

## Sporting Code Committee

### World Record Review Panel proposals 2005.

#### WRRP - 2006 Year 2 changes to SC3.

The proposed amendments, which follow, are intended to achieve the proposals from the World Record Review Panel that were passed by the Plenary meeting last year.  
(Additions to the existing SC3 are shown in Blue, deletions shown with strikeout.)

#### WRRP Proposal 1

To restrict declarations for World Record claims to electronic recording only.

Amend 4.2.1 as follows: (amended section shown here, remainder as at present.)

##### 4.2.1 Declaration content

The information shall be written on a single sheet of paper or board, or recorded in the memory of a flight recorder prior to the flight.

For world records, only the latter shall apply. (AL7)

#### WRRP Proposal 2

To include in SC3 at appropriate places, a requirement for all personnel involved in verification and homologation, except the pilot and Official Observer (OO), to clearly be independent of the claimant and the flight other than the contact required by this code to collect data and information for verification purposes.

Replace the wording for 5.1.6 with rewritten

##### 5.1.6 Conflict of interest

~~Official Observers may not act in such capacity for any record or badge attempt:~~

~~a. In which they have any financial interest, or~~

~~b. In which they are pilot or passenger.~~

All personnel involved in data review and claim approval must ensure the claim is evaluated objectively according to the rules and procedures required by the Sporting Code.

As such:

a. Official Observers may not act for any record or badge attempt in which they have any financial interest or in which they are pilot or passenger. \*

b. For World Records, all personnel involved in homologating the claim must be independent of the claimant and OO other than the contact required to collect data and information for verification purposes.

(AL7)

*\* Ownership of the glider or motor glider shall not be considered "financial interest". The essence is that monetary or other substantial gain shall not depend on the successful certification of the claim by the OO or other individual concerned.*

##### 5.1.7 Violation of duty

In case of violation of duty, the appointment of the OO shall be withdrawn. In addition, negligent certifications or wilful misrepresentations are grounds for disciplinary action by the NAC concerned. (See also 3.0.5) (AL7)

## **World Record Review Panel continued:**

### **WRRP Proposal 3**

Qualifications required of an Official Observer overseeing a World Record claim.  
Add to para 5.1.4 and 5.1.5 further sections referring to OOs for World Records.

Note, A concern has been raised regarding 5.1.4 b (below) that this provision may prevent the claim of an otherwise valid world record, particularly for a performance that is not anticipated, so that arrangements for an approved OO to be on site have not been made. It was suggested that there should be a "let out" clause that would allow such records to be claimed. IGC is asked to consider if such a clause should be included. The intention of the proposal has been to ensure an OO experienced in FR validation controls the flight, no alternative wording has at this stage been suggested. Should IGC decide that provision for non approved OOs is desired, it is requested that the bureau be authorised to approve the amended wording for this rule so it may come into use on 1<sup>st</sup> Oct 2006.

#### **5.1.4 Competence**

- a. OOs must be knowledgeable in the Code and have the integrity, skill and competence necessary to control and certificate glider and motor glider flights without favour. Before being approved by the NAC, the OO should be given briefing or training appropriate to the duties of an OO.
- b. For World Records, the OO must be specifically approved in writing for this role, by the NAC. Previous satisfactory experience as an OO for FAI badges or National records where flight recorders were used shall be required before approval is given. Where more than one OO is involved, an OO with the NAC approval shall oversee and where necessary, certify that the work of other OOs is correctly verified.

*(The approved OO may be identified by the title "Senior OO" or similar.)*

#### **5.1.5 Geographical area of authority**

OOs are entitled to control and certificate flights of gliders and motor gliders in:

- a. The country of their own NAC, and
- b. In any country and for glider pilots of any nationality, if the country's NAC so permits.
- c. For World Records, the approved OO must have written authorisation from all the NAC's involved. (see 5.1.4 b)

### **WRRP Proposal 4**

For World record attempts any FR used to record the flight of a glider with a Means of Propulsion (MoP) must have an approved system that records the use of the MoP automatically without any action by the pilot. This MoP recording system must not be capable of being turned off or require the FR to have a special type of mounting within the cockpit.

(Para 1.3.6 included for clarity. No change to 1.3.6 is required. add additional sections to 4.8.1 and 4.8.2)

**MoP RECORDER 1.3.6** A device that either:

- a. Records the time and altitude of any operation of the MoP or a change in configuration of the glider after which the MoP cannot be operated, or
- b. Records the fact that the MoP is not being used. It must operate in such a way that failure of the device will indicate that the MoP is being used.

**World Record Review Panel** continued:

4.8 MEANS of PROPULSION EVIDENCE and CONTROL

4.8.1 Means of propulsion evidence

The requirement to record data on the use of any MoP may be fulfilled by any of the following methods:

- a. The data is recorded by a MoP recorder, or
- b. By direct observation from the ground that the MoP has stopped, provided that there is no means of restarting it, or
- c. By a seal applied to the MoP in such a way that the generation of forward thrust by the MoP always results in breaking the seal.
- d. For World Records, where a MoP recorder is required, it must be incorporated as part of the flight recorder.

