



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*



Minutes

of the Bureau Meeting of the **FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission**

Held in Ribiers, France
on 6-9 November 2008

*Avenue Mon-Repos 24
CH-1005 Lausanne
(Switzerland)
Tél.: +41(0) 21/345.10.70
Fax: +41(0) 21/345.10.77
E-mail: sec@fai.org
Web: www.fai.org*

FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
MINUTES
CIVL Bureau Meeting, Ribiers
6-9 November 2008

1. Roll call: Flip Koetsier (FK), John Aldridge (JA), Louise Joselyn (LJ), Wayne Sayer (WS), Agust Gudmundsson (AG), Scott Torkelsen (ST), Paula Sayer (PS). Apologies from Leonard Grigorescu (LG)
2. Conflicts of interest: LJ is on the organising team of the HG Worlds 2009, Laragne
3. Outstanding matters from previous meetings. Outstanding actions are:
 - i) AG will investigate the possibility of FAI setting up a PayPal account for sanction fee (and other) payments.
 - ii) Publishing the S7 LR templates in Word format is an ongoing part of S7 revisions.
 - iii) AG will pursue the WPRS programmer to add 'results received not yet processed' to option list for events page, and automatic reminders for missing results
 - iv) FK to acknowledge receipt of Steward and Jury reports and provide feedback as a matter of course.
 - iv) Aerobatics: JA to ask Dennis Pagen to complete Annex to 7A.
 - v) JA will try to create spec document for an overhaul of Practical Guidelines for Comp Organisers and LJ will review the document after the French HG Worlds.
 - vi) ST and FK will each investigate hosting the Bureau meeting Nov 2009 and report at BM at time of 2009 Plenary.
 - vii) There will be a proposal from the Software Working Group to recommend FS is used in Cat 1 comps, see also software report
4. Review/debrief of Cat 1s since last BM
 - i) 1st PanAm PG (LG's report) The report was discussed at length including how the bureau can keep watching brief on preparations for Cat 1 comps. The role of stewards was discussed and is covered later.
 - ii) PG Europeans Serbia. Problems here were also discussed. Some of the team fees held by the FAI continue to be held for now while more details are determined. The CIVL Bureau recognised that the situation at this Championship had been highly unsatisfactory, and agreed that it was necessary to ensure in future that NACs guarantee the quality of competitions held on their territory.
 - iii) PG Accuracy Europeans Serbia. Some points were added as separate agenda items.
 - iv) HG Europeans Greifenburg. This was plagued by bad weather and a fatality.
 - v) HG WW, Classes 2&5, Italy. This was a successful competition. The women's medals issue was mentioned.
5. Review/status of 2009 Championships, LRs & 2008 Test competitions. Appoint screening committees where necessary:
 - i) HG Worlds, Laragne, France. The practice event was an excellently organised and run competition. Invitations to NACs will be sent during the 2nd week of November, and entry forms will be online at the same time. The screening committee will be FK, JA and AG. The Bureau agreed that JA, FK will approve the Local regulations by 1st December, after consultation with AG, Heather Mull and Dennis Pagen. They will be ratified by the Plenary 2009.
 - ii) PG Worlds, Valle Bravo, Mexico. PS will contact Leonard and the organiser to get a list of registered pilots, which will be circulated to the other members of the screening committee (AG, ST and PS).
 - iii) PG Accuracy Worlds, Croatia. The LRs are underway but not yet received. Location of HQ not yet resolved. Some difficulty in communication which FK will oversee if necessary. The steward will keep him informed

6. Review/status of upcoming 2009 Test Competitions (2010 Cat 1s)
 - a. Pre-Aerobatic Worlds, Omegna, Italy. Dates for the Cat 2 comp still need to be fixed. PS will remind the organisers to send an application. Dennis Pagen will be steward.
 - b. Pre-Europeans, PA, Inoni-Eskisehir, Turkey. Violeta Masteikiene will be asked to be Steward. Jurij Vertacnik has asked the organisers to provide dates for the Cat 2 (pre) comp. FK will oversee if necessary.
 - c. Pre-Europeans, PG, Austria. FK will remind the organisers that there must be a valid test of the organisation in a pre comp and that 5 days may be too short to achieve this. Scott Torkelsen will be steward and a trainee steward will be confirmed.
 - d. Pre-Asian PG, Yoshinogawa, Japan. Dates of the pre-comp have yet to be confirmed. Leonard Grigorescu will be steward and a trainee steward will be sought.
7. Jury & Stewards
 - i) Schedule for 2009 championships. PS noted there are still too few volunteers, particularly experienced people.
 - a) HG Worlds France. Steward - Flip Koetsier (NL). Jury President - John Aldridge (UK). Jury: Scott Torkelsen (DK) and Kurt Meyer (GUA).
 - b) Croatia PG Acc worlds: Steward - Riikka Vilku (SWE). Jury president - Andy Cowley (UK), jury members - Violeta Masteikiene (LIT), Uga Jondzic (SRB) (to be confirmed).
 - ii) Review of activity since last BM. There is an excel database of all competition organisers and an updated list of jury/steward volunteers, which has been used to seek CIVL officials for forthcoming championships but we are still short of volunteers.
 - iii) Website recruiting page for J&S is now in place. LJ will update it as necessary. A short profile and photo of the selected CIVL officials could be sent to the competition organisers to promote on their website, to raise profile of officials among pilots.
 - iv) LG's Steward Checklist. The Bureau will review it and send comments to LJ by December 19th.
 - v) Online J&S Database. The J&S selection process is still not as transparent as it should be. AG suggested specifying a separate project and commissioning a database/software expert to produce the online database for jury/steward registration, training, appointments, a PG Accuracy & Aerobatics judges database and maybe other modules, such as accident database. AG will specify a proposal and get a quotation to circulate to the bureau, with an aim to get this online before the Plenary.
 - vi) Suitability of officials. Training is underway but need more assessment of volunteers. JA will create a form to provide feedback from the steward (for trainee steward) and jury president (for the new jury member). This would be sent to the Bureau and the trainee. Once the format is approved, this form will be included in the J/S handbook.
 - vii) Payment of stewards. CIVL relies heavily on the expertise of Stewards, in the run-up to and the running of test competitions and championships, and this workload is increasing in light of the Serbia experience. JA will draft a proposal for the Plenary, on behalf of the Bureau, that from 2009, CIVL funds a payment to stewards for their work at championships and test events. Travel and accommodation costs would continue to be covered by the event organisers. It was suggested that only the steward will receive a payment because of the increasing workload. Such a payment would also serve to demonstrate the value of this expertise as well as to encourage more people experienced in FAI Cat 1 competitions to take on the role of Steward, especially as the number of Cat 1s is increasing.
 - viii) The role of CIVL officials was reviewed including whether Stewards should fly during the task & the subject will be put on the agenda of the SSCs to discuss and make recommendations.
8. Status of bids for 2010 & Bid Notification procedures
 - i) A bid for the European HG Championship to be held at Ager, Spain has been received: More information required, including a signed copy of Annex A. LJ will collate comments and FK will contact the bid organiser to get more information. The dates for the test comp (in consideration with the dates of HG Worlds, France, in terms of pilots and officials) need to be set before a steward can be appointed.

- ii) A bid has been received to hold the Women's Worlds and HG Class 2 & 5 Worlds at Tegelberg, Germany. More information is required before a decision can be made. FK will collate the comments from the rest of the Bureau and ask organisers to provide more details.
- iii) The CIVL Bureau has received interest in organising a Pan American PG 2010 competition, however, no bids have been received and with only days to go before the deadline for 2011 bids, the Bureau considers it is now too late to consider further bids for 2010. Organisers will be encouraged to produce full bids for a future year.
- iv) The SSCs will be asked to consider whether the schedule of continental championships can be flexible in terms of the year they can be held. The requirements of the CIVL internal regulations should be maintained; *3.6.2 The bid should be received by the CIVL at least 60 days (see 3.5.1 and 3.5.3) before the CIVL meeting two years ahead of the competition.*

The Bureau is seriously concerned at the quantity and availability of experienced CIVL officials for an increasing number of Cat 1 comps. FK will write to the NACs and organisers to point this out and ask them to encourage and support more volunteers.

- iv) There have been no formal notifications received for bids for 2011. LJ (on behalf of the Bureau) will contact chairman of SSCs and ask them to actively chase/encourage bids already in preparation for 2011 and search for suitable bidders and notification of bids for 2012.

The template in Annex A must be amended to include dates of the test comp and main comp.

9. World Air Games

Both LJ and Dennis Pagen have worked hard for a year already and especially during the pre-WAG in August. There are still issues to resolve, and difficulties in communication.

- i) LJ raised serious concerns about the Accuracy WAG. The organisers have just notified that they are considering changing the launch method to tow and the site to the Turin airfield, without any consultation with the steward. There is unlikely to be an opportunity to test towing on that site in a competition prior to the WAG. Letters notifying selected pilots' NACs are already being issued. The Bureau believes such a significant change between test event and main event has potentially serious safety ramifications. The possibility of withdrawing the Accuracy element from the WAG was raised, though this is not a desirable outcome. LJ to contact FAI and WAG organisers to discuss.
- ii) Another issue noted is that although safety rules included in *STC* are increasing (back protection, etc) some organisers are not checking equipment. It was agreed they must be made aware that they must make these checks.
- iii) Financing - WAG officials & judges. The FAI has agreed that travel costs for Accuracy & Aerobatics Judges and FAI officials to the WAG will be covered by the FAI, estimated to be 4,600 Euros.
- iv) LJ and Dennis Pagen need to prepare the Local Regulations in time to circulate with the plenary agenda December 19th.

10. Subcommittee reports:

- i) *HG SC*. A brief note was received to say that a report had not been prepared. The Bureau was disappointed not to get an update on the activity of the HG SSC including any progress on sprog measuring.
- ii) *PG SC*. A clear and succinct report was received. It was agreed the points should be added to the SSC agenda. The Bureau was pleased to see point 4 (see attached report) was also raised for discussion.
- iii) *PA SC*. The report showed that this is another proactive SSC and elements of the report will be added to the SSC agenda prior to the Plenary.
- iv) *Aerobatics SC*. The bureau was disappointed that no Aerobatics report was received and there seems to have been no activity in the SC. LJ will contact future possible volunteers. Volunteers should be reminded that the Aerobatics SSC technically covers both HG and PG.

