IGC Agenda 2006 Item 12.3.3

Agenda item 12.3.3.a

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) FOR A BETTER DEFINITION OF THE BEGINNING OF A SOARING PERFORMANCE

In SC3 the start and the beginning of a soaring performance are defined as follows:

START	1.1.7	The beginning of the SOARING PERFORMANCE. It must be either:	*(AL6)*
	a.	The release from launch, or stopping the use of any means of propulsion, or	
	b.	Leaving the OBSERVATION ZONE of a START POINT, or	
	c.	Crossing a START LINE.	
START POINT	1.1.8	The WAY POINT marking the beginning of a SOARING PERFORMANCE. It must be either:	*(AL6)*
	a.	The RELEASE POINT, or	
	b.	A WAY POINT declared as a START POINT, or	
	c.	The midpoint of a START LINE.	
START LINE	1.1.9	A horizontal line, 1 km in length, oriented approximately perpendicular to the first LEG. The midpoint of the line (the START POINT) is at ground level.	*(AL6)*

A careful study of this wording shows that there are several inconsistencies in the way the beginning of a soaring performance is defined.

Firstly the beginning of the soaring performance may be defined in different ways but it is not specified in which case these definitions apply. It is important to make clear that the start point may be the release point or stopping the use of any means of propulsion only if no way point has been declared as start point.

Furthermore according to the existing wording the start point may be the mid point of the start line. This definition does not take into account the fact that an observation zone is defined for the start point. To be consistent with the rest of the sporting code the beginning of the soaring performance should thus be defined as the leaving of this observation zone.

Finally we propose to introduce in the sporting code the concept of virtual release which is analogue to the virtual outlanding existing in the Annex A (and which we also propose to introduce in the sporting code in a separate proposal on the finish procedure)

We therefore propose to replace the existing wording of paras 1.17 to 1.1.9 by the following:

START **1.1.7 The beginning of the soaring performance. It is either:**

a. Leaving the observation zone of the way point declared as start point if any has been declared or

b. In the absence of such a declared point, the release from launch (or stopping the use of any means of propulsion) or a virtual release (any valid fix in the GNSS flight recorder following the real release)

START POINT **1.1.8 The way point marking the beginning of the soaring performance. It is either:**

a. The way point declared as start point or

b. In the absence of declared start point, the release point (or power off) or a virtual release point giving a better performance, or

START POINT OZ

1.1.9 The observation zone of the start point is in accordance with start and finish points OZ defined in the Sporting Code General Section, § A 13.2

Agenda item 12.3.3.b

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) FOR A BETTER DEFINITION OF THE END OF A SOARING PERFORMANCE

In SC3 the end of a soaring performance is defined as follows:

FINISH	1.1.11	The end of the SOARING PERFORMANCE. It occurs on: *(AL6)* a. Landing the glider, or b. Entering the OBSERVATION ZONE of the FINISH POINT, or c. Crossing a FINISH LINE, or d. Starting an MoP.
FINISH POINT	1.1.12	The WAY POINT marking the end of a SOARING PERFORMANCE. It is: *(AL6)* a. The point at which the nose of the glider comes to rest without external assistance after landing, or b. A WAY POINT declared as the FINISH POINT or goal, or c. The midpoint of a FINISH LINE, or d. The point at which an MoP is started.
FINISH LINE	1.1.13	A horizontal line, 1 km in length, oriented approximately perpendicular to the final LEG. The midpoint of the line (the FINISH POINT) is at ground level. *(AL6)*

A careful study of this wording shows that there are several inconsistencies in the way the end of a soaring performance is defined.

Firstly, the end of the soaring performance may be defined in different ways (after the flight) but it is not specified in which case these definitions apply. For instance, it is important to make clear that the finish point may be where landing or starting the use of any means of propulsion only if no way point has been declared as finish point.

Furthermore according to the existing wording the finish point may be the mid point of the finish line. This definition does not take into account the fact that an observation zone is defined for the finish point elsewhere in the code. To be consistent with the rest of the sporting code the end of the soaring performance should thus be defined as the entering in this observation zone. All references to the finish line should be deleted.