4.8.2 **MoP control methods**

- a. With the use of an MoP recorder:  
The MoP recorder must be sealed and opened only by an OO, and must not be accessible to pilot or crew during flight, except where it is an IGC approved flight recorder operated in accordance with the IGC approval.
- b. Without the use of an MoP recorder:
  - (i) Before takeoff, the MoP may be sealed by an OO as in 4.8.1c (and the OO shall certify that the seal was intact after landing), or
  - (ii) The MoP may be rendered unusable by removing an essential part of the engine or the propeller (and the OO must certify that this was done), or
  - (iii) The MoP may have a mechanical lock applied to the retraction system that cannot be unlocked until after landing.
- c. For World Records the MoP recorder must be of a type (see 4.8.1d.), which records the use of the MoP automatically, without any special action by the pilot. It must not be capable of being switched off during the flight, nor require a special type of mounting within the glider to enable it to operate.

**WRRP Proposal 5**

Actions to be taken by IGC/FAI and applied to any pilot or OO proven to have falsified information or cheated in any manner to obtain the award of a World Record.

The resolution passed in 2005 specified a number of actions. However, FAI/IGC have limited rights to tell an NAC what to do. The Sporting license is issued by the NAC on behalf of the FAI, which could therefore invalidate it. The wording below is suggested as leaving room to manoeuvre depending on the seriousness of the event.

Create new Para 3.0.5 This is a rewrite of the original wording proposed.

**3.0.5 Falsification of evidence - actions to be taken**

Should it be proven that any person involved in a world record claim has altered, concealed, or in any other way misrepresented the claim's evidence with the intent to deceive, the claim shall fail. The FAI will invalidate Sporting Licences of those guilty of the fraud and may cancel permanently or for a period of time any other award, record, title, etc. it has conferred. The NAC(s) may be asked to cancel the appointment of the Official Observer(s) involved, where appropriate. (See also SC3 5.1.)

**World Record Review Panel continued:**

**WRRP Proposal 6**

Changes to the procedures for analysis of the FR data required by WRRP include sending the data from a world record claim in electronic form to FAI within 7 days. Note the change of "diskette" to "memory device" was not a WRRP requirement, but was suggested separately.

Previously we have not banned second FRs having a different declaration. It has been the subject of some discussion when it was pointed out that this could be a method of cheating. It is appropriate to include here as a part of the general strengthening of the World Record rules. There may be a legitimate reason to have a different declaration on a second FR, but it could also indicate an intention to cheat by claiming a different course from the original declaration. The last sentence in blue of the analysis paragraph indicates that the claimant would need to prove that the differing declaration was legitimate, not the homologator proving the reverse.

Amend 4.6.4 a iii as follows

- (iii) After flight  
After landing, the flight data shall be transferred from the FR to a ~~diskette~~ memory device acceptable to the NAC via a PC or other device in the manner specified in the IGC approval for the equipment. The OO shall check any seals that were applied before the flight. The ~~diskette containing the~~ flight data shall then be sent to a person approved by the NAC to make the analysis. This may be by physical dispatch of the memory device or by e-mail if acceptable to the NAC. For world record claims, a copy of the .igc file is to be sent to the FAI within 7 days along with the notification of a claim. (see 3.2 ) This process must be performed for all FRs carried during the flight. (AL7)

Amend 4.6.4 b as follows. The first para has been rewritten although some portions remain unchanged.

b. DATA ANALYSIS

~~Analysis of the flight data shall be performed by a qualified person approved by the NAC, whose duty is to ensure that the appropriate evidence is present to verify attainment of way points, heights, times and position, as required. Detailed guidelines for analysis are in Annex C. Where there is more than one FR, the one holding the last declaration shall normally be used for analysis. However, in the case of a failure or partial failure of this FR, another may be used provided it has the same declaration details and is approved for the type of flight performance claimed.~~

Analysis of the flight data shall be performed by a qualified person approved by the NAC, whose duty is to ensure that the appropriate evidence is present to verify the attainment of way points, heights, times and position. Analysis guidelines are in Annex C. Where there is more than one FR, the one holding the last declaration (the primary FR) shall normally be used for analysis. If the primary FR has a failure, a secondary FR may be used for verification provided it has the same declaration and flight data details. A difference in the declaration on a secondary FR from the primary FR may be grounds for refusal to accept any claim from that flight. If the soaring performance qualifies for a badge or record, the following shall be forwarded to the NAC. (AL7)

- (i) The original data ~~diskette~~ on the memory device (the first copy) storing the flight data for each FR. This must include the data file in \*.igc format, and the file in its original format (if different) as transferred from the flight recorder immediately after landing. (AL7)

The remaining paragraphs are not changed.

Ross Macintyre  
Sporting Code Committee