

The RCP process for changing rules in the NAR Sporting Code a.k.a. “The Pink Book” is defined in the sporting code under section “F” of the appendix. The process can be reviewed online at <http://www.nar.org/pinkbook/> the cycle for proposed changes now runs on a one year cycle. A dedicated online RCP Forum for proposals to be reviewed commented on and finally voted on is now being used to and is available for all NAR members. You must sign up on the forum page to post comments and to vote on the proposals. The FAQ for logging into and using this forum is located here [http://www.nar.org/pdf/RCP\\_FAQs.pdf](http://www.nar.org/pdf/RCP_FAQs.pdf) If you have forgotten your username and or password, send a request to [pinkbook-rcpforum@nar.org](mailto:pinkbook-rcpforum@nar.org) Include your full Name and NAR number. Usernames can be retrieved; passwords cannot be retrieved just reset.

Fourteen proposals were received prior to the August 31, 2012 deadline. Each of those proposals is posted in the online forum for you to review and to provide your official comment on. You are allowed to make one comment per topic, and each comment is limited to 100 words. I am your moderator and approve every comment before it is posted for everyone else to see. Please be patient things may take a little longer than you might expect for your comments to be posted.

Take the time to read the proposals carefully. I also recommend that you discuss the proposals with fellow contest flyers for the pros and cons of the proposals. Some clubs even have discussion at business meetings to allow for opinions to be shared amongst members.

Every member of the NAR has the opportunity to make an official comment on the proposals up for consideration. This forum is for you to share your comments with other NAR contest flyers that are going to vote on these proposals.

The following timeline will complete the current cycle. You must "post" your comments by May 30, 2013. Try to be concise and brief with your comments. Once the comment period closes, all comments will be here online for all to see. Details for an upcoming electronic ballot done through this forum for you to vote will be communicated soon. When the proposals are voted on, they will require a 66% vote for the proposal to be passed and become a part of the pink book effective for the new contest year July1, 2013, but they will have no bearing on NARAM-55. I would like to remind everyone that the opportunity for you to submit a RCP is as simple as writing up your idea or submitting it online at the link you can find at: <http://www.nar.org/competition/pinkbookrcpform.html>

Jim Filler  
NAR RRC  
Contest Board

### **RCP# 2013M-01**

**Submitted By:** Dave Cook NAR: 21953

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Resolve minor issues with the first paragraph of 14.10 relating to record trials and record attempts, and multiple grammar problems.

**Logic:** The first paragraph of 14.10 has multiple clarity and grammar problems.

The third sentence of 14.10 reads "All entries at a sanctioned meet are to be tracked using the same method. "This is over-broad and raises conflicts with 10.2 and 6.3.6: a) "sanctioned meet" includes record trials; this conflicts directly with 10.2 and with the purpose of 6.3.6 and is probably not intended. b) The phrase "all entries at a sanctioned meet" needs to be clarified since it could be interpreted to require that all altitude events in one contest have to use the same tracking method. This interpretation would be too restrictive since one might well want to fly B Payload with theodolites and F Altitude with altimeters. The proposed change tries to clarify the first paragraph of 14.10 with respect to record attempts and remove the conflicts with 10.2 and 6.3.6, and along the way fixes grammar errors "whether will fly using" in the fourth sentence of 14.10 and "contest director will also assure" in the fifth sentence. It should also be clarified whether the last sentence of 14.6 applies to record attempts since altimeter records are kept separately, but I am not proposing a change here since that may bring up debatable issues and I am trying to keep this proposal in the nature of a technical correction.

**Effect:** No impact.

**Wording:** Change the third sentence of the first paragraph of 14.10 to read "All entries in a given event, other than non-competition record attempts, are to be tracked using the same method."

Replace the fourth sentence of the first paragraph of 14.10 with "The sanction request form submitted by the contest director shall, for each altitude event, designate under "Special Provisions" the tracking method to be used for that event as either "Theodolites (14.1)" or "Altimeters (14.10)". In the case of record trials, the contest director may designate either or both types of tracking."

Replace the fifth sentence of 14.10 with "The contest director shall ensure that all announcements and publications for the sanctioned meet inform prospective entrants of the tracking method for each altitude event."

## **RCP# 2013M-02**

**Submitted By:** Ted Cochran NAR: 69921

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Accidental ignition of motors or ejection charges during preparation for flight shall lead to a disqualification for that flight. Further, unless the model can be made safe to the RSO's satisfaction, the contestant shall not be permitted to attempt additional flights with that model.

**Logic:** The intent is to provide a significant incentive to competitors to design electronic systems controlling pyrotechnics to be absolutely safe until ready to fly, without dictating the methods by which that safety is achieved. This RCP is inspired by three separate potentially unsafe events that occurred at NARAM-54.

