

The Model Aeronautic Association of Canada

# MAAC - RC Scale

## "Static" Judges & Pilots Pre-Contest Review

Roly Worsfold - RC Scale Committee Chair

Dec.15, 2016



*This document compliments the Judges Certification program as a summary of the key points for judges training and contestants understanding of the basics which "Static" judges are looking for.*

# "Static" Judges and Pilots Pre-Contest Review

## Static Judging Review

This document reviews the 'basic' criteria to static judge a model. Develop your system and use this for every model. Judges who follow the judging process arrive at a consistent and accurate score each time.

Outline, Colour and shall be judged no closer than 4 meters (15 feet).

### Key Points

The following information summarizes the key points on what to look for when Static judging a RC Aircraft for the following Static elements when 3 judges are used one for each element.

- Colour and Markings
- Outline
- Craftsmanship

Utilizing this information and reviewing before each contest will help you to provide better feedback to the contestant.

**Remember** - judge based on the contestant's documents provided, if you utilize your own biases it will skew your judging scores which is not fair to the contestant. They are using the same information provided in this judges training to build their model.

### Contestant Feedback

It is very important to the RC Scale program for the judges to provide feedback to the contestants using the Score Sheets and provided feedback spaces. This is the avenue for the contestant to improve their model.

Using the Guidelines in the Judges Certification program will assure a good contest experience for judges and contestants

### Criteria for Accuracy of Outline

As an example of outline criteria, if the vertical stabilizer shape at the tip on the model does not match the 3-views, photo documentation (if supplied) will be reviewed for evidence supporting the model.

- Since photographs of the actual aircraft being modeled take precedence over 3-views they should be used as the final determination as to whether the vertical stabilizer matches or not.
- If there is no photo that clearly shows this view, downgrade  $\frac{1}{2}$  point if the size/location discrepancy is minor and a full point if major. A minor deduction (1/4 point) is typically where the mismatch is 5% in relative size of the linear dimension relation and for angular relation 2 degrees.
- Similarly a moderate deduction (1/2 point) is typically where the mismatch is 10% or 5 degrees.
- Major deductions of 1 point are for mismatches greater than 10% and 5 degrees.
- No deductions will occur for errors less than 5% or 2 degrees.

## "Static" Judges and Pilots Pre-Contest Review

- To determine percentage, consider the following diagrams:

Outline Quality Level
<b>Superior</b> Looks exactly like documentation presented, with a scale-like ground attitude, and all parts in the correct relationship. The cross section and profile are accurate, and all the outline features are accurately present.
<b>Excellent</b> Minor discrepancies hardly noticeable differences from documentation.
<b>Good</b> Changes made do not detract from overall effect, slight variation.
<b>Fair</b> Some obvious changes, noticeable differences from documentation presented. Items such as tail surface proportions, control surface size, dihedral angles.
<b>Poor</b> Gross exaggerations from documentation presented.

### **Criteria for Finish, Color and Markings**

A minor deduction (1/4 point) is typically given where a mismatch is noted but is minor. Moderate or major deductions (1/2 to 1 points) will be typical where the mismatch is readily apparent.

#### **1. Finish:**

This is to include the sheen or reflective properties of the finish, weathering details, and the application of materials e.g.: many WWI aircraft were painted with a brush and brush marks were easily seen even from a distance.

- If the documentation shows brush marks in certain areas, the model should also show this artifact.
  - The Finish judge should consult with the Craftsmanship judge to ensure an item is not double downgraded, once by the Finish judge and once by the Craftsmanship judge.

#### **Color:**

It is the contestant's responsibility to authenticate the model colors by providing documentation such as color photos, published artist conceptions, paint chips, color reference guides, or factory paint samples.

### **Criteria for Finish, Color and Markings cont.**

- Color and hue of the model need to be checked against the color reference provided in the documentation packet. The "sheen" or reflective properties may also be verified from these same samples, but will only be used for scoring the Finish qualities as previously described.
- Black, Flat Black, or natural aluminum does not need paint reference samples.

# "Static" Judges and Pilots Pre-Contest Review

## Markings:

This inspection verifies size and placement of markings to match the documentation. Ideally, the documentation would show the placement of all markings. However, if no documentation is available, a typical view showing that squadron's markings from references other than the aircraft modeled may be used to depict typical marking locations (these items need to be noted as TYPICAL MARKINGS for the judge in the documentation packet).

**Tip:** Hold the photo extended from your eyes until the size in the photo closely matches the size of the model on the judges table.

