



Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

held in Budapest

Friday 6th and Saturday 7th March 2020

at Grand Hotel Margitszigeti

Draft Ver. 3/3/2021 8:31 PM

1. Opening and Welcome (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The IGC President Mr. Mozer welcomed the delegates to the 2020 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked them for coming to Budapest. Mr. Mozer then asked people that were participating in the IGC meeting for the first time to present themselves. The new delegates from Australia and Switzerland and, the delegate and alternate delegate from Romania were all warmly welcomed by IGC. Then Mr. Mozer expressed his gratitude to the local organizers of the meeting, in particular Mr. Andras Gyöngyösi, Mrs. Diana Gyöngyösi and Mr. Gergo Czirak from the Hungarian Gliding Federation for their excellent support, which allowed the meeting to be very well prepared. Furthermore, Mr. Mozer welcomed the member of the FAI Executive Board Ms. Marina Vigorito who joined the meeting for item 4 – FAI Matters.

1.1 Absent friends (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President then called the meeting to order and requested the observation of a moment of silence in honor of friends and colleagues lost in the previous year.

1.2 Roll Call (Vladimir Foltin)

During the roll it was determined that 33 votes were present including 6 proxies (from Ireland to UK, from Brazil to Argentina, from New Zealand to South Africa, from Canada to USA, from Sweden to Denmark and from Turkey to Italy). Thus 17 votes were required for an absolute majority on any ballot, 22 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

From agenda item 6.1.3 onwards Lithuania (having also the