

6.9.1 ANNEX C – F4H STATIC JUDGING SUMMARY

6.9.1C.1 STATIC JUDGING – GENERAL

The static judging process for flying scale models in class F4H is a simplified version of the process used for class F4C. Because the Builder of the Model rule (BOM) see para. 6.1.10 is not applicable to F4H, the assessment is carried out without regard as to who built the model.

All the assessment is carried out with the Static Judges positioned 5 meters away from the centerline of the model, consequently, the F4H static judging process is much less intensive because if any part or detail of the model cannot be clearly seen at 5 meters it is not include in the assessment. Surface Texture, Scale Detail and Craftsmanship are not assessed because these aspects cannot be clearly seen at 5 meters.

Each aspect of static judging of the model is marked by each judge out of 10 in increments of 0.1 of a mark. The Static Judges must work together as a team and attempt to reach agreement on the marks to be awarded for each aspect. Although each judge retains the right to differ, any degree of difference should be minimal.

Regardless of the actual marks awarded, it is imperative that an accurate and fair comparison is attained across all the models entered in the competition. The relative mark of one model compared to another is the most important standard to be achieved.

Before any static judging commences, the judges should make a general comparison of the complexity aspects of as many as possible of the models entered in the competition and place them in an approximate order of merit. This need not be a formal process and does not require all the models to be 'lined up' and presented to the judges. These observations can usually be achieved by simply walking around the 'pit area' or the place provided for competitors to assemble and prepare their models.

The competitor must remain with the model throughout the static judging process in case the judges need to question the competitor on any aspect of the model or the documentation. Depending upon the size of the model, additional handlers should also be available to position the model as directed by the judges.

Judges should not exceed 20 minutes to complete the assessment of each model.

It is important that the static judges retain all the static score sheets until all the models have been static judged and the final review has been completed.

6.9.1C.2 EXAMINATION OF DOCUMENTATION

The documentation required consists of Score sheets, the Competitors' Declaration and the Proof of Scale documentation. These documents must be available when the model is presented for static judging and the Static Judges should carefully examine the documentation before assessing the model.

6.9.1C.2.1 Static Judging Score Sheets

The competitor is responsible for ensuring that the Static Judges are provided with the correct scoresheets which must be correctly filled in with the Competitors details and the details of the model.

6.9.1C.2.2 Competitor's Declaration

A completed and signed Competitors Declaration form is an essential document and static judging cannot commence unless the completed Declaration has been presented to the Static Judges.

6.9.1C.2.3 Proof of Scale Documentation

The Rules for class F4H specify the requirement for proof of scale documentation, (see para 6.9.5).

Photographs and printed reproductions must conform to the same requirements as F4C but the overall limit of five photographs or illustrations must not be exceeded.

If more than 5 different photographs or printed illustrations are presented, the judges must direct the competitor to remove or cover up the excess before judging commences.

Drawings must conform to the same requirements as Class F4C

The scale accuracy of the model can only be judged by comparing it with the proof of scale documentation or scale evidence presented by the competitor. Judges can only award marks for scale accuracy based on the information provided by the competitor.

It follows therefore that if the documentation relating to any part of the model is missing, inadequate or poorly presented, then this must be reflected in the marks which can be awarded.

Proof of Scale documentation should be presented in a format which can be quickly and easily understood. Advice to competitors on how the documentation should be presented is given in para. 6.3.1.5 of the F4C Rules. Good presentation, however, is no guarantee that it is fully comprehensive.

Further guidance to Judges on what the optimum standard of proof of scale documentation should be is provided below.

Judges must ensure that a competitor does not benefit by default when this documentation is incomplete or of poor quality.

6.9.1C.2.3.1 Photographs

Photographs submitted as evidence of outline should ideally show the complete aircraft and the image size should not be less than 15cm wide.

The photographs provided should be of good quality, with good definition, a good depth of focus and ideally be free from distortion. Static Judges must have a good understanding of camera lens distortion and perspective distortion and how these factors can influence the photographic image of the subject aircraft.

With the ready availability of computerised photo editing software (e.g., Photoshop), Judges should be on their guard in order to spot photographs of the full-size aircraft which may have been edited in order to hide errors on the model. Similarly, judges must be on the lookout for photographs of the model which have been edited to make the model appear to be the full-size aircraft.