- v) Sporting Code SC. A very thorough report was received. LJ will circulate relevant elements to SSC chairs to include on their agenda.
- vi) Records & Badges SC. A comprehensive report was received with several matters to be addressed in the S7 SC.
- vii) Safety & Training (S&T) SC. A thorough report was received. It was clarified that updating the Safe Pro and Para Pro documents were the responsibility of the S&T chairman. This had not been done due to a misunderstanding of whose responsibility it was. They will be updated before the plenary.
 - a) Accident reporting & database. LJ will add to all SSC agenda that the new incident reporting form needs to be examined and modified according to their discipline. Once reviewed, the S&T SSC will decide on one standard form or separate forms for each discipline. It will be proposed to make the form mandatory in cat 1 and later in Cat 2 competitions. The forms can be filled in by anyone but will be mandatory for the person involved in an incident. Stewards will be required to ensure forms are completed and collated by the Jury President (in Cat 1 events). The existing accident database is continuing to be updated, and will be superseded by the new online database which will institute a more consistent information gathering process.
 - b) Safe pro and Para pro need updating and should be reviewed by the relevant SSC.
 - c) Reconsideration should be given to whether Safe pro and ParaPro need to be extended to cover more disciplines, such as debagging for aerobatics, speed flying, towing, tandem and others.
 - d) IPPI card pricing. There was a question about whether IPPI prices should be standardised across nations, but it is not in the remit of CIVL.
 - e) CIVL should review its webpage to update links to manufacturers' equipment safety and recall notices.
 - f) ST will review the TOR of the S&T SSC.
 - g) AG asked why the chair of the S&T and PG SSC was not included at the recent review meeting convened by the FAI with certain Bureau members as competition safety in paragliding competitions was the primary discussion point. The bureau agreed the meeting was not convened appropriately and excluded key people and FK will communicate this to the FAI President.

11 Working Group reports:

- i) Continental Records WG. JA has published an outline for continental records. Need to contact delegates representing other continents. The WG will formulate a proposal for the Plenary.
- ii) Software WG. A comprehensive report was received and is attached.
 - a) World XC Contest. There was discussion of the good work that had been done by the software team to bring the WXC online and the bureau is prepared to pay a token amount to programmers for work they continue to do, from the existing Software budget.
 - b) CIVL will have to move the WXC from the DHV sponsored servers to a new server within the next few days. Some have already been shut down, without notice.
 - c) Sporting Licence database of FAI. This is due to be online on 1st Jan 2009, and will provide a useful cross check of holders of valid Sporting Licences, based on information provided by the NACs and delegated authorities. The database is designed to be used alongside the existing system of presenting paper licences at registration of all FAI sanctioned competitions.

12 Safeguards for successful Cat 1 events:

Following the problems at the PG Europeans in Serbia, it is agreed that the Bureau has been too reluctant to decline to award championships when bids are weak, or to remove sanctioning of poorly organised events if required.

A wide ranging discussion identified a number of measures that can be implemented to avoid problems of non-performance in Cat 1 events and to tackle them if they do arise. If a financial

penalty system is introduced, it must set against measurable and provable goals. Such a system should be added to the sporting code.

The bureau has agreed to improve the process by:

- Improving the bid guidelines document and Annex A and including a better sample budget template.
- More rigorous assessment of the bids by CIVL Bureau, and relevant SSCs, including S&T.
- Ensuring a formal relationship is established between the organisers and the NAC or Federation before the OA is signed (within 3 months of awarding the bid)
- Ensuring the NAC (or Federation signing the OA) continues to be involved and understands its responsibilities.
- Communication between CIVL officials/Steward and the organisers should be copied to the NAC as a continuous process.
- Reviewing the Steward Report template to set out more clearly what are essential changes, and what are recommendations following a Test event. Updating Steward training/briefing and the Steward & Jury Handbook.

Other ideas discussed include:

- Reassessing Annex A of the OA after the test comp and in light of the Steward's report.
- Setting a system of financial penalties for non-compliance with Steward's recommendations and/or terms of the OA.
- Ensuring Plenary voting on bids is by secret ballot.
- FAI will be consulted on the possibility to vote AGAINST awarding a championship when more than one bid is received. Current practice is only to vote for the acceptance of a particular bid or to choose between bids or to abstain.

13 Entry standard exemption procedures. JA emphasised the correct standard form must be used and must be fully completed. Exemptions in the past have been granted too easily. In future we will not normally take into consideration pilots who are applying because:

- they did not possess a valid FAI sporting licence at the time of the competition:
- pilots did not qualify because the competitions they flew in were not sanctioned:

The exemption form must be fully completed, including the formal support of the delegate, NAC or delegated national governing body. It must be submitted by the same authorities.

PS will modify the form and update it on the website. FK will be the contact point for application submissions.

Defining responsibilities of screening (previously selection) committees. The committee should check ALL pilots, including the pilots who automatically qualify. It should notify the CIVL president of any potential anomalies in the issuing of FAI sporting licences. At least 1 member of the screening committee must be a bureau member, and the jury president should be another member, as it is his responsibility to check at the competition site that pilots are qualified.

14 Competition sanctioning & results input - issues arising

- i) PreWAGs & test events as Cat 2s. JA will propose to clarify S7 such that organisers must hold the "test" event as a Cat 2 event.
- ii) FAI Sporting Licence (FAI SL) & WPRS.
 - a) There are pilots in the WPRS database who do not hold a current valid FAI SL, but they do not score ranking points, and they are clearly marked (with an *)
 - b) We have anecdotal evidence that some pilots may have qualified for Cat 1 competitions by flying in Cat 2 competitions without an FAI SL, and who have qualified for WPRS points without a valid FAI licence. This problem should be solved by the FAI SL database, and by the bureau decision to tighten up on licence possession.

- c) Checking licences at category 2 competitions and penalties. If a pilot in a Cat 2 competition is later found not be in possession of an FAI SL, a letter will be sent from the CIVL president to the organising NAC informing them they have not upheld their responsibility. It was proposed to change S7 so that there is an official warning letter for a first offence with a financial penalty for a 2nd offence that the cat 2 sanction fee will be doubled for the next application from that country.
- iii) The S7 NAC/pilot entry form template should be modified to reflect online registration processes. It should clearly indicate what statements are mandatory for online forms, such as: confirmation of support for the pilot from the NAC, and a statement that the pilot qualifies for their FAI SL.
- iv) JA to propose an addition to S7 that CIVL ID numbers for Cat 2s are recommended to be included as part of the results sent to CIVL.

15 CIVL Competition Co-ordinator - current situation.

PS, the CIVL Competition Co-ordinator has tendered her resignation, to be effective from after the 2009 Plenary in February. She wants to spend more time flying in the Owens Valley, USA. The Bureau thanked her for all her work, noting that she will be sorely missed, and wishing her all the best for the future.

The Bureau agreed that we need to recruit a replacement as soon as possible. The job description has been reviewed and updated, the key skills identified and the hourly rate of pay for a new recruit also reviewed. It was discussed and agreed that the post might suit a past competition pilot wanting to stay involved in the scene, or someone else with good knowledge of how FAI sanctioned competitions are run and scored. Good database oriented IT skills are essential. It was agreed that the post does not require attendance at Bureau or Plenary meetings. Regular reports would be sufficient.

A recruitment advertisement has been drafted, to be checked by FAI for consistency in FAI practice. The post will be advertised as soon as possible, by distribution to CIVL delegates and NACs of member nations. Also, the post will be advertised on the CIVL website and promoted via other appropriate media. Deadline for receiving applications will be 31 December, and all Bureau Members will be involved in reviewing and selecting a suitable candidate.

It was agreed that additional work and responsibilities undertaken by PS, will be redistributed among Bureau members. General enquiries will be directed centrally to FK and fielded appropriately. LJ will review other contact points on the website to ensure they are appropriately directed. Ongoing work on the Steward & Jury database, maintaining it, adding new recruits, and ensuring all competition posts are filled, will be passed to ST after the 2009 Plenary. ST will initially be caretaker of this task. PS will liaise with ST on all aspects until her departure.

Further discussions revived the necessity of a CIVL PR coordinator. This was the original rationale for the creation of this paid post, but which was overtaken by the explosion of essential work required to handle the sanctioning and results processing of CIVL competitions. It was agreed that there was still a very strong case for a PR coordinator, and the work could help significantly in improving the smooth-running of CIVL operations, as well as raising the profile of CIVL in the free flying world. It was agreed that once the CIVL Competition Coordinator post was filled, the PR Coordinator role will be re-examined.

16 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the PWCA. It was agreed that the MoU needed revising. PWCA competitions must still complete the same paperwork as others for Cat 2 sanctioning. FK will lead the revision process, coordinate bureau input and liaise the PWCA.

17 Website & press promotion.

- a) There is a lot more PR that can be done, but not as part of the current role of the secretary, And there is a lot more on the website than can be done to make it a more useful reference and promotional tool for CIVL. LJ feels more direction on the website is needed and everyone

agreed. AG suggested opening up a blog page to include items on upcoming events and in-progress competitions. Originally the PR coordinator job was for external PR, but now it is more for internal PR. It will be addressed more fully once the coordinator's job is filled.

- b) The editor of Cross Country magazine has indicated he will accept a regular CIVL column for the magazine and LJ is happy to do this. AG will write the first article with LJ about the WXC and other topics were agreed.

- 18 Reports on Bureau Decisions - any for ratification by plenary. Few decisions have been made by the bureau and most of those that have been made, have been notified to the delegates. There is one additional notification: approval to cover ST's travel costs to EHPU meeting earlier in the year.

The matters that will need ratification by the Plenary are the Selection Criteria for the WAG and bids for 2010 Cat 1 competitions, accepted by the Bureau on behalf of CIVL.

- 19 Medals. For 2009 competitions these will be ordered by FK. Some discussion on difficulty sometimes of knowing if enough women are entered to Cat 1 competitions to make a valid female championship which will require medals. ST expressed disappointment that medals could not be awarded at PanAm championships (one too few pan-american women), even though the medals were available.
- 20 Mailing lists have been set up for the Bureau, Sporting code, Software WG, HG and PG SSCs. There has been varying amounts of discussions on all of them and they seem to working satisfactorily. The Accuracy SSC mailing list is ready to be created, but the chairman prefers to work with a larger, more informal group. ST will set up a mailing list for Safety and Training. Ask SM about setting up a mailing list for R&B SSC.
- 21 Anti-doping rules and procedures. This was discussed and the bureau is aware the revised rules have been adopted by the FAI. We will await more direction from the FAI and make ourselves more familiar with potential ramifications in the meantime.
- 22 Finances:
 - i) Expenditure against 2008 budget reflects we have not spend budgeted amounts partly due to the unspent software portion, and partly we should expect more expenditure accruing before the end of the year.
 - ii) A financial report and budget will be prepared for Jan 5th and the final financial report will be prepared for Jan 26th 2009.
 - iii) Expenses.
 - a) ST requested if he could get reimbursement for train ticket he had to buy due to a missed flight while travelling to the EHPU meeting. While he bought the cheapest tickets, the first airline was not responsible for him missing the 2nd flight because of delay. It was agreed individual members should not be responsible for expenses incurred on official business.
 - b) The bureau agreed it was not reasonable to ask NACs to cover the costs of extraordinary meetings such as the one convened by FAI in September. It was agreed that CIVL would cover the costs of FK, JA and LG for the meeting in Paris.
 - c) The bureau authorised expenses for the CIVL secretary to attend this November 2008 bureau and February 2009 plenary meetings. For future meetings, a proposal will be included in the financial report at the next plenary.
 - d) Km rates for driving have been agreed before but we need a policy for when a CIVL official chooses to drive instead of fly, and would cost more at the agreed km rate. WS will consult FAI for direction.
- 23 Preparations for 2009 Plenary:
 - i) Date & timing for pre-Plenary Bureau meeting. This will be on Wednesday evening (we can check later on arrival times of bureau members)
 - ii) Provisional dates & timings for SC/WG meetings: Across two days, Thursday & Friday. More detailed timing to be drawn up by FK/LJ. J&S seminar will be planned for Thursday evening.