Finally we propose to introduce in the sporting code the concept of virtual outlanding which is already exists in Annex A. The absence of such a concept generates anomalies and even inequality between gliders and motorgliders. Let's take a simple example: a glider and a motorglider leave together to try a silver distance on an out and return - 2x60km. At 5km from the turnpoint (under a storm), they have to turn back. The motorglider which flies back with the engine on will gain the silver distance unlike the glider which soars back.

We therefore propose to replace the existing wording of paras 1.1.11 to 1.1.13 by the following:

FINISH **1.1.11 The end of the soaring performance. It is either:**

a. Entering the observation zone of the way point declared as finish point if any has been declared or,

b. In the absence of way point declared as finish point, performing the real landing or a virtual outlanding (the position and time of a virtual outlanding may be any valid fix in the GNSS flight record preceding the real landing).

FINISH POINT **1.1.1 The way point marking the end of the soaring performance. It is either:**

a. The way point declared as finish point if any has been declared or,

b. In the absence of way point declared as finish point, the point at which the nose of the glider comes to rest without external assistance after landing (or a virtual outlanding position giving a better performance).

FINISH POINT OZ **1.1.13 The observation zone of the finish point is in accordance with start and finish points OZ defined in the Sporting Code General Section, § A 13.2 (see SC3 § 1.1.9).**

Agenda item 12.3.3.c

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) FOR A BETTER DEFINITION OF THE FLIGHT DECLARATION

In SC3, the flight declaration is defined as follows:

DECLARATION	1.3.2	The official description of the task and other data as listed and defined in 4.2.

We feel that this definition of the flight declaration is not sufficient since this document is the most important data conditioning the soaring performance.

The **Flight declaration** should be considered as a contract (between the Official Observer and the Pilot) precisely defining the performance of the attempted distance.
As, after the failure of a distance flight with declared way points, the declaration can be amended, the contents of the available changes should be defined precisely and clearly in the § 1.3.2.

We therefore propose the following wording:

DECLARATION 1.3.2 The official description of the task and other data as listed and defined in 4.2

a. **A declaration is always required except where specifically not required in the rules (§ 1.4.1c).**

b. **Way points must be declared and used in the sequence declared except where specifically not required in the rules (§1.4.1d).**

c. **ALL the declared way points may be cancelled together after the flight, the declared distance thus becoming a free distance.**

d. **The way point declared as finish point may be cancelled after the flight, the declared goal distance thus becoming a distance using up to 3 turning points (ended by a real or virtual landing).**

Agenda item 12.3.3.d

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) TO REINSTATE THE POSSIBILITY OF CLAIMING MORE THAN ONE DISTANCE OR SPEED RECORD ON A SINGLE FLIGHT

Affected paragraph of the Sporting Code SC3 para. 3.02 and SC3c para. 4.5

Motivation

In 1999, the IGC Plenary decided to restrict the record claimed on a single flight to one speed record.
In 2004, the plenary meeting also restricted the records claimed on a single flight to one distance record.

We feel that these decisions were wrong because there is absolutely no logical reason to prevent a pilot from becoming the holder of a record if he has broken it in valid conditions.

A typical example of the unfairness of this rule was given when Terry Delore and Steve Fossett had to renounce their claim to the *straight distance to a goal* world record of 2,128 km for the flight they achieved on 4 December 2004 because they could only claim one record (they selected the free distance record of 2.193 km). Therefore, Klaus Ohlmann is still the holder of the distance to goal world record ,despite his performance having been overtaken. Interestingly, Klaus Ohlmann himself pointed out the anomaly of this rule during his keynote speech of last year.

As far as we know, such a rule does not exist in any other air sport

We feel, therefore, that the delegates would gain distinction in reinstating the possibility of claiming more than one distance or speed record on a single flight.

If the delegates agree with this proposal, we recommend that it become effective from 1st of April 2006 in order to put an end to this anomalous situation as soon as possible.