6.9.1C.2.3.2 Scale Drawings

The specification for drawings is defined in rule 6.3.1.3.3b), which specifies minimum dimensions. However, line thickness is also important and drawings which show thick outlines are often an indication that the drawing has been enlarged from a small image and will be of dubious accuracy. The line thickness of a drawing should be no greater than 0.5mm.

Judges must seek to verify the origin of drawings and where they have been published. If the drawing is not clearly marked with the originator/publisher, it must be certified by the appropriate National Aerospace Council (NAC). Drawings which do not display proof of publication or have not been endorsed by the competitor's NAC are not admissible and must be disregarded.

The drawings should be applicable to the same Mk./variant or modification standard of the full-size subject aircraft that has been modelled. Drawings of a different variant of the same aircraft are acceptable providing the differences between variants are minimal, clearly identified and illustrated with supplementary sketches and/or cross referred to photographs.

6.9.1C.2.3.3 Proof of Markings and the Colour Scheme

Proof of all markings and the complete colour scheme on both sides of the subject aircraft as well as the upper and lower surfaces of the wings, can be difficult to obtain and all too often, whilst excellent photographs are provided for the aeroplane type, only one photograph or illustration shows the subject aeroplane.

Judges must not make assumptions that the markings are the same on each side of the aeroplane or that similar aircraft carry the same markings and colour scheme.

6.9.1C.2.3.4 Proof of Colour Accuracy

Colour accuracy is concerned with the tonal accuracy of the colours used on the model by comparison with the proof of colour evidence submitted and it is essential that if high marks are to be awarded, a comprehensive standard of colour evidence must be presented.

Correct colour may be established from samples of original paint; published descriptions if accompanied by colour chips certified by competent authority; colour photographs or published colour drawings.

Colour photographs can be unreliable since they can be reproduced in virtually any shade; furthermore, the ambient light conditions (colour temperature and polarization) prevailing when the photographs were taken, may not be the same as when the model is judged. E.g., photographs taken of the full-size aircraft illuminated with artificial light are not a reliable proof of colour when the model is judged outdoors.

Proof of colour must also indicate whether the finish is matt or gloss, or somewhere in-between.

cont/...

6.9.1C.2.3.5 Proof of Scale Realism

Realism is by definition; “representing things as they really are” and when assessing realism in the context of scale model aeroplanes, it is best to make a comparison between the whole model and a photograph of the full-size subject aircraft.

The best evidence of realism for an F4H model is a good quality photograph which shows the whole of the full-size aircraft which has been modelled, including any weathering or signs of use and/or damage or imperfections in the structure and the finishing.

This photograph can be the same as one of those used for assessing scale accuracy, but ideally the photograph should be presented separately.

6.9.1C.3 ASSESSMENT OF THE MODEL

Most of the Guidance for the assessment of F4C models (6.3.1.ANNEX C) also applies to F4H but Static Judges should be careful to avoid penalising the omission of details which are not clearly visible at 5 metres.

There are no rules governing the order in which the various aspects are assessed but it is suggested that they are marked in the order laid out below which is also the order they appear on the score sheet. In practice there is often some overlap of these aspects, e.g., errors in outline are often revealed by the colour scheme and the markings.

6.9.1C.3.1 Assessing Scale Accuracy

It is suggested that the model should first be positioned in a pose similar to that in the best photograph and checked for any obvious discrepancies. Because of the possibility that the photographs may suffer from some form of distortion (see 1.3.1 above), Static Judges must cross check between photographs and the drawings. Photographs that are taken at an oblique angle can often give a false impression of dihedral and/or rigging angles and the drawings may provide a more accurate reference.

6.9.1C.3.2 Side view – Examine the fuselage outline, cabin or canopy shape, cockpit aperture shape, engine cowling, propeller and spinner shape, outline of fin and rudder, wing and tailplane sections. Also, the shape, angle and position of landing gear legs and nose/tail wheel or skid and the size of wheels and tyres. If applicable a check should be made of wing stagger, wing gap and the shape and arrangement of struts and rigging wires. Particular attention should be given to the wing thickness and any changes of section along the wing. It will be necessary to examine both sides of the model because there are few aeroplanes where the port side is identical to the starboard side.

6.9.1C.3.3 Front-end view – Examine the wing dihedral, thickness and taper, washout, prominence of ribs, wing struts, bracing and gap on multi-wing aircraft. Also, the thickness of fin, rudder and tailplane, cross-sections of fuselage and engine cowling, cowling shape and cut-outs, propeller size and blade shape, shape of cockpit canopy or windshields; size, shape, position and angle of landing gear, wheel track, tyre thickness.