- iii) Plenary meeting will be (provisionally) scheduled from 09.00 to 19.00 Saturday and 09.00 to 14.00 Sunday.
- iv) System of nominations and voting for bureau and SC/Permanent WG chairs. A system of prior nominations may be discussed at the plenary with a view to changing the process for the 2010 meeting. For 2009, nomination papers will be prepared in advance and given to delegates at the start of the meeting, as well as details on who is eligible to stand for the various posts. This will streamline the process and encourage delegates to think about this beforehand.
- v) Louise will check incoming proposals and bids for completion and comprehension before they are distributed.
- vi) It was agreed that certain CIVL Bureau personnel would stay at the hotel hosting the Plenary as it is important they are on site to help with logistics.

24 Any other business

- i) Officials' wear: t shirts and cap will be sourced for J&S appointees. It was agreed these would be yellow, to provide 'uniform-like' consistency, and are easy to spot. Small sizes will be ordered for women.
- ii) Bali Beach Games. An informal report has been received, the competition went well, and the organisers appreciated the assistance provided. A judging seminar and an accuracy seminar were run with the support of the Accuracy SSC. Although not an FAI sanctioned event, people with CIVL event experience (Jury, Meet Director, Judge) were present.
- iii) It was highlighted that clarification is needed in the Voting rights of non-delegate Bureau members (typically secretary and/or treasurer). Internal Regulations and FAI by-laws are not entirely consistent. JA to clarify. He will also seek clarification of how/whether CIVL volunteers, such as Bureau Members, can also take on a separate, and clearly defined paid role.

Annex Documents

Sporting Code SSC Report
Paragliding SSC Report
PG Accuracy SSC Report
Records & Badges SSC Report
Safety & Training SSC Report
Software WG Report

Annexe 1 - Outstanding Actions from previous meetings

November 2006 Meeting, Pléguien

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
				Report from Bureau Meeting October 2007
28	Investigate the possibility of using PayPal for sanction fee payments.	AG	Closed	AG will investigate. Moved to action point from November 2008 meeting.
38	The LRs need downloadable template.	JA	Closed.	Will become part of uploading revised S7 documents process.
46.5	Guidelines for SSCs and Working Group to be updated to be more specific about reports.	LJ	Closed.	DONE. Further feedback received from AG.

November 2007 Bureau Meeting - Reykjavik

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
6iii)	Accuracy records - table of proofs	LJ/ST	Closed	With PG Accuracy SSC.
6v)	Safety & Training: find resources to update SafePro & ParaPro	AG	Closed	New SSC chair, ST, taken over these issues.
6vi)	Aerobatics - contact Aerobatics SSC chair about Judging training exes in 2007/8/9	LJ	Closed	No claim made in 2007 or 2008. Pal indicated SSC wants to organise training in 2009. LJ action point from November 2008 meeting.
7i)	CIVL database: add 'results received not yet processed' to option list for events page	AG	Cont.	Task on S-T's list of things to do
7i)	Automatic reminders for missing results	AG	Cont.	Task on S-T's list of things to do
7i)	Tables & pages for J&S and for Judges	AG	Closed	Covered in SW WG report
8i)	Contact LG for smooth handover of J&S administration	PS	closed	DONE
8ii)	Update J&S handbook to include template for recording protests and outcomes	JA	closed	DONE

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
8iii)	Compile list of (recent) past decisions from Jury reports	PS	Closed	More difficult than anticipated. Bureau agreed to discontinue task.
8iv)	Feedback to J&S on reports to be coordinated with relevant expert	FK	Closed.	Task added to President's job description
8vi)	Communicate (via website) J&S initiatives, updates etc	PS/LJ	closed	DONE
8viii)	Update Guidelines to Organisers & J&S handbook that travel plans must be agreed by both parties	JA	Closed	DONE. Organisers handbook ongoing.
8ix)	Find volunteers for gaps in J&S schedule for 2008	PS	closed	DONE
8ix)	Find more recruits for PG Accuracy. Ask RV to steward 2008 pre-Worlds	LJ	closed	DONE
9i)	Request LRs for Valle de Brava from LG	ST	Closed	DONE.
9vii)	Voss: LRs to be prepared & reported to SSC for checking	FK LJ	closed	Event cancelled

13	Aerobatics: Ask DP to complete Annex to 7A. Identify changes & proposals to Aerobic Annex A	JA	open	Asked - awaiting response. On HG agenda.
14/15 v)	WPRS - proposals for change for Plenary	AG	closed	On SW WG agenda
15ii)	Write definition and wording of WPRS for all S7, including time limit for submitting results. Add to SSC Agenda.	AG/JA LJ	closed	DONE DONE
15iii)	Ask FAI to add Championship team results on web.	FK	cont	ongoing Will contact Thierry again to have this organised
15iv)	CIVL Pilot ID: Amend sanction application form. Amend S7 registration template.	PS JA	closed	DONE
17i)	Pre-WAG: Rules/LRs to be written for each participating discipline	AG LJ/DP	Closed	DONE
17i)	WAG: contact organisers for dates of test events	AG	closed	DONE

18	Officials' wear: Tshirts to be sourced. Size data to be collated. Look for sponsors for jackets.	WS PS WS	Closed	DONE. T shirts have been produced. No sponsors have been found.
19	Make initial inventory of website. Review structure. Report in Feb.	LJ	closed	DONE
20	Set up Prez page on website for Bureau activity outside decisions	LJ/FK	Closed	DONE
21	Mailing lists: Ask Thierry to set them up. Inform SSC chairs to populate them. Inform delegates	PS FK	closed	DONE NB. Some still not functioning.
22	WAG promotion to member countries.	FK	closed	Done on website and at Plenary.
23	Create spec document (within 6 months) for an overhaul of Practical Guidelines for Comp Organisers.	JA	Cont	Will probably be taken over by LJ after July 2009
26	Investigate costs of oct 08 meet in Amsterdam. Dates to be agreed by email	FK All	Closed	DONE

February 2008 Bureau Meeting, Manzanillo

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
5iii	J&S page on website to recruit	LJ	closed	DONE
6i	HG Euros, Greifenberg. Updates to LRs	JA	closed	DONE
6ix	PG Pre-Worlds, awaiting Steward's report	ST	closed	DONE
7	IPPI cards - questionnaire on S&T for IPPI card nation purchasers	JA/ S&T SCC	closed	Moved to S&T agenda
10i	Race V6.2.20 - PR on web when finished	AG/ LJ	closed	DONE
10ii	FS: recommend use in Cat2s in 2008 and for Cat 1s from 2009	AG	closed	DONE, on SW WG Agenda
14	Dates & venue for October Bureau meeting	All	closed	DONE

Feb 2008 Bureau Meeting Addenda - post Plenary

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
2	Check dates for next Plenary: 19 to 22 Feb? Particularly not to clash with EHPU	all	closed	DONE
3	J&S database: Poll for more volunteers and for trainees	PS	closed	Moved to action from Nov 08 meeting
4	LRs approved/ratified at Plenary need updating with new rules	JA LG ST LJ	Closed	DONE

February 2008 Plenary Meeting actions

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
11	Approved amended IRs should be published	JA	Closed	DONE
14	TOR for Continental Records WG	JA	Closed	Moved to action from Nov 08 meeting
24	Change to wording in S7, ref Portugal comment	JA	Closed	DONE
45	Website to include info on J&S selection process	LJ	closed	DONE
	Confirm to delegates dates of next Plenary meeting. Add to website.	JA LJ	closed Closed	DONE DONE

Feb to May Email actions outstanding

Minute	Action	Who	Status	
	Review of LG's Steward role check list	all	closed	Moved to action from Nov 08 meeting
	Review of role of CIVL coordinator	all	closed	Moved to action from Nov 08 meeting

CIVL Sporting Code Subcommittee Report

The reports should cover issues raised by pilots, organisers, SSC members, delegates, Steward & Jury reports etc.; Outcomes (recommendations, proposals, actions); and concerns.

Subcommittee or Working Group: Sporting Code	Date: 30 Oct 2008
Name: John Aldridge	Confidential to Bureau: <input type="checkbox"/> /N For publication: <input type="checkbox"/> /N

Summary of subcommittee activity since the last report:

This has mainly consisted of implementing changes to the 2008 sporting code authorised by the 2008 Plenary.

Since publication of the 2008 edition of S7 activity has been restricted to collecting and collating requests for future changes (see Annexes) and giving advice on sporting code interpretation to the FAI (on record matters), to Bureau members and SC chairmen.

Issues raised, discussed or actioned and resolved:

Two matters arose from record claims submitted to the FAI. In the first case (of a pilot claiming a triangle record larger than that for which current records exist) advice on interpretation of S7D was given.

The second case involved a deficiency in the S7D rules for a new (in 2008) record category of "Free Distance Flight" which resulted in the rejection of a claim by the FAI. I consulted with the Chairman of the Records & Badges SC and persuaded the FAI to accept the record for verification with an assurance that the S7D omissions were merely drafting errors which would be addressed in the next edition and that the Plenary had clearly intended the new category of record to be effective from 1 May 2008. I do not anticipate any difficulty in updating S7D but delegates will need to be aware that a rejection of the changes the Sporting Code SC will propose will also result in the withdrawal of the record submitted this year.

Issues raised to be resolved, suggested actions:

See Annexes.

Issues or concerns requiring Plenary or Bureau guidance/response:

None identified at this stage.

Issues of potential interest/relevance to other SSCs:

All Sporting Code SC issues are relevant to other SCs!

For HG SC Comment

S7A - 16.5.8 Altitude Infringements

Where vertical infringement of airspace, cloud or briefed altitude limits is considered etc..... **Additional wording.**

S7A - 2.28.2.1 - consider splitting airspace and altitude limits that have been briefed - with less draconian penalties for the latter.

S7A & B - include statement that track logs become the property of the FAI and may be published - perhaps consult FAI before proposing this rule.

S7A - Changes to Chapt 12 & Annexes to LRs

Move remaining paragraphs (about goals) **from Chapt 13 into Chapt 2**, perhaps under HEADER 2 "Goals in Soaring Competition".

Reason: tidying up.

S7A - 16.5.7.3 Early Start

Specify that the time penalty will be applied by shifting the pilot's track log time by the amount of the penalty. This is to ensure that, firstly the pilot loses any lead bonus, secondly that in the event of a stopped task the pilot is not allowed to fly for a longer time than those pilots who started at the correct time.

Reason: response to steward requests.

S7A - 2.24.6 Take-off "Push" system

This does not currently state that no pilot may move into the start lane during a push nor does it state that only one push may be implemented at a time in a lane.

I believe the push rules added to the loc. regs. should be put on the agenda to be added to Sec. 7. The two rules added were always part of the push system as far back as I remember. It doesn't make sense for a pilot who is sitting on the ramp to be able to push. It also doesn't make sense for a pilot to be able to push another line in which he can't launch.