**Effect:** None

**Wording:** Add 11.10 to read:

Not with standing any other provision do this code, if a model using electronics to ignite motor(s) and/ or ejection charges does so during preparation for flight, that model shall be considered to have made an official, and disqualified, flight. Further, unless the model can be made safe to the RSO's satisfaction, the contestant shall not be permitted to attempt additional flights with that model.

### **RCP# 2013M-03**

**Submitted By:** Matt Steele NAR: 22961

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Reduce the Weighing Factor of R&D from 36 to 32.

**Logic:** The weighting factor for R&D is currently 36. This is a very high weighting factor, the highest of any event. Furthermore, the event is usually only held at NARAM. Thus this single event has a huge influence on NARAM meet and National Championships. It likely has too much influence on the championships. In reality, this event is similar to Scale in terms of degree of difficulty. Both events may require hundreds of hours of effort to produce a winning effort. In light of that comparison, it makes sense that R&D has the same weighting factor as Scale.

**Effect:** None

**Wording:** 63: Weighting Factor 32

### **RCP# 2013M-04**

**Submitted By:** Matt Steele NAR: 22961

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Clarify that RC records are for duration-based events only.

**Logic:** Eliminate RC records for altitude events, since the use of RC has no real effect on altitude-based events

**Effect:** Delete all RC records in altitude-based events.

**Wording:** 17.6 Radio Control

a separate class of records will be kept for radio-controlled entries IN DURATION EVENTS ONLY.

### **RCP# 2013M-05**

**Submitted By:** Matt Steele NAR: 22961

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Standardize size of NAR numbers on models for craftsmanship events.

**Logic:** For many of the craftsmanship models, it is nearly impossible to find the NAR number on models, as many people want to make it as small as possible to minimize any impact on judging. The imposition of a standard size eliminates any judging deductions for the NAR number. This is similar to the FAI requirement for all models.

**Effect:** None

**Wording:** 9.4 NAR Number each entry shall carry, legibly displayed upon its exterior surface as the model rocket appears in flight readiness, the contestant's name or NAR license number with characters at least 5mm tall. In the case of a team entry, the entry shall carry the team name or number. The NAR number shall only be judged for neatness and craftsmanship, and not be judged against the markings and outline of the model.

## **RCP# 2013M-06**

**Submitted By:** Bob Ferrante NAR: 28626

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Allow an additional model to be entered into multi-round events in the event there is a tie for first place after all 3 rounds have been flown.

**Logic:** FAI rules which are flown in a multi-round format with maximum times allow an additional model to be flown in subsequent fly-off rounds per FAI rule 4.2. This change would allow a modeler to enter one and only one more model to fly with in any fly-off rounds.

FAI 4.2 Number of Models

For classes S3, S4, S6, S8, S9 and S10 one (1) additional model may be processed and flown by the competitor on there being a tie for first place at the end of the third round.

**Effect:** None. All records are recorded based on a single flight. Current competition models would still be usable, and just as competitive.

Wording: Change rule 15.12.2

FROM:

15.12.2 Number of Models

A contestant may enter no more than two models in a multi-round event for the purpose of making all official flights, including any necessary additional flights, except as stated in Rule 11.5

TO:

15.12.2 Number of Models

A contestant may enter no more than two models in a multi-round event for the purpose of making the first three rounds of flights, except as stated in Rule 11.5. One (1) additional model may be entered and flown in the event if a modeler is tied for first place at the end of the third round.

## **RCP# 2013M-07**

**Submitted By:** Jim Filler NAR: 27862

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Add "Mission Points" to Classic Model. Mission points will enable a function "intended" in the design of the model to be included in the score of the flight. The modeler would inform the judge prior to the flight of what the mission is. Some examples would be a boost glider that glides back for recovery or a 2-stage model being flown successfully with two stages.

**Logic:** Mission points are about increasing the risk/reward/complexity of the event to make it more interesting and challenging. Mission points increase the interest in the event and in participation in the event.

**Effect:** None

**Wording:** 57.70 General Flight: 100 points

General Flight points are awarded for proper operation of the model during flight, including launch, lack of misfires, stability, recovery, and lack of damage on landing. No consideration should be given

to staging or scale-like flight characteristics, as these are covered under Mission points; however, if the general flight performance of the model is adversely affected by the failure of one or more of these aspects, points may be deducted from General Flight.