Finish, Colour and Markings	Quality Level
	Superior Looks exactly like documentation presented, markings correct, colour matches, finish and/or weathering appropriate.
	Excellent Minor discrepancies hardly noticeable differences from documentation.
	Good Changes made do not detract from overall effect, slight variation in colouring or markings.
	Fair Some obvious changes, noticeable differences from documentation presented.
	Poor Gross exaggerations from documentation presented.

## Criteria for Craftsmanship:

**Craftsmanship shall be judged no closer than 1.22 meters (four feet).**

1. Inspect parting-line area of control surfaces for visibly unrealistic hinging, uneven fit, or gap on both top and bottom.
2. Inspect for inadequately disguised model-related disassembly sections in wings, cowls, empennage, etc., checking for poor fit or unrealistic appearance including large screw heads in conspicuous areas or "model" type exposed control horns that are not scale.
3. Inspect for correct prototypical choice in hidden or exposed control arms or linkages to elevator(s), rudder(s), ailerons, etc., as depicted in the documentation.
4. Inspect quality of simulated metal-skin features for applicable three-dimensional panel lines, scale rivets (raised or flush), or fastener detailing. Verify approximate scale uniformity in size, spacing and correct three-dimensional effects of these features top and bottom.
5. Inspect for applicable fabric-covered surface sections in cosmetic appearance. Also verify "taping" appearance when applicable for fabric-covered surfaces.
6. Inspect for quality in rigging or connector detail on externally braced aircraft such as biplanes.
7. Inspect for quality in detailing any applicable small protruding pitot tubes, antennas, air scoops, hooks, pods, etc.
8. Inspect for quality in visible dummy engine detail including exhaust and stains where applicable.
9. Inspect for any unrealistic model damage anomalies regarding shrinkage, scuffing, scraping, peeling, tears, or gouges. Simulated wear such as realistic metal dents or exposed bare metal in painted regions for high-wear areas common to aircraft may enhance the model rather than be cause for downgrade.

# "Static" Judges and Pilots Pre-Contest Review

## Criteria for Craftsmanship cont.

10. Inspect for applicable window or canopy EXTERIOR detail quality insofar as framework and their resolution from the transparent window regions. Also verify overall exterior fit to airframe or adjoining multiple canopy sections when applicable. A functional sliding canopy is not required, but the described cosmetic static appearance is.
11. Inspect for realistic quality detail features of the landing gear, which are generally additional to the basic machined, stamped, or wire drawn strut components. A downgrade is applicable only if the gear struts are void of realistic detail qualities independent of materials used. Typical off the shelf landing gear do not include items such as brake lines, tie down hooks, fill ports, scissors, drag links, or wheel covers (front and back) that match full size aircraft. These are the "extras" that a modeller can detail out to affect the craftsmanship score in this area.
12. Inspect for applicable wing tip and taillight (etc.) feature qualities for their realistic detailed appearance. Functional illumination is not a requirement for optimum score.
13. Inspect for unrealistic surface defects like wood grain, sanding marks, fillet defects, cracks, voids, pinholes, etc.

Craftsmanship Quality Level
<b>Superior</b> Quality of reproduction of model is such that it is indistinguishable from prototype, all fine detail present.
<b>Excellent</b> High degree of excellence in simulating the prototype but lacking in fine detail
<b>Good</b> Definite attempt made to duplicate prototypical features, but to a lesser degree, i.e. inked panel lines instead of raised.
<b>Fair</b> Well built, but definitely lacking in detail or shows model characteristics such as non-prototypical control horns.
<b>Poor</b> Construction detracts from model, i.e. runs in paint, poor surface preparation.

**Note: Static Judging** is the key for the contestants to improve their models - Static Judges must put a reason for each of their downgrades so the contestants can improve their model for the next contest.

- **Some contests** allow the contestant to get their downgrade points back if there is no reason given for the downgrade.
- This gives the event credibility in the judges scoring.

# "Static" Judges and Pilots Pre-Contest Review

## Documentation

For those classes with full judging of their model - Documentation is very important - "Prove it or lose it".

**Pilots/Builders** - if your documentation shows something that is on the plane or not it should show on the model or not - if not expect a deduction. Your documentation shows the extra effort you put into your model.

**Judges** - remember photos take precedent over 3-views. Judge the documentation; do not use your own perceptions or knowledge of a particular aircraft.

- Please provide feedback on the score sheet so the modeller can improve.

Following the above key points for RC Scale Aero-Modelling judging will help to provide consistency in judging and contest results.

1.0 - Original Version - December 15, 2016

Index #	Explanation	Date

MODEL AERONAUTICS ASSOCIATION of CANADA  
MODÉLISTES AÉRONAUTIQUES ASSOCIÉS du CANADA