Dennis Pagen

S7A & B - 5.5.2 Calculation of Scores (and maybe S7C as well)

Should say that any rounding up is done after the application of penalties.

Reason: as scores should not be rounded twice.

Clarify validation of Women's continental comps when part of overall open class Cat 1 meet.

Reason: follow up from Griefenburg Europeans.

S7A, B & C to include rule giving the MD and SD power to ban flying from the site if a task or day is cancelled due to dangerous conditions.

S7A, B & C to give MD and SD the power to exclude from a comp pilots who do not demonstrate the necessary skills e.g. launch or landing skills.

S7A, B & C to specify the things that will attract financial penalties for non-performance in 1st Category events. These must be measurable and provable.

Reason: FAI recommendations.

S7A, B & C and OA to include provision for an extra visit by the steward 6 months before the event at the organiser's expense when it is necessary to confirm that recommendations have been followed.

Reason: arising from Serbian PG Euros experience.

S7A, B & C 7.1.3 Method and Timing of Payment [sanction fees]

Re-write to cover payment of officials' expenses rather than sanction fees – if sanction fees are to be payable 30 days after test event.

Reason: necessary follow-on to introduction of performance penalties.

S7A & B 3.4.2 Eligibility to Compete

Both sections require that a pilot should have placed at a certain level in the 3 years before the meet. They might not have flown a comp since. Is this a sensible qualification? Put on agenda for HG & PG SCs?

S7A 3.4.2 Eligibility to Compete

Add further bullet point: Or Placed in the top 2/3rds of pilots in a women's world championship during the 3 years prior to the Category 1 championship.

Reason: Current rules give no credit for competing in this Cat 1 event.

S7A 3.4.8 Procedure for Checking

Delete "will" in first line and replace with "is to".

Reason: to place an obligation on those checking.

From CIVL Comp Coord:

[S7A,B & C 4.4 - Results \[of Cat 2 meets\]](#)

[I notice it also doesn't state what formats are acceptable for results, so can we add that next time too? What is on the form I send out is:](#)

All results should have the CIVL ID number for each pilot recorded. Acceptable formats are: FSDB file.

The full RACE database is acceptable.

An Excel format (.xls or .csv) with the results in the following order:

Name (First name followed by family name) **Nation** (IOC abbreviated codes) **Total** (score) **valid_FAI_licence** (number) **FAI_Pilot_ID** (if they know it - this is their number from the CIVL WPRS website)

Please note: PDF files are not acceptable.

> can you sand me a copy of the "International rules of the air" mentioned

> in the SECTOR 7C - CLASS 0 PARAGLIDING ACCURACY CLASSIII 2007 Edition

> (Chapter 2.19.7 "Collision avoidance" - pag. 20).- N.B. Also in S7A, 2.17.7

Items from Jury/Steward Reports

From Griefenburg Steward Report

10. Changes important to Section 7 that you think will improve fairness or effectiveness:

- The during the championship set rule that makes it possible for the meet director to specify a height limit for crossing the start line does improve safety (avoids cloud flying) and fairness. CIVL should consider to implement this or a similar rule in the sporting code.

From Laragne Pre-Worlds Steward Report:

10. Changes important to Section 7 that you think will improve fairness or effectiveness.

- Suggest to change paragraph 5.5.8 and change the time that must have been elapsed since the first valid start taken by a competing pilot from 2 hours to a more flexible possibility like "to be decided by the meet director and at least 1 hour". We have experienced that during short tasks 2 hours is too much.

From Monte Cucco HG Worlds Steward Report:

10. Changes important to Section 7 that you think will improve fairness or effectiveness.

- Paragraph 16.5.7.3, Early Start does not make clear how giving the penalty should be carried out.
Part of the scoring and penalty giving will have to be that the start time of the pilot that started too early will have to be corrected and set to or after the official start time. If that is not done, the scoring program will not check the track log of the pilot that started too early correctly.
The scorer and the steward in this championship suggest to solve this as follows:
The track log of the pilot who started too early should be shifted forward by ten times the amount by which the pilot started before the official start time, providing this is not longer than 5 minutes. That will create that the pilot started at or after the official start time and the “penalty time” will be added.
- Paragraph 2.17.11 Maximum Wind Speed. This paragraph states that the organiser shall include in the LR’s a reasonable wind speed in which a task may be flown. Suggest to change this rule to a reasonable wind speed in which launching can be carried out. It will be difficult and not really useful to make ruling about the wind speeds in long tasks.
- Paragraph 5.5.8 Scoring of stopped task. This paragraph states that when a task is stopped, but not cancelled and a minimum of 2 hours has elapsed since the first valid start taken by a competing pilot, the task will be scored.
Suggest to change this paragraph to a more flexible rule where the meet director can decide about the time that has to have elapsed since the first start. Weather conditions and/or expected weather conditions and therefore the length of tasks can make it necessary to make this time shorter than the stated 2 hours.
- Paragraph 5.5.8 Scoring of stopped task. Some considerations and suggestions for changes to make the rule clear:
 - Make clear in the rule in S7A that the “score back” time applies for all the pilots. In this championship there was some doubt if the rule would also apply for pilots that had landed on goal before the task was stopped. For the steward it is clear that this rule also applies for pilots in goal and a result can be that some pilots that reached goal will be “scored back” and therefore be scored as not having reached goal.
 - The rule states that the task will also be scored if at least one pilot is in goal. The interpretation of the steward of this rule is that the task should still be scored, even if the pilot at goal is subsequently scored-back and will appear not to have reached goal. Suggest to make this clear in S7A.
 - In future “multi class” events the CIVL officials and scorers will have to be aware that if, because of dangerous weather conditions, the tasks are stopped, classes that already completed the stopped task (all competitors in that class on the ground at the time the task was stopped) will not be “scored back”.

For PG SC Comment

S7A & B - include statement that track logs become the property of the FAI and may be published - perhaps consult FAI before proposing this rule.

Chapt 13 - Move remaining paragraphs (about goals) into Chapt 2, perhaps under HEADER 2 "Goals in Soaring Competition".

Reason: housekeeping.

S7A & B - 5.5.2 Calculation of Scores (and maybe S7C as well)

Should say that any rounding up is done after the application of penalties.

Reason: scores should not be rounded twice.

Clarify validation of Women's continental comps when part of overall open class Cat 1 meet.

Reason: duplicates proposal for S7A for conformity.

S7A, B & C to include rule giving the MD and SD power to ban flying from the site if a task or day is cancelled due to dangerous conditions.

S7A, B & C to give MD and SD the power to exclude from a comp pilots who do not demonstrate the necessary skills e.g. launch or landing skills.

S7A, B & C to specify the things that will attract financial penalties for non-performance in 1st Category events. These must be measurable and provable.

Reason: FAI recommendations.

S7A, B & C and OA to include provision for an extra visit by the steward 6 months before the event at the organiser's expense when it is necessary to confirm that recommendations have been followed.

Reason: Experience from Serbian Euro PG.

S7A, B & C 7.1.3 Method and Timing of Payment [sanction fees]

Re-write to cover payment of officials' expenses rather than sanction fees – if sanction fees are to be payable 30 days after test event.

Reason: Necessary if financial performance penalties are to be applied.

S7A & B 3.4.2 Eligibility to Compete

Both sections require that a pilot should have placed at a certain level in the 3 years before the meet. They might not have flown a comp since. Is this a sensible qualification? Put on agenda for HG & PG SCs?

From CIVL Comp Co-ord:

[S7A,B & C 4.4 - Results \[of Cat 2 meets\]](#)

[I notice it also doesn't state what formats are acceptable for results, so can we add that next time too? What is on the form I send out is:](#)

All results should have the CIVL ID number for each pilot recorded. Acceptable formats are: FSDB file.

The full RACE database is acceptable.

An Excel format (.xls or .csv) with the results in the following order:

Name (First name followed by family name) **Nation** (IOC abbreviated codes) **Total**

(score) **valid_FAI_licence** (number) **FAI_Pilot_ID** (if they know it - this is their number from the CIVL WPRS website)

Please note: PDF files are not acceptable.

- > can you send me a copy of the "International rules of the air" mentioned
- > in the SECTOR 7C - CLASS 0 PARAGLIDING ACCURACY CLASSIII 2007 Edition
- > (Chapter 2.19.7 "Collision avoidance" - pag. 20).- N.B. Also in S7B, 2.18.5

From PG SC or Paula?

1.6.7.3. Start Point/Departure point:

The take-off place; or the point of release of tow; or the crossing of a start line; ~~or a ground feature photographed from the correct photo sector~~ Do we still need this?. In Category 1 competitions flight distance will be measured from the take-off point.

2.27 Out landings

.....

Landing evidence shall be from GPS track log as evidenced by an approved GPS flight verification system (Chapter 16, Rules for GPS Flight Verification) ~~and if possible the name and address of a witness other than a member of pilot's national team.~~ Do we still need this?

4.1.2 Language

The rules, regulations and information circulated to NACs and competitors or issued during the event shall be in English and, at the discretion of the organisers, ~~French~~ (Is this a rule of FAI or we can get rid of?) and/or the language of the host country. In all interpretations the English language version shall prevail.

6.6 Forms and briefing notes

-
- ~~Official outlanding map. This must be of larger scale or the same scale as pilot's maps. Pins must have contest numbers written clearly on them. Maps and pins must be duplicated so that the previous day's evidence can remain until after protest period.~~ Has never been used or asked for in PG competitions, do we need it?
-

From Steward Report, Serbia PG Euros

10. Changes important to Section 7 that you think will improve fairness or effectiveness

After all the problems encountered at this competition, in order to avoid the same kind of problems in the future I strongly recommend:

a. The future bids to include:

- meteorological history of the flying area
- pictures of the Take Offs with a glider laid on to show reference of the size
- pictures of the landings to see if there are any dangers (power lines, positioned in lee side or other hazards)

b. In cases when after the test event the Steward made recommendations, the Steward should be present again about 3-4 months before the start of the main competition to see if the recommendations were applied or not. In case the recommendations were not fulfilled, the competition should not take place.

c. Although it is not very easy to find organisers for our competitions, one way to ensure that the organisers are doing the right thing, it will be probably if the entry fees went directly to the FAI. The organisers should receive let say 40% of the entry fees before the beginning of the competition, another 30% during the competition and the last 30% after the end of the competition if everything was correctly done.

d. Launch priority. Currently in S7b it is stated that the top 15 male and 5 women have priority and they can enter the launching area at any time (if there is ordered launch), but there is nothing stated about the priority in case of re-launches (the priority is applying also in such cases or not - a pilot from top 15 or 5 could take off in front of a pilot low ranked who didn't take off yet at least once?)

e. The rule regarding team scoring and the nomination of the 3 pilots and the reserve should be revised. The experience of this championship, the first one to use this rule, proved that the rule isn't perfect. There is no much difference between the teams with 6 and 5 pilots and just few teams had only 4 or less pilots due to lack of qualified pilots. The nomination of the reserve pilots was not working very well - what will happen in case the reserve pilots gets injured and after that one of the 3 pilots to score for the team is also incapacitated? There is nothing in the rule stating that another pilot could be used as a reserve. I recommend that the rule should be revised by the Paragliding Subcommittee and the CIVL Plenary.

f. The penalty system has to be revised. For some infringements pilots should get 0 points for the task but this is meaningless in case of a cancelled task. Probably in such cases the rule should state that the pilots who infringe the rule should get a penalty for the next valid task.

g. At the Team Leader's briefings there were some discussions regarding the scoring formula and the use of the leading points. This issue should also be discussed by the Paragliding Subcommittee.

h. The key members of the staff should not be changed or, in case of objective reason, should be replaced only with suitable people and in agreement with CIVL.

