. ‘Landing Area’ with the additions as shown below:</i></p>																									
<p>b) A landing area consisting of the appropriate number of 10 metre landing circles, for the final, 3 metre circles, laid out square to the wind direction and with the marked landing tapes pinned down at the centre of each circle. The contest director is responsible for determining the direction and layout of the circles. Any changes of indicated landing area are forbidden during the round. The landing area must be located at a place on the field where there is no danger of collision with any person during the landing of the models.</p>																									
<p>c) <u>The location of the timekeepers timekeeping judges and pilots during landing near their landing circles is the responsibility of a specially appointed landing officer.</u></p>																									
S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting):	For: 10	Against: 6 Abstain: 1																							
Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting after amendment																								
Comments (if necessary):																									

Page 37	Class S8									
bs)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>11.7.4. Timing and Classification</td> <td>Submitted by</td> <td>SUI</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3">Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Modify the following sections: 11.7.4.9 and 11.7.4.10 - as shown below. Renumber the final subparagraph 11.7.4.11 to 11.7.4.10:</i></p> </td> </tr> </table>	11.7.4. Timing and Classification	Submitted by	SUI	Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):			<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Modify the following sections: 11.7.4.9 and 11.7.4.10 - as shown below. Renumber the final subparagraph 11.7.4.11 to 11.7.4.10:</i></p>		
11.7.4. Timing and Classification	Submitted by	SUI								
Amended at the Technical Meeting? YES (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):										
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Modify the following sections: 11.7.4.9 and 11.7.4.10 - as shown below. Renumber the final subparagraph 11.7.4.11 to 11.7.4.10:</i></p>										

	<p>11.7.4.9. There shall be four rounds three initial rounds and one final round, except for Continental and World Championships Cat.1. events, which shall have four initial rounds and two final rounds. At Cat1. Events the five competitors with the highest score after the initial rounds qualify for the final rounds, and shall fly as a group.</p> <p>11.7.4.10. The five competitors with the highest scores after the initial rounds qualify for the final round(s).</p> <p>All competitors in the final round(s) shall fly as a group. If there is a frequency conflict, the competitor with the worst score in the initial rounds must change the frequency of his/her radio.</p>
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 12 Against: 2 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting after amendment
	Comments (if necessary):

Page 38	Class S8		11.7.5.4. Organisation of Starts	Submitted by	SUI
		bt)	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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:0 Abstain: 1
			Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
			Comments (if necessary):		

Page 38	Class S8		11.7.5.3. Organisation of Starts	Submitted by	UKR
		bu)	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 5	Against: 8 Abstain: 4
			Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
			Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine	

Page 39	Class S9		12.5 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	SUI
		bv)	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 15 Abstain: 1
			Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
			Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Switzerland	

Page 39	Class S9		12.5 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	ITA
		bw)	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 5	Against: 11 Abstain: 1
			Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
			Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Italy	

Page 39	Class S9		12.5 Sub-Classes	Submitted by	UKR
----------------	-----------------	--	-------------------------	---------------------	------------

bx)	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 3	Against: 13	Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
	Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine		

Page 39	Class S9			
by)	12.5 Sub-Classes		Submitted by	RUS
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 15	Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Russia			

Page 43	Class S5 and S7			
bz)	Annex 1 - Scale Judging Tables		Submitted by	SVK
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 8	Against: 5	Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 43	Class S5 and S7			
ca)	Annex 1 - Scale Judging Tables		Submitted by	UKR
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 12	Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine			

Page 43	Class S5 and S7			
cb)	Annex 1 - Scale Judging Tables		Submitted by	RUS
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 12	Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Russia			

Page 47	Annex 2			
cc)	Annex 2 - 2. Judges Tasks		Submitted by	UKR
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 13	Against: 3	Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):				

Page 47	Annex 2			
cd)	Annex 2 – d.4. Specific Events		Submitted by	SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 4	Against: 6	Abstain: 7
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting		
Comments (if necessary):	withdrawn by Ukraine			

Page 49	Annex 2		
ce)	Annex 2 – d.4. Specific Events		Submitted by SVK
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 13	Against: 0 Abstain: 4
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 49	Class S4 and S8		
cf)	Annex 2 – d.4.a Specific Events		Submitted by SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 15	Against: 0 Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 49	Class S8		
cg)	Annex 2 – d.5. Organisers’ Tasks		Submitted by SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 0 Abstain: 1
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page 51	Space Models World Cup		
ch)	1. Classes		Submitted by SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 12	Against: 3 Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page	Safety		
ci)	Proposed new Annex 5 – FAI Space Model Safety Code		Submitted by USA
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 11	Against: 4 Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously recommended by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page	Safety		
cj)	Proposed new Annex 5 – FAI Space Model Safety Code		Submitted by CRO
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (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: 1	Against: 14 Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting:	unanimously rejected by the technical meeting	
Comments (if necessary):			

Page	Annex motors		
ck)	Proposed new Annex 6 – Common Motor Source		Submitted by USA
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):		

	<i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 6 Against: 9 Abstain: 2
	Technical Meeting Voting: Referred back to Space Models Subcommittee for further evaluation
	Comments (if necessary):

Page	CGR
cl)	CGR 15.2.2 Current World Championships for Class S (Space Models) Submitted by ITA
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 3 Against: 14 Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting
	Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Italy

Page	CGR
cm)	CGR 15.2.2 Current World Championships for Class S (Space Models) Submitted by SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 2 Against: 15 Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting
	Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Switzerland

Page	CGR
cn)	CGR 15.2.2 Current World Championships for Class S (Space Models) Submitted by SVK
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 8 Against: 9 Abstain: 0
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting
	Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Slovakia

Page	CGR
co)	CGR 15.2.2 Current World Championships for Class S (Space Models) Submitted by UKR
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 1 Against: 16 Abstain:
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously rejected by the technical meeting
	Comments (if necessary): withdrawn by Ukraine

Page	CIAM Records
a)	4.5.3 Homologation Requirements (Space Models) Submitted by SRB
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 14 Against: 0 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting
	Comments (if necessary):

Page	CIAM Records
b)	Forms: Application for record confirmation – Space Models Submitted by SUI
	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No (delete as appropriate) (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as <i>strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red</i>):
	S-C Voting (prior to the Technical Meeting): For: 14 Against: 0 Abstain: 3
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting

	Comments <i>(if necessary)</i> :
--	----------------------------------

Page		Submitted by	SUI
c)	Amended at the Technical Meeting? No <i>(delete as appropriate)</i> (If “yes” then, type in the amended proposal with deletions as strikethrough and new text in bold underlined red):		
	S-C Voting <i>(prior to the Technical Meeting)</i> : For: 14 Against: 0 Abstain: 3		
	Technical Meeting Voting: unanimously recommended by the technical meeting		
	Comments <i>(if necessary)</i> :		