6.9.1C.3.4 Plan view - Examine the wing outline and fairings, aileron size, flaps (if visible), tailplane size and outline; elevator size, shape and cut outs, trim tabs, fuselage shape and taper, cockpit or canopy shape, engine cowling shape. The plan view assessment also provides the opportunity to check the accuracy and the position of the markings on the wings.

6.9.1C.3.5 Assessing Markings and Colour Scheme Accuracy

Judges should only award high marks for aircraft markings and colour scheme accuracy if the documentation provides evidence of all the markings and the total colour scheme. i.e. on all surfaces. It cannot be assumed that the markings are the same on each side of the aeroplane. As a guide, if the evidence for markings shows only one side elevation of the subject and there is no indicative evidence to support the markings on the other surfaces, irrespective of how complex they are, no more than 2.5 marks should be awarded.

6.9.1C.3.6 Assessing Markings and Colour Scheme Complexity

Prior to commencing judging, the judges should agree the principle for awarding complexity points in relation to markings. A high mark for markings complexity is not solely dependent upon the number of different colours and markings, but the difficulty in achieving the required effect.

It is important to ensure that the marks awarded are a fair comparison with the spread of marks awarded across the range of models entered.

For high marks to be given in this section it is also important that evidence is provided for all the markings which are visible at 5 meters.

6.9.1C.3.7 Assessing Colour Accuracy

The assessment must be made by comparing the evidence of colour with all the different colours on the model and this includes the accuracy of all the colours used for markings, lettering and insignia.

Judges should avoid wearing polarizing or tinted glasses (unless a neutral grey tint) when assessing colour.

It is essential that if high marks are to be awarded, a comprehensive standard of colour documentation must be presented.

6.9.1C.3.8 Assessing Colour Complexity

The system for awarding colour complexity points should be agreed before starting judging and consideration should be given to the greater effort involved in reproducing multi-coloured finishes compared to models which feature only one or two basic colours.

It is suggested that up to two complexity points may be given for each main colour that covers a significant part of the airframe. A maximum of a single point may be given for each minor colour, such as those for the insignia, struts, guns, bombs etc. and basic colours of black and white should attract a fraction of a complexity point.

The marks awarded should not be confined simply to the number of colours used, but also how the colours are distributed on the model and whether the colour boundaries are on a flat or curved surface/structure.

6.9.1C.3.9 Assessing Realism

The quality of the documentation is of vital importance when assessing realism and if the documentation does not contain a good quality picture or a photograph that 'captures' the character of the full-size aeroplane, then this omission must be reflected in the marks awarded. The judge must be careful to avoid making assumptions based on the type of aeroplane.

If the subject aircraft is an unblemished museum example, then the model should be in similar pristine condition. If the subject aircraft is an operational aircraft, then a degree of weathering and signs of regular use should be evident.

Judges must take care to avoid using any knowledge they have of the full-size aircraft and must not make assumptions based on the subject aircraft type, or the construction techniques used when it was built, or the environment the aircraft was in when it was photographed.

6.9.1C.3.10 Assessing Originality of the Model

The judges must seek to confirm that the competitor has selected the correct category for the model on the declaration, however, an allowance should be made if the competitor is able to provide evidence that he has modified any third-party items to improve the Scale Accuracy.

A model which has been assembled 'straight out of the box' or built entirely by someone other than the competitor should score a zero.

The following should be used as a guide:

Competitor built (own construction from a plan or a traditional kit).....10 marks

Pre-built airframe and wings, covered and painted by the competitor.....6 - 8 marks

Fully moulded composite model painted by the competitor.....4 - 6 marks

ARTF model with markings modified by the competitor.....0 - 4 marks

'Out of the box' or purchased model with no added work0 marks

6.9.1C.4 FINAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW

When all the models have been individually assessed the spread of marks awarded for all the models, particularly the complexity marks should be reviewed under the guidance of the Chief Static Judge.

The relative complexity marks of one model compared with the others is important and to ensure this is achieved, the static judges must be given time to complete this review and if necessary, make retrospective alterations to the marks previously awarded.

A judge's marks can only be changed by the same judge who made the original assessment, and any alterations must be initialled by the same judge.

The use of a summary sheet for this review is recommended and the score sheets must only be released for final computation of the static scores when the review has been completed.