From Jury Report - Euro PG Serbia

i. We discovered an inadequacy in the Section 7 B, 5.2.5 that may lead to miss interpretation and needs to be clarified: According to the actual text, it is possible to presume that in case of an injured pilot the reserve one will only be able to score for the team from the next task on; however what if the pilot was injured during the attempt to take off after the window was open but did not fly at all, can then at that moment be replaced by the reserve in the very same task? In such situation the reserve pilot automatically takes place or is it necessary for the Team Leader to notify the Meet Director? If so, by what via must be made? (oral or in writing) and what is the time limit for the request?

Also, the reserve pilot has to be nominated in the beginning along with the 3 pilots scoring for the team. If this pilot gets injured or ill and one of the 3 also becomes incapacitated, what options does the team have to replace him? The Jury requests that this point should be revised and clarified at the next plenary meeting.

j. The penalty system needs to be revised. As it is now a pilot who is caught cloud flying or fails to report back should receive 0 for the task. But if the task is cancelled than it's not possible to penalise them according to the rules, as the task will not be scored.

k. Also in Section 7 B 2.24.3, ORDERED LAUNCH, it needs to be specified if this rule is also applied to the top 15 male and 5 female in case of a second re-launch. It was also suggested that order should be according to the competition rankings only

after reaching 1500 points (so after two good tasks or more if they are weak), as results of just one task could be very random.

For PA SC

S7A & B - 5.5.2 Calculation of Scores (and maybe **S7C** as well)

Should say that any rounding up is done after the application of penalties

Reason: scores should not be rounded twice.

Clarify validation of Women's continental comps when part of overall open class Cat 1 meet.

Reason: conformity with S7A.

S7A, B & C to include rule giving the MD and SD power to ban flying from the site if a task or day is cancelled due to dangerous conditions.

S7A, B & C to give MD and SD the power to exclude from a comp pilots who do not demonstrate the necessary skills e.g. launch or landing skills.

S7A, B & C to specify the things that will attract financial penalties for non-performance in 1st Category events. These must be measurable and provable.

Reason: FAI recommendations.

S7A, B & C and OA to include provision for an extra visit by the steward 6 months before the event at the organiser's expense when it is necessary to confirm that recommendations have been followed.

Reason: Experience in Serbian PG Euros.

S7A, B & C 7.1.3 Method and Timing of Payment [sanction fees]

Re-write to cover payment of officials' expenses rather than sanction fees – if sanction fees are to be payable 30 days after test event.

Reason: necessary if financial performance penalties are applied.

From CIVL Comp Co-ord:

[S7A,B & C 4.4 - Results \[of Cat 2 meets\]](#)

[I notice it also doesn't state what formats are acceptable for results, so can we add that next time too? What is on the form I send out is:](#)

All results should have the CIVL ID number for each pilot recorded. Acceptable formats are: FSDB file.

The full RACE database is acceptable.

An Excel format (.xls or .csv) with the results in the following order:

Name (First name followed by family name) **Nation** (IOC abbreviated codes) **Total**

(score) **valid_FAJ_licence** (number) **FAI_Pilot_ID** (if they know it - this is their number from the CIVL WPRS website)

Please note: PDF files are not acceptable.

> can you send me a copy of the "International rules of the air" mentioned

> in the SECTOR 7C - CLASS 0 PARAGLIDING ACCURACY CLASSIII 2007 Edition

> (Chapter 2.19.7 "Collision avoidance" - pag. 20).-

From European PA 2008, Niska Banja, Serbia

Recommendations for changes to the Sporting Code:

- Clarification of responsibility for appointing Judging team. Also ensuring S7C complies with 'FAI registered' Judges (as per General Section).
- Judging Code needs reviewing in terms of numbers and roles and nationality mix (may be different for Cat 1 and Cat 2 events). Also consider need for whole flight observation role. Consider option for 'conditional' reflight award - giving Judging

team time to review a flight when less busy, but without delaying the completion of a round.

- Review of wording for specification of minimum requirements for harness/back protection. Consider also specifying minimum standards for helmets.
- Consider adding to Local Regulations template that organiser specifies typical timings for length of flying days, breaks for Judges etc.
- Review/clarification of Chapter 2.21.6 Relaunches - 'abnormal conditions' can be difficult to define and therefore to rule on.

From Pre-worlds PA 2008, Ivanec/Trakošćan, Croatia

22. Changes important to Section 7, Annex 9 that you think will improve fairness or effectiveness

- It was common opinion among the pilots and the organising staff that the present rule in S7C about back protection leaves very much room for interpretation and that it cannot be enforced in practice. The rule says: **2.16.5 Harness & other flying equipment**
A pilot's flying equipment should not be modified such that built in safety features are adversely affected (ie removal of back protection, tying up of airbags etc). Harnesses shall be fitted with back protection, with a minimum level of 12cm deep foam or equivalent level of protection (air bag, gel, etc).

The rule does not say for example what is the measuring point or what materials or material combinations are allowed. At the moment everything is allowed. Even though all agreed that the intention of the rule is good, to protect pilots' spines, the wording is a failure and should be reconsidered.

- A question was raised about the number of persons needed at the target of PLA competitions. At the moment the S7C requires 9 members of the judging team (+ minimum 2 reserves) and besides this at least two people to operate the video camera that is now mandatory. This adds up to a team of minimum 13 people, costs of whom are paid by the organiser. This may make it difficult for the organiser to invite judges from several countries.
The PLA subcommittee should openly consider how judging is organised in other sports/air sport disciplines, how costs are divided, are there technical solutions that can be used instead. New ideas should naturally not be allowed to lower the good standard of today's PLA judging.
- The organisers of PLA competitions rarely check pilots' equipment in more detail than the documentation. If new rules are enforced, such as the one for back protection, it is necessary to give equipment check good time before the flying starts and appoint qualified staff to organise it.

From European PA 2008, Niska Banja, Serbia

Steward Recommendations for changes to the Sporting Code:

22. Changes important to Section 7C that you think will improve fairness or effectiveness

- A CIVL PLA judge database is strongly recommended. It is very difficult to organise an effective judging team to a major competition if there is no database where judges' experience and contact information is available.
At the moment it is the Chief Judge's responsibility to assemble the judges and to see to that there are enough judges during the competition: S7C 13.2.9:
"The Chief Judge is responsible for the following

... assembling and briefing all judges prior to the commencement of the Competition.”

This may be difficult is the Chief Judge, although he/she is a part of the organisation, is from another country and there is no judge database.

- Back protection rule: S7C 2.16.5 Harness & other flying equipment. The rule does not say for example what is the measuring point or what materials or material combinations are allowed. At the moment everything is allowed. Even though all agreed that the intention of the rule is good, to protect pilots' spines, the wording is a failure and should be reconsidered.
- The subcommittee could consider if there is a need to rotate the start order. Some team leaders commented that it might well happen that same pilots fly in same conditions a number of days.
- The question of female competition was raised, should female pilots fly in one group. On the other hand many female pilots compete against the male pilots, not necessarily against just other female pilots.

For Record & Badges SC

FAI received a record claim for a triangular flight of 404km made in sub-class O-5. The pilot claimed the "speed over a triangular course of 400 km" record. Problem: para 3.4 of section 7D very explicitly indicates that this type of record is available for triangles of up to 300 km only.

With the performances flown nowadays, consideration of raising the limit for the max size of the triangle for those speed flights appears to simply have been overlooked.

"Speed around triangular courses of 25, 50, 100, 150, and all multiples of 100 km" is the way the IGC deal with this and would take care of triangles of 200,300,400,500 etc.

Another problem passed on by the FAI:

As to question B *[In the "Annex6..." we find the sentence "To be homologated, the initial Free Distance record must exceed the corresponding "non free" record by the value defined in 3.4." What is the corresponding "non free" record to the free distance flight using up to three turn points? My assumption when claiming the record was: there is no corresponding flight. But I might be wrong]*, and the rejection of the Anja Kroll's record claim, which came after my clarifying response to Richard....

- 1) free distance records have not existed before.
- 2) the requirement that the initial free record claim exceed the non-free record claim doesn't really work, as you are comparing apples and oranges. I fly free distance tasks in sailplanes and they don't compare at all with pre-declared, non-free tasks. My humble suggestion is that the initial claim in the category be awarded to the first person smart enough and energetic enough to make a flight and file a claim! If that record performance is not sufficiently difficult, another claim will soon follow.

Of course Michael Meyer is correct that the new type of record should be listed in 3.4 (Types of Record) and not just be defined as a type of flight in paragraph 1.6.5.8. However, during some previous correspondence with Thierry Montigieux, I had already noticed (and noted for the 2009 edition of S7D) that para 3.4 does not in fact list the types of record that should be allowed but merely gives the margins existing records in various categories need to be exceeded by to set a new record.

From Richard Westgate to R&B SC

1) Can Free Distance Flights now be claimed as World Records? There is no reference to them in section 3.4.

2) Was Walter Geppert's recently ratified World Record (HG Class 5) a free distance flight as intimated on the Oz Report? (<http://ozreport.com/1211200439>) In which case why has the flight been ratified in the category 'Distance over a triangular course'? By definition a course is pre-defined. For guidance, Free Distance records originated with the IGC and they list them separately. Also, 1.6.5.8 definitely refers to Free Distance flights as separate records.

3) If the above is the case then surely, again by definition, speed flights have to be flown around pre-defined courses. Walter has had a 'speed around a 'course' of 300km' ratified for this flight.

4) What are the FAI rules on retro fitting the start/finish point for a free distance out & return or triangle flight? Do you place the turnpoint where the track logs cross? Or is the flight completed if you get a start and return tracklog point in an FAI 400m radius cylinder? Where do you put the turnpoint then? We have accepted post flight turnpoints in the UK Paragliding XC League for the last 4 years and still haven't found a satisfactory way of doing this!

5) Why does CIVL still refer to 'GPS or flight data recorders that comply with the IGC (sporting code section 3) standards' when there are only 2 flight recorders which are IGC World Record approved and suitable for Hang-Gliding or Paragliding use? Neither of these instruments are widely used and the vast majority of flight data recorders which are used to ratify CIVL World Records are not IGC approved.

This continued reference to IGC still causes confusion.

'If an IGC flight data recorder is being used, the declaration needs to be made solely in the instrument itself.'