#### 57.71 Mission: 200 points

Mission points are awarded for appropriate operations of the model that are the same operations that the original model performed during flight. Examples of such operations are staging, operation of a camera payload, or gliding such as boost glider. Mission points will not be awarded to a flight if the original model did not perform the same function. An example would be you could not declare clustering for mission points if the original model only used one motor in flight. Any such operation must comply fully with the safety standards set forth in this NAR Sporting Code. If it does not, the entry shall be disqualified. The RSO is the only official who may judge the safety qualities of the operation.

### **RCP# 2013M-08**

**Submitted By:** Matt Steele NAR: 22961

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Alter the point spread in the craftsmanship categories that unfairly penalize degree of difficulty over craftsmanship.

**Logic:** Under the current rules, a simple, well done model scores better than a more complex model, as degree of difficulty is short changed in the scoring criteria. This rule change attempts to find a better balance between the two categories. The overall scoring would be altered so the math adds up correctly.

**Effect:** None:

**Wording:** Scale

50.12.5 Craftsmanship: 250 points

50.12.6 Degree of Difficulty: 250 points

Super Scale:

52.7.6 Craftsmanship: 225 points

52.7.7 Degree of Difficulty: 225 points

Sport Scale

53.12.3 Degree of Difficulty: 200 points

53.12.4 Craftsmanship: 200 points

Plastic Model

55.5.1 Craftsmanship: 400 points

55.5.2 Degree of Difficulty: 400 points

Concept Scale

56.5.3 Degree of Difficulty: 200 points

56.5.4 Craftsmanship: 200 points

## RCP# 2013M-09

**Submitted By:** Dan Wolf NAR: 24516

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Remove option of using altimeters for altitude events other than precision altitude events

**Logic:** The current implementation for using pressure sensor based altimeters has a number of defects. While some of these could be re mediated, there are too many issues to resolve in a timely manner. In addition, the contest community, including many of the most highly respected and knowledgeable competitors is against it over concerns for cost, access, and quality of pressure based altimeters.

**Effect:** Will lower barriers of entry for flying altitude events for contestants. Will make it easier for new competitors but place more burdens on host clubs who choose to fly altitude events. Some clubs will choose not to fly altitude events. Improves the morale of the competition community.

**Wording:** Change the 2nd sentence of section 14.1 to read Approved electronic altimeters may be used for precision altitude events

## RCP# 2013M-10

**Submitted By:** Dan Wolf NAR: 24516

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Remove engine classes in several events from the Sporting Code.

**Logic:** Just because model rocket engine classes go up to G motors doesn't mean it is a good idea to have contest events also go up to G motor class for most events. For example, Parachute Duration and Cluster altitude both stop at C. Unfortunately, because those events are in the Pink Book, they are flown at section, open, regional, and sometimes NARAM when they should not be. They usually have lower participation, cost more money to fly, and are difficult for people to test fly unless they have access to a large field.

**Effect:** Will make competition less stressful, more beginners friendly, cheaper, and easier.

Current records in those impulse events would be retired.

Wording: The following classes of impulse only for each event are proposed:

Altitude - 1/8A thru D

Boost glider -1/8A thru D

Dual Eggloft Altitude and Dual Eggloft Duration - C thru E

Eggloft Altitude and Duration - B thru D

Flex Wing - 1/4A thru A

Helicopter Duration -1/8A thru D

Rocket glider -1/8A thru D

Scale Altitude -1/8A thru C

Super Roc Altitude and Super Roc Duration -A thru D

## **RCP# 2013M-11**

**Submitted By:** Edward LaCroix

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Revise the payload altitude event.

**Logic:** The standard NAR payload is intended to represent an instrument package whose dimensions and mass cannot be modified, but must be accepted as a design constraint.

### **Wording:**

#### 25.1 Scope

Payload Competition comprises seven events open to model rockets that carry one or more standard sand or altimeter NAR model rocket payloads. In an altimeter payload event requiring more than one payload, only one of the payloads must be an altimeter payload. If the model is staged, the payload(s) must be enclosed in the uppermost stage of the model. The purpose of this competition is to carry payload(s) of given mass and dimensions to as high an altitude as possible and to recover the payload(s). The standard sand or altimeter NAR payload is intended to represent an instrument package whose dimensions and mass cannot be modified, but must be accepted as a design constraint.

#### 25.2 Sand and Altimeter Payload Specifications (Amended)

The NAR standard sand or altimeter model rocket payload is a non-metallic cylinder containing fine sand or an NAR approved altimeter and if needed, enough sand so the payload's mass is no less than 28.0 grams. The cylinder shall be 19.1 +/- 0.5 millimeters in diameter, and  $\geq 60$  millimeters in length.

25.2.1 The sand payload may be permanently sealed to prevent the loss of the sand. No holes may be drilled into it, no changes made in its shape, and no other material may be affixed to it.

