OSTIV Trophy for Vasama

Evaluation of Standard Class Sailplanes at the 1963 World's Championships, Junin, Argentina

by H. Zacher, Dipl. Ing.

As a result of the notice in Swiss Aero Revue in December 1962, seven of the ten Standard Class sailplanes taking part in these World Championships were made available for the design competition for the OSTIV Trophy. These were:

ES-59 Arrow (Australia); SZD-24-4 Foka (Poland); M 100 S (Italy); Eon 460 (Great Britain); Sagitta (Netherlands); SB-7 (Germany); PIK-16C Vasama (Finland).

The SB-7 was withdrawn from the Standard Class in the Championships and entered in the Open Class. It was then withdrawn from the OSTIV Trophy competition.

The OSTIV Jury membership was: G. Abrial (France); J. Bojanowski (Poland); R. Kunz (Austria); L. Welch (Great Britain); H. Zacher (Germany), Chairman.

The six sailplanes were examined on the ground regarding design, payload, price, suitability for home construction, maintenance, ground handling, assembly, disassembly and pilot's accommodation.

The jury members then flew the six sailplanes during which they checked take-off and landing characteristics, the stability and controllability (particularly in turn reversal), high and low speeds, airbrake effectiveness and the ability to sideslip, all subjectively.

The jury was of the opinion that the Foka possessed unusually good characteristics and was certainly the most highly developed aircraft of the group. The design was, however, not according to the spirit of the Standard Class suggestions, which stress the necessity and desirability of simplicity, cheapness and suitability for club use. As a result the Foka could not be given the OSTIV prize. However, it nevertheless earned the highest praise.

The other five sailplanes were unfortunately not free from various more or less important deficiencies. It was, however, the unanimous view of the jury that the Vasama was the best of these five sailplanes and had earned the OSTIV Prize.

Some of the deficiencies and imperfections were:

1. Bad wing surface finish (waviness, imperfect airbrake fitment, etc.).
2. In assembly, still too many loose bits and often awkward locking methods.
3. Cockpits are often too narrow and in some cases the ventilation is ineffective. The cockpit covers have sometimes difficult locking devices and are not always jettisonable.
4. Regarding flying qualities, there were cases of lack of control harmonization, high aileron loads and large aileron yawing moments. In some cases, the airbrake effectiveness was far too little. In normal turns shaking occurred and in two cases the stall was certainly not harmless.

In conclusion, the “Standard Class Glider Specification” will be mentioned. The old question about the sense of the various limitations and the possibility of modifying them arose once more, and the jury chairman asked the OSTIV Sailplane Development Panel to discuss them. It was agreed with Mr. Gehriger, Chairman of the C.V.S.M., that as far as span, prohibition of lift flaps and retractable undercarriages were concerned, there should be no change. However, the airbrake requirements should be eased. Concerning fuselage cross-section and pilot comfort, there might perhaps be some suggestions forthcoming.
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