I am aware of 3 ratified Paragliding World Records where the declaration was made in the instrument but that instrument was not IGC approved (eg Flytec 5030/Brauniger Competino) No paper declaration was made ('If a GPS is being used to validate the flight, a paper copy of the task declaration must be filled out, signed and presented to the official observer prior to the start of the flight').

6) Does CIVL police World Records for Airspace Violations? and if so, what are the penalties applied? What are the allowances for GPS altitude error? What guidance do you give Official Observers on this?

Unfortunately, the Section 7D still contains some inaccuracies, omissions and contradictory statements. *N.B. These were not specified by the author*

Subcommittee or Working Group: Paragliding Sub-Committee	Date: October 2008
Name: Chris Burns (Calvo)	Confidential to Bureau: Y/N For publication: Y/N

Summary of subcommittee activity since the last report:

All the issues that have been covered are unresolved issues carried forward from last year and new issues raised by last years decisions.

The main issue has been the new team scoring formula which had its first run in the European championships in Serbia.

The members of the sub-committee who attended the Europeans met to highlight the issues that needed resolving. These issues were then discussed on the mailing list.

Issues raised, discussed or actioned and resolved:

There are a number of issues raised and discussed but not yet resolved. They are covered in the next section

Issues raised to be resolved, suggested actions:

Team size and Team scoring:

it is a fact that all the countries present at the Europeans felt that the system required improving to make it more sporting and involve all team members. As it stands at the moment the rule is detrimental to team spirit and contrary to the sporting principle.

Proposals reqd.

2) Reserve Pilot Nomination:

Currently the reserve pilot has to be nominated and once that pilot has substituted the original scoring team member they are no longer allowed to fly in the competition.

there a number of situations where this would be completely unfair and could also lead to a pilot who is unfit to fly continuing to fly.

Proposals reqd.

3) Female place:

The Current rule in section 7 does not state that if a country is not taking a female they cannot take an extra male. Again I believe that the concensus of opinion is that the place is gender specific so the rule should state this. ie: if a country is not taking a female they may not take an extra male.

Proposal reqd.

4) Organisation:

In Serbia a number of very important improvements were required by the steward after the test competition, these were not carried out. we need a proposal to ensure that this situation can not occur again. one suggestion is that the steward is required to visit the competition site 3 months before the main event (at the organisers cost) and if the required improvements are not fulfilled the event can be cancelled.

Organisation:

Any personell changes between test event and actual event must be approved by civil bureau and pg sub-committee.

Organisation:

I suggest a proposal that the organisers are required to provide a minimum of 5 wind

Guidelines for CIVL Subcommittees. Version 2.0

dummies (of a reasonable standard) for each task day. the lack of this was a major problem in Serbia and delayed or lost task days

5)Entry Fees:

Related to the above topic, another suggestion is that more of the entry fees are paid to and retained by Fai, to ensure the compliance of the organisers.

6)Safety:

It has been suggested that if the pilot numbers are reduced (130 or 120 max) this would improve safety and reduce the pressure on take off size.

Safety:

Suggested proposal that there is a seperate flying safety committee on a seperate radio frequency communicating with the Meet/Safety director on the conditions on course.

7)Scoring:

Leading points on clock start elapsed time race:

Is it fair to have leading points on such a task as only a limited number of pilots can use the first start time?

80% of time points for achieving end of speed section but not goal:

Does this not contradict the principal of safety in having a seperate speed section to goal so as not to have pilots on full accelerator close to the ground?

Pilot landing to assist a crashed pilot:

We need a better way of rewarding a pilot in this situation that is clear to all pilots and can be shown in the scoring each day.

8)Penalties:

At the moment we have penalties where the pilots are punished with zero for the task. if the task is cancelled this penalty is zero we need a proposal to make the penalty fair

but effective. For instance: if a pilot fails to report back he scores zero for the task. if he won the task the penalty could be 1000 points, if he bombed out it would be more like 70 points. this is obviously not fair.

There are proposals being formulated by different delegates to cover all the above issues. Needless to say the first point will probably occupy the most time!

Issues or concerns requiring Plenary or Bureau guidance/response:

None yet

Issues of potential interest/relevance to other SCCs:

All of these issues will have effects on other areas.

PARAGLIDING ACCURACY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO CIVL BUREAU

The reports should cover issues raised by pilots, organisers, SCC members, delegates, Steward & Jury reports etc.; Outcomes (recommendations, proposals, actions); and concerns.

Subcommittee or Working Group: PARAGLIDING ACCURACY	Date: 4.NOVEMBER 2008
Name: JURIJ VERTACNIK	Confidential to Bureau: No For publication: Yes

Summary of subcommittee activity since the last report:

Activities of SC in this period were mainly focused on:

1. Observing rules implementation and collecting proposals for improvements:

Through the year, some “problematic” issues have been observed : LHT – light harness touch rule, relaunches, safety measures. These will now be discussed as a base for further refining of the rules. Some new issues have been recommended through stewards’ reports and from pilots/organisers. At the Paragliding accuracy world cup in Osven (SVN) SC organised a debate on main issues, where representatives from 8 countries attended. Currently discussion is going on virtually by email and will be finished round NY with proposals for plenary.

2. Supporting and expanding paragliding accuracy discipline:

This topic contains activities at three main segments of PGA competition structure: organisers, judges and pilots:

Transfer and exchange of experience **among organisers** have been provided by engaging organisers of one competition in a jury of another and by helping organisers with judging seminars and by email support. There is an opportunity to participate in Coupe Icare in 2009 – help needed to organise it.

Consistent **judging** is vital for our discipline and CIVL funding to run seminars shows positive results. This year seminars were run in Malaysia, Indonesia (Asian beach games), Italy, Montenegro. It is expected that Stubai (AUT) will host a PAWC early next year and a judging seminar will be provided from 2008 budget.

To raise **pilots** ability and motivation to improve their landing skills and /or participation at PA competition, we recognised a need for educating pilots in basics of accuracy landing technique. This year materials (films, text) were prepared and the first seminar was run in Bali for Indonesian pilots attending ABG (by current World Champion).

This year we saw a growth of PA discipline in Asia with three main competitions: Malaysia (where PAWC will be held next year), Japan (where last leg of PAWC 08 has just finished) and Asian Beach Games in Bali (where 5 nations attended accuracy competition with a very good performance of Indonesia, Korea and China)

Issues raised, discussed or actioned **and resolved:**

A general agreement has been reached, but final recommendations will be made at

the end of the year or just before plenary:

FLYING ORDER (no change in approach and rules since a draw is included.
Recommendation to MD to get most of the day regardless on round ending)

RELAUNCHES (better briefing from MD, SD and CJ. Better following and publishing reasons. Depending on site: more focus on pilot separation and target area approach: to avoid difficult judging situation)

SAFETY (in 2009 at FAI cat1 and test competitions (WAG, WC, pre EC) : organiser /MD/SD/ will provide a »safety report« to CIVL/PGA SC including reports on all safety issues from rules including checks of pilots equipment. CIVL PGA SC will prepare a formula to help organiser with this task.)

LIGHT HARNESS TOUCH (will be deleted from S7 to avoid misunderstanding. It is still possible to introduce LHT directly in FAI2 local rules)

VIDEO EVIDENCE (review of rewording: the recordings shall be made, the organisers do their best (a missing video is not a reason for relaunch) and the recording can be used in case of the protest (if the jury so decides).)

Issues raised to be resolved, suggested actions:

A general agreement has not been reached yet:

BACK PROTECTION (proposal: back protection is obligatory, but it is difficult to define a specification of harness. From competition fairness point of view a minimum thickness of harness will be defined.)

Action needed:

JUDGES DATABASE (together with Agust G.)

JUDGING CODE REVISION (according to Steward report recommendations)

RECORDS (to start a discussion for including PA records in S7D. Currently unofficial rules and database is provided at www.pgawc.org)

Other:

LR for WC 2009 Croatia (rules are revised by Riikka V. and will be by SC too)

BIDs for WC 2011 (to notice and get response /bids prepared/ from organisers)

Issues or concerns requiring Plenary or Bureau guidance/response:

None identified at this stage.

Issues of potential interest/relevance to other SCCs:

- Creation of judges database
- Records definition for PGA

Records & Badges Subcommittee Report

The reports should cover issues raised by pilots, organisers, SSC members, delegates, Steward & Jury reports etc.; Outcomes (recommendations, proposals, actions); and concerns.

Subcommittee or Working Group: Records & Badges	Date: 31 Oct 2008
Name: Stewart Midwinter	Confidential to Bureau: No For publication: Yes

Summary of subcommittee activity since the last report:

Several issues have been raised by FAI Records office and dealt with. Questions have arisen from pilots about interpretation of S7. See John Aldridge's report for a list of the issues raised.

Issues raised, discussed or actioned and resolved:

FAI Office sought approval from the subcommittee for two PG Diamond Badge claims. FAI Office requested interpretation for a record claim in free distance category (see John Aldridge's report). Several world-record-seeking pilots discussed problems with current record declaration procedures. The R&B SC proposes that SMS declarations be considered for adoption at next plenary meeting, as it is not always possible to have a valid, or in some cases an arm's length, O.O. On hand when making a record flight. While a series of paper declarations can be made ahead of time, an SMS to the national records coordinator just before the flight can indicate which declaration is actually being used on the day. e.g.

"Mia Schokker L Rd. R Tri. 50 km" would indicate that the pilot Mia Schokker is launching at L Road in pursuit of a right-hand (clockwise) 50 km Triangle. The specific turnpoint details would have been communicated previously to the records coordinator.

Issues raised to be resolved, suggested actions:

See Annexes.

Issues or concerns requiring Plenary or Bureau guidance/response:

Section 7 needs updating at next plenary meeting.

Issues of potential interest/relevance to other SSCs:

All Sporting Code SC issues are relevant to other SCs!

For Record & Badges SC

Edited exchange with Thierry Montigneaux of the FAI:

Good morning Thierry,

I hope, i finally found someone, who can give mir definite answers to my questions.

I am new in the business and there are lots of questions, where I cannot find definite answers in Section 7 D hanggliding. Can you help me?

The main question is the difference between the classical triangle and the new type with turnpoints declared post flight. Do we now have both types of records in parallel, i.e. FREE TRIANGLE DISTANCE and TRIANGLE DISTANCE or COURSE(?) (with declared turnpoints prior to flight), or is there only one record?

Answer: My understanding of reading Section 7D is that we now have both the classical AND free records. The last sentence of 1.6.5.8 indicates that a free record must supersede the corresponding non-free record, which is a clear sign that both co-exist. But I agree with you that there is no explicit statement in S7D of the situation of 'classical' vs. 'free' records

1. Is it allowed to start and finish a TRIANGLE DISTANCE at any point?

Formerly, this point had to be a turnpoint of the triangle. For FREE TRIANGLE DISTANCE it is of course possible.

Answer: Paragraph 3.6.1 defines remote start/finish points and will answer your question on this point.

2. Does FREE DISTANCE with turnpoints declared post flight imply, that no declaration at all and no Official Observer / witness is required for these types of records? Can we trust in igc-files with valid G-records like in the various XC-online contests?