25.2.2 An altimeter payload must contain an NAR approved altimeter (Appendix G). If the altimeter payload contains sand in order to achieve the required minimum mass of 28 grams, the sand must be sealed off from the altimeter section of the payload. Furthermore, an altimeter payload must be sealed to prevent loss of the altimeter in flight, and this sealing must be done in the presence of an official per 14.10.1. Tape may be used on the exterior of the payload to join and seal the altimeter section of the payload and for no other purpose. Per 14.10, an altimeter payload must have at least 3 vent holes evenly spaced around the circumference of the portion of the payload containing the altimeter. Otherwise, no other holes may be drilled into an altimeter payload, no changes made in its shape, and no other material may be affixed to it.

25.3- Enclosed Payloads The standard sand or altimeter NAR model rocket payload or payloads carried in a model shall be completely enclosed and contained within the model, shall not separate from the model in flight, and shall be removable from the model.

25.6 Return Following the flight, the contestant shall present his/her entry as recovered and, in the presence of an official, shall remove the payload(s). If the event is Altimeter Payload, then the returns procedure under 14.10.2 also applies. If the official cannot examine the payload(s), the entry shall be disqualified. If the contestant removes the payload(s) in the absence of officials, the entry shall be disqualified. The official may require that the payload(s) be rechecked if there is any question as to whether or not mass may have been lost from any payload, and shall disqualify the entry if it no longer complies with Rule 25.2.

**RCP# 2013M-12**

**Submitted By:** Matt Steele NAR: 22961

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Increase the protest fee from \$5 to \$20.

**Logic:** The idea is reduce petty and frivolous protests that distract from the fair spirit of competition. The current \$5 fee has been around for many, many years and has not been adjusted for inflation.

**Effect:** None

**Wording:** 12.1 Protests

Protests will be considered only when presented in writing to the Contest Jury no later than one hour after the end of the competition, and when accompanied by \$20.00 in cash.

**RCP# 2013M-13**

**Submitted By:** Edward LaCroix

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** Currently, a 1/8A streamer duration multi-round maximum of 20 second is too easily achieved. This was demonstrated at NARAM 53 where a total of 12 individuals and teams max'ed all three rounds. There were fly-offs in both C (four individuals) and Team divisions (6 teams). This RCP adjusts the 1/8A SD MR max's to increase the difficulty of max'ing an 1/8A SD model.

**Logic:** To increase the 1/8A streamer duration multi-round timing maximum to more accurately reflect the demonstrated performance for this class of motor.

**Effect:** None as multi-round timing does not itself constitute a record category. Existing motor class duration records set as a result of multi-round competition timing will stand.

**Wording:** SEC# 31.4 Classes- (The table shall display):

Motor Class- 1/8A; Weighting Factor- 8; Multi-Round Maximum- 30 sec. (was 20 sec.)

**RCP# 2013M-14**

**Submitted By:** Edward LaCroix NAR: 11248

**Type:** Regular

**Summary:** To help ensure that glitches in altimeter operation do not allow erroneous results to potentially, and unfairly, influence the results of a competition.

**Logic:** There are altimeters on the approved list which do not visually display or audibly "beep" a "zero" when powered up. Rather, they report, "beep" out, the \*last\* flight's altitude. The Perfect Flite P'nut and Strato Logger altimeters are good examples of this type of operation. The concern is that a "glitch" could result in an altimeter reporting last flight data as the new altitude result and therefore unfairly influencing the outcome of competition.



The remedy is simple. At Safety Check-in, after the altimeter has been powered and booted-up, record in the "Remarks" section of the contestant's flight card, any displayed or audibly reported altitude (representing a previous flight).

With this data recorded, when a contestant returns his/her altimeter, the \*new\* displayed or audibly reported altitude can be easily compared to the recorded "last altitude" to prevent a glitch from becoming an erroneous entry. In the unlikely occurrence that the new altitude \*matches\* the altitude recorded in the "Remarks" section of the contestant's flight card, the CD will be called upon to determine if the new altitude will become accepted, official result.

**Effect:** None

**Wording:** 14.10.1 Safety Check-In Procedure. Insert after, "The altimeter's power source will be turned on in the presence of the safety check official, and readiness to record new flight data will be verified after boot-up.", the following: "Any previous altitude report, beeped or visually displayed, shall be recorded in the "Remarks" portion the contestants flight card for comparison to the new reported altitude at the time of return." If the new altitude \*matches\* the altitude recorded in the "Remarks" section of the contestant's flight card, the CD will be called upon to determine if the new altitude will become the accepted, official result.