Agenda item 12.3.3.e

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) FOR A BETTER DEFINITION OF THE ACHIEVEMENT OF A GOAL

In SC3, achieving the goal is defined as follows:

> 4.3.4 **Achieving the goal**
> Where the soaring performance is required to end at a declared finish point, the goal will be achieved if:
>
> a. The landing point is within 1000 metres of the declared finish point or,
>
> b. If the finish point is an airfield, the landing is within the boundaries of the airfield or,
>
> c. Satisfactory evidence is produced showing that the glider was in the observation zone and within 1000 metres of the finish point, or
>
> d. A finish line at the goal is crossed.
>
> e. For any type of closed course goal flight where a start other than release or a start line is used, the glider must exit the start point OZ within 1000 metres of the declared start point. *(AL6)*

We believe that this wording is not clear enough and leaves too many options open.

For example, the **means of achieving a set goal** can equally, if necessary, be chosen after the flight. If the pilot has failed to fly over the two finish point observation zones and the same happens with the finish line, it is possible to change to the landing position (or the engine start-up point). And if the landing takes place less than 1km before the finish line or within the limits of the airfield declared as the finish point, the set goal is considered to have been achieved.

A speed record attempt where the glider lands out (or restarts the engine) 900m before the finish line is valid on the declared distance between the start and the finish with the glider's landing time as finish time!

Furthermore, it would be a good thing to get now a better similitude between the SC3 and its annex A for this question of achieving a goal.

We propose to simplify this definition as following:

> **4.3.4 ACHIEVING THE GOAL**
> **The goal is achieved if:**
>
> **a. The glider entered (or landed in) the FAI finish observation zone of the way point declared as finish point,**
>
> **b. And, for any type of closed course goal flight, the start and finish observation zones were respectively left and entered within 1000m from the start/finish point.**

Agenda item 12.3.3.f

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) NOT TO REQUIRE A WORLD RECORD TO BE A NATIONAL RECORD, IF IT IS CLAIMED BY AN INTERNATIONAL TEAM

The FAI accepts the validation of records claimed by international teams composed of members of different nationalities or affiliated to different NACs.

However, according to paragraph 6.1.2 of the Sporting Code General Section « To be eligible as a World Record, the performance must have been recognised as a National record by the NAC, except as concerns international team performances in Class G (Parachutes – Largest Formation Record), and for all performances in Class K (Spacecraft) and Class P (Aerospacecraft).»

The FFVV thinks that it is illogical to require a performance established by an international team to be recognised as a National record, since in most countries a pilot must either be a citizen of this country or have lived in this country for more than 3 years to become the holder of a national record.

We therefore propose, that the plenary mandate the IGC Board to file a proposal to the FAI to extend the exemption of the requirement to be recognised as a National record to all international team performances in gliding.

Agenda item 12.3.3.g

PROPOSAL FROM THE FRENCH GLIDING FEDERATION (FFVV) TO CREATE A MICROLIGHT MOTORGLIDER CLASS

Microlight aircraft are becoming more and more popular in many countries. This is due to the fact that they are cheaper than certified aircraft and benefit, in many countries, from very liberal regulations. For example, in France, pilots need no medical, no log book and they can take off from any field with the permission of the field's owner.

Several manufacturers, mostly from the East European countries, have started to produce motorgliders which comply with the microlight specifications (in Europe, the maximum take-off mass is limited to 300 kg for a single seater and 450 kg for a two seater and min. speed 65 km/h). This trend was clearly visible at the Aero 2004 exhibition in Friedrichshafen, where as many microlight motorgliders as conventional motorgliders were displayed. Microlights like the Silent, Apis, Test, Alpine, Taurus, look really like modern motorgliders. They have retractable engines and show interesting performance.

The gliding movement is, therefore, faced with the emergence of a light gliding movement which is developing outside of the structures of our gliding community. As a consequence, there is a major risk that the gliding movement will lose members to the profit of the microlight movement. Furthermore, there is a safety issue since such microlights can only be flown safely if their pilot has been trained like a glider pilot.

The FFVV thinks, therefore, that the IGC should provide a home for this kind of motorglider. We know that we already have (too) many classes but the creation of such a class is largely justified by the number of existing microlight gliders, which is probably already higher than the number of gliders in all other existing light glider classes.
Clearly the IGC would make a major historical mistake by missing this train!