Answer: A free distance implies that the "waypoints" can be declared post-flight (first sentence of 1.6.5.8). Other than that, I understand that the requirements of 3.5.4 (with the exception that the points can be declared post-flight) and chapter 5 still apply for the control by an Official Observer of a free distance record flight.

3. Is there any difference for national and world records?

Answer: Every FAI member country is free to establish for their own needs national record categories different from the FAI-defined world record categories. However, only national records which follow the FAI rules can obviously be claimed as world records if they break a world record.

Where can I find this in Section 7 or any minutes of a meeting, any other official document...? For glider airplanes, things look much clearer than for hang/paragliders.

Answer: Other than the Sporting Code, the minutes of CIVL meetings are the most interesting documents to find additional information on the subject:

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/meetings/plenary

Comments by Thierry Montigneaux about Section 7:

In your recent reply to my message, you stated "...I am just a bit surprised that our sporting code does not provide a clear statement of our record categories...".

While preparing my reply to the gentleman [below], I spent some time reading through SC7D, something I had not done for some time as I am not dealing routinely with record claims. I must admit that I also had difficulties finding elements of reply for our friend in some cases.

While reading through S7D, I have noted the following points which you may wish to include in your review process for the next edition:

1) all sub-paragraphs of 1.6.5 define 'types of flights' except 1.6.5.8 which defines 'types of records' (see 2nd sentence). Looks like a discrepancy to me.

2) 1.6.5.8 mentions 'way points', but what a way point is is defined nowhere in chapter 1. We have definitions for turn point (1.6.8), control point (1.6.9), position check point (1.6.11), but nothing for way points. 'way points' are also mentioned in 1.6.13.3.2 and 1.6.13.3.3. Looks like a definition is missing.

3)'free' records are mentioned nowhere in chapter 3, and probably should. In particular, should a world be added to 3.5.4 about what a task declaration should include when free records are to be flown ?

Question about remote starts & finishes

Hi John,

I hope I am on the right way to contact you for a question about a world record flight over a triangle course.

I have nothing found in Section 7 about the declaration for beginning a triangle course.

Is it required to have the start and finish point in a triangle course on the vertex of that.

Can you please clarify this for me?

Response by R&B Subcommittee: This clarification should go into S7D at the next Plenary.

Paragraph 1.6.6 describes the triangle course, and 3.6 describes restrictions on the shape of the triangle.

I believe you are asking whether it is possible to have a start point and finish point which is not one of the 3 points of the triangle. If that is right, I can say that in concept it is possible to do this. However, I also see that 1.6.6 appears to slightly contradict 3.6. The former section defines a triangle as having only 2 intermediate turnpoints, plus a departure point, while the latter section clearly states that you may have a remote start and finish point. I suggest that the extra detail provided by 3.6 is what we should rely on in this case (while making a note to correct 1.6.6 at next year's Plenary meeting). All record attempts now will make use of 3D GPS units (i.e. they must record altitude in the tracklog) and 400m-radius turnpoint cylinders. So long as you meet both of those requirements you should be okay.

Information request which indicates that badge application and processing procedures need to be clarified in S7D:

Dear Stewart,

A pilot wishes to claim Eagle Diamond for this flight he has posted on an OLC

He did 132.6kMS and wants to claim 125Km closed course.

Under the "new" process, is this sufficient evidence for this claim? I know Diamonds go through you!

Best Wishes

Another request asking about badge application procedures

Message submitted via the CIVL Homepage for Stewart Midwinter

Hi,

I'm having difficulty establishing how I apply for my FAI Gold Badge.

I am a hang glider pilot, and over the summer I believe I completed a flight that qualifies, and the flight was recorded on my Compeo instrument.

I approached my NAC for instructions as to what to do next and they pointed me to the FAI web site.

The FAI web site points me back to the NAC for Gold Badge flights and I cannot find the form that the my NAC is referring to.

Can you help me please and establish what need to happen.

Response of R&B subcommittee:

Your NAC is supposed to issue badges for pilots in your country. It is supposed to develop its own procedures for assessing flight performances and compare those to the requirements set by CIVL.

CIVL in turn has made up some badges and pins that your NAC can buy and issue to qualifying pilots.

I suggest you contact xx for further instructions.

Did you file your flight anywhere like OLC? That's a way to get the flight validated and recorded on-line, which helps with the assessment of your performance.

Discussion re SMS declarations for world or national record claims

Stewart Midwinter:

Record declarations are a problem, because Official Observers are a problem.

We now allow flights to be recorded by GPS or datalogger, but we still require an official observer to be on hand to witness the declaration and the start. And that's a problem because OOs are hard to come by. In many cases the only person you can rely on is your driver, who is often your spouse, but that spouse may be perceived to have a conflict of interest. So, do we really need OOs? Can we dispense with them?

If you use an IGC-certified datalogger like the Colibri, the declaration is right in the instrument, and can't be changed once downloaded from a PC. So you can't cheat by declaring a big triangle, then modify it to a smaller triangle en route. So do you need an OO in this case? Well, yes and no. No

OO is needed for the declaration, because it's not possible to falsify it. BUT you can still cheat. If you have the money, just buy several dataloggers and load a different task in each one. After the flight, submit the task that you actually flew. What's the solution to this? Either have an OO on hand, or... read on below.

On the other hand, if you use a GPS, there's no tamper-proof declaration in the instrument. The next best thing is to create a route in the GPS, and have the OO witness that before takeoff. As above, if there is no OO on site, there's nothing stopping you from flying with several GPS's.

So, for both of these types of instruments, it's possible to cheat, and we need an OO on site. Or do we? I'm testing an alternative right now with Martin Henry, a Canadian pilot and world record-holder. He will provide me with record declarations for himself or his wife Mia Schokker (also a world record-holder) ahead of all his flights this summer (one sample is attached). The attached SMS message clearly indicates who will do the flight, and what the task is. Mia won't be able to fly with two GPS units tomorrow and then submit a claim for a 50 km triangle if the 100 km triangle didn't go well. (only one problem with the attached SMS: it doesn't indicate if the triangle is going to be flown clockwise or counter-clockwise).

I see a lot of promise in this technology. It's simple, cheap, and likely goof-proof. I'll let you know how it goes. Any comments?

Response to Stewart:

Hello to all!

Thanks to all for this valuable discussion. For me, everything seems clear in this case. In our country, we had no new OOs since some years. I will start an initiative to get new observes here. For the people responsible in overseeing records, it's much better to have an independent OO with no personal or business relation to the pilot. On a good day, pilots don't fly alone. If we come back to an understanding among pilots, that OOs are not "old fashioned and bureaucratic" but help to verify reliable records, it will not be a problem to get a sufficient number of OOs.

For the future, we can think about some "electronic task declaration centers". Pilots can then send via SMS, email,... a task declaration valid for one day or until the next task declaration for this pilot arrives. This is much better than some private SMSs between a pilot and an OO. We shall setup the minimum information required. Technically I see no problem to have such a server operated by our NAC. To make it safe for the pilot that his message arrived, the server could echo an acknowledgement.

Response by Stewart:

Everything is written that I would have, and more, about this question.

Hope this helps.

cheers

S

Additional response:

Regarding the above question. The notes at the bottom of the description of free distance imply a free distance must exceed a established declared task (as I read it). :

"To be homologated, the Free Distance record must exceed the corresponding "non free" record by the value defined in 3.4."

He needs to look at what record he is attempting to attain and see whether or not there is an established record. For Paragliding the current declared triangle distance is 237.1 km's. To break this record he will need to exceed the distance by the values defined in 3.4. Note: the declared triangle record does not permit a mid point start finish, yet the free distance does. (I think I have this right?)

As far as our experiment with OO options I don't think we really have a plan that is tested. I'm not comfortable with any sort of procedure that we could make up to get "it" to work... we need to figure it out first. I think SMS or Email combined a Data Logger may prove to be a valuable procedure that will enhance the validity of a claim, it may not prove to be enough to deal with the perceived need to control and observe the use of the recording device.

For now, he will still need an OO, to observe the protocols (GPS- the observation of the clearing of the track log... through to the download as defined by the present rules. Data logger- OO as defined by the present rules). The key to free distance and the OO, is to supervise the instrument for the claim. The actual claim is established after the flight. What I will suggest is, Hans should contact the NAC that will oversee the claim, and question the use of a family member as a OO (might I suggest he at the very least he make the effort to get a few more pilots signed up as OO's! This in fact is, if a pilot wants to come down and fly with us, it is mandatory that he/she get their OO status!....)

The essence of the rules is the idea that the pilots claim can be verified by an acceptable Official Observer. The OO administers the device and is willing to verify all aspects of the claim. This question of "more than one device" is settled by the OO. The question of changing a non free distance task (a declared task) during the flight is handled by the OO who "secures" the declaration prior to flight. By the way, I would also like to point out.... It's not always the wife that performs the ground crew duties!..... Sometimes the Husband gets stuck with the task! ;-)

Response to above proposal

This sounds to me like a very good proposal. It could also be one central server run by the FAI where you have to send your SMS to and which sends out a confirmation SMS. I don't see a point of running multiple national servers. We should get it going soon.



CIVL Safety and Training Subcommittee Report: Bureau Meeting Ribiers, France November 7th - 9th, 2008

Since taking over the work of this subcommittee from Klaus Tänzler, and with ominous warnings from the FAI over the past 3 years, that SAFETY is and will most likely remain an area of high priority. Most of my work since February has been divided into ascertaining exactly how this SC has worked in the past 5 years, by going back in the minutes and records of previous meetings and attempting to work out, how I would like to set up this SC as streamlined and efficient as possible for the future, and maintain an increased focus on safety and training.

So activities during 2008 have been ascertaining what documents both virtual and online that relate to this SC, as well as dealing with the issues/questions at hand at any given time as well as attending an ESTC meeting (European Safety & Training Commission) in Chamonix, France, where items that needed to be addressed in a European perspective were discussed and new contacts to other Safety and Training specialists within EU were established. (See document: **2008 Chamonix 1**, attached).

I asked to be part of the Safety Meeting held in Paris, France Sept. 15th convened by the president of FAI, but this request was declined, as it seems CIVL already had ample representation of the CIVL Bureau (Flip, John and Leonard). Minutes are available.

Documents relevant to this SC are: SafePro, ParaPro, IPPI Card. See: www.fai.org/hang_gliding/documents Also, * New Incident Report Form

Other relevant SC sites on the FAI/CIVL website:

Safety and Training:

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/civl/subcommittees/safety_training

Safety:

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/safety

The International Pilot Rating Systems (SafePro / Parapro):

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/safety/rating_systems

The International Pilot Proficiency Information (IPPI) Card

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/safety/ippi

Hang Gliding & Paragliding Safety Notifications:

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/safety/safety_notices.asp

Safety issues concerning our equipment have been and will be passed on to the HG relevant SC for discussion and recommendation and decision, PG issues to the PG SC, Aerobatics and PG Accuracy the same, and I anticipate that these SCs will report

any “safety” issues or concerns that they may have throughout the year with this SC as they have done in the past, and it is a system that doesn’t really need working on. Pitch control, wing loading, line shock load and glider certification are proof that CIVL has been actively involved in controlling dangerous developments in our sport.

Safety issues on a whole, concerning equipment failure or recall of equipment, is covered poorly by CIVL and could be improved by making official contact to the testing bodies world wide, asking for regular updates on new wings or other equipment issues, as well as ensuring that our CIVL site also shows the latest recalls or warnings concerning our flight equipment.

Updating the FAI website on links to the latest testing bodies and to show cooperating manufacturers of our flight equipment could be viewed as improving visibility, cooperation and last but not least, safety. See:

http://www.fai.org/hang_gliding/safety/safety_notices.asp

The new CIVL Incident Report Form:

In cooperation with Mark Dale technical officer BHPA, Dave Thompson BHPA and John Lovell ESTC/BHPA, I have been given the BHPA’s version of their **Incident Report Form**. I slightly modified it with a CIVL logo, but this form is only meant as a template, as it primarily refers to “free flying” and not competition flying.

The heads of the respective HG and PG specialties are asked to examine and study this template and feel free to make comments and to “customise” it to meet their specific needs eg. XC - HG & PG, Accuracy & Aerobatics HG & PG, these results will again be collected and evaluated by this SC and together with the bureau a final draft of a new Incident Report Form should be produced at the next plenary. See.

Document attached: **New CIVL Incident Report Form template.doc**

The gathering and evaluation of these accident statistics of all upcoming FAI Cat 1 competitions will be one of the latest developments for increasing safety awareness that this SC will be working with for the next many years.

This data base will be maintained by FAI on its server and the SC will work with Agust Gudmundsson (who has already promised his assistance), in liaison with FAI, to ensure that this project will also get off the ground expeditiously and possibly be available as an “online service” to national team leaders , pilots and CIVL/FAI officials at the competition site within a year.

However until it is available online, it should become part of the FAI/CIVL Steward’s job, to ensure that he collects all Incident Report Forms from the pilots or team leaders and then passes a hard copy of these to the FAI Jury at the competition site, before the end of the competition. These can then be collated by CIVL and entered onto the database eventually.

Annual Incident Statistics of FAI Cat 1 competitions should be produced for the delegates as of 2010, although these will not show much as far as reliable statistics are concerned within the first few years. Furthermore this mandatory incident reporting

system should also be considered to apply to all Cat 2 competitions that run under FAI regulations in the future.

Similar Incident databases already exist in other European countries as well as national “online” versions of incident reporting worldwide. CIVL should follow suit and money needs to be budgeted to write the software and create the online database, and consideration given to maintaining/updating the data.

SafePro: Probably could do with a revision; however there is no activity as of the moment concerning changes to this document. Ask the HG SC to review the document and come back with comments.

ParaPro: Needs updating, as it has last been updated in 2005. At the plenary meeting in Mexico in 2007, this SC held a meeting and made recommendations to the plenary which were passed by the plenary. Due to some misunderstanding, the document has not yet been updated. This will be rectified by the end of November 2008.

IPPI: International Pilot Proficiency Identification: Does it need an update or does it need to be widened to also cover tandem/biplane/passenger HG and PG qualifications? There have been questions concerning this in particular. What about motorized HG or PG? Should this also be covered in the future? Discussions required.

Personally, I do not see that having tandem/biplane/passenger as well as towing or winching qualification of HG or PG qualifications or ratings visible on this card as a problem. Both SafePro and ParaPro will have to be updated to reflect this as well.

However I do have a problem with motorized assisted flying being on the IPPI card. In many countries these aircraft are not considered HG’s or PG’s but micro light aircraft. Powered paragliding and hang gliding is covered by CIMA and should be responsible for issuing international licences or pilot proficiency documentation.

Training of FAI Jury and Stewards: Recommendation: Training sessions should consider making a separate training session specifically for the FAI stewards on safety issues. Prospective stewards should be made aware that they need to be more proactive in addressing mistakes and correcting faults immediately to ensure that incidents can be proactively avoided, by thinking and acting on issues in association with the organization and not only observing and reporting retrospectively. Incidents need to be avoided.

The FAI Stewards’ team should always try to have at least one official that has actually had competition experience as a pilot, on the team. More awareness of the differences of each FAI officer’s roles should be stressed.

Aerobatics: ESTC Safety concerns and recommendations: See document: (2008 Chamonix 1.doc)

In 2006 the ESTC has made recommendations to CIVL concerning the 6 issues highlighted in green font colour on page 4 of this document. This has not been passed on to CIVL until now. This information will be forwarded to the Aerobatics SC chair as soon as possible for evaluation and recommendation.

In conclusion, although there is a fair amount of work that this SC is responsible for, most of the communication concerning ongoing matters can and should be done as online collaborations, between the members of this SC and all of the other heads of SC's, specialists and delegates throughout the year. An FAI-hosted email list will be established.

The pertinent paragraphs of our documents such as SafePro, ParaPro, IPPI and Incident Reporting Form that need to be changed or amended can be discussed online between the members of this SC throughout the year.

Sincerely Scott Torkelsen
Chairman CIVL Safety & Training

Software Working Group Report for CIVL Bureau meeting Nov.2008

The reports should cover issues raised by pilots, organisers, SSC members, delegates, Steward & Jury reports etc.; Outcomes (recommendations, proposals, actions); and concerns.

Subcommittee or Working Group: Software WG	Date: 5. November 2008
Name: Agust Gudmundsson	Confidential to Bureau: No For publication: Yes

1. Summary of subcommittee activity since the last report [Last report Plenary 2008]:

- a) Implementing and release of improved version of the **WPRS** formulas March 1st 2008.
- b) Ongoing work to improve the **WPRS** formulas for proposal for the Plenary in 2009.
- c) **WXC** World XC online contest was opened November 1st and number of online contests are already connected and scored
- d) Development and support of **FS**, new HG/PG XC flight verification and scoring system.
- e) Release of **FS web** pages for help/guidelines and user forum
- f) Supporting and maintenance of **CIVL database**
- g) Preparation for proposal of a project of Jury and Steward database, Judges database and accident/incident reporting system.

2. Issues raised, discussed or actioned and resolved:

- a) **Race** version 6.2.20 was released and published on the CIVL web. This new version is mostly bug fixes done in last 2-3 years. It is expected to be the last version of Race as the focus is on FS.
- b) **FS** the CIVL flight verification and scoring system was released and used in many competitions. A special CIVL web (<http://fs.fai.org>) has been built to handle information, guidelines and discussion forum for FS. Number of versions of FS have been released during the year and users get automatic updates of the system.
There has been no major faults or errors found since the release of FS. It can be said that FS has been received well and its release is a success. The flexibility in scoring is way better than was possible in Race. It has already more scoring formulas built in and the parameters and options for the scoring is much more than has been available before. There is work to be done in making new and improving various reports in the system. Also the FS-web is open for all to add more help and information for FS users. It would be helpful if competition organisers would add samples of real tasks from competitions. This is to help other task setters to see how various tasks can be set.
FS has been used in number of competitions during this year, including the HG pre World championship in Laragne. It is proposed to be used for the first time in a Category 1 competition in Laragne in 2009.
- c) **WXC**: The CIVL Software WG initiated last year a trial project to interconnect the online XC contests around the world, to form a CIVL World XC online contest.
The basic philosophy is to have an online XC contest to join the CIVL WXC network and submit the flights of that contest to the CIVL WXC. The pilots submit their flights to their local online XC contest, which in turn automatically also submits the flight claim to the CIVL WXC using the open source WXC protocol.

The system is already up and running. The work in progress now is to add new online contests to the WXC network. It has taken more time than expected. Now there are number of contest signed up to the WXC some are already connected and being scored. Others are working on the WXC protocol to get connected.

The CIVL WXC is intended to increase the interest of pilots to do more challenging flights and compare flights between pilots and different parts of the world.

Also it is intended to create more interest in online competitions on a country or continent level.

3. Issues raised to be resolved, suggested actions:

- a) Jury and Steward database: Handling Jury and steward information has been done manually. The process of selecting qualified jury and stewards for category 1 competitions has to be assisted with some software system.
- b) Judges database: The same applies to Judges for aerobatic and PG accuracy competitions, where a system is needed to handle and maintain information on Judges.
- c) Online accident reporting: Safety is of high importance in hang and paragliding. One aspect of it is collecting incident and accident reports. The Safety and Training SSC is working on a template for such reporting. That requires software to handle online registration of accident and incident reports. It also requires modules or system to produce statistics and information to indicate trends and to help in improving safety in hang and paragliding (including competitions)
- d) WPRS formula improvements: There is ongoing discussion on the WPRS formula and how it can be improved. The issues in the formula are:
PG accuracy: The difference in points between pilots can be very small in many cases, just 0.5 points.
PG aerobatics: The average number of competitors is now using the total of both synchro and solo. It could be solved by averaging separately for synchro and solo.
PG XC: There is concern on the points pilots get in different competitions. Some stronger competitions seem to give pilots placed in the middle of the results too high points compared to other competitions. Work is ongoing to improve the balance between competitions.
- e) WXC system: The WXC online contest system will be in continuous improvement to have more functionality. One issue is to automate somewhat badge flight claims. Another issue is to show tracklogs of current and past HG/PG World records. Also it has been mentioned to use the WXC system to handle some issues of setting records. This might include a way for pilot to define number of possible flights. Then just before the flight he can send email or sms to the system or some remote observer and state what task he will be doing. The Record and Badges SSC report describes the issue.
- f) WXC server: The WXC server is running in hosted environment. The DHV has kindly agreed to pay for the hosting until end of this year. In beginning of November we saw some of the services shut down without notice. Because of this the system has to be moved quickly to another server. The transfer of the system to another server has been prepared and will finish in November.

4. Issues or concerns requiring Plenary or Bureau guidance/response:

- a) A proposal will be made to include FS in S7 as approved software for Category 1 competitions at the next Plenary.
- b) An improvement of the WPRS formula for all disciplines will be put forward for the Plenary to adopt from March 1st 2009.
- c) The WG suggests that CIVL Bureau accepts to develop a system to handle Jury and Steward information. The system should also handle Judges information for accuracy and aerobatics.
- d) A possibly separate system to handle online registration of incidents and accidents, details to be defined in cooperation with the safety and training SSC.
- e) The definition of a system to manage Jury, Steward and Judges is to be defined in November and see if it fits within current budget and if approved, development to be started as soon as possible.

5. Issues of potential interest/relevance to other SSCs:

- a) The WPRS is classifying pilots in all disciplines of CIVL. Also it is used by some SSCs to define which pilots are qualified for Category 1 competitions.
- b) Development and support of FS for HG/PG XC competitions and eventually to handle PG accuracy and HG/PG aerobatics
- c) The WXC is interesting for HG and PG XC pilots so the relevant SSCs should promote flying and participation in WXC.
- d) A system handling Jury and Stewards information is relevant to all SSCs handling Category 1 competitions.
- e) Also a system handling Judges information is of relevance to PG accuracy and HG/PG aerobatics.
- f) Incident and accident reporting is of relevance to all SSCs as it focuses on safety in HG/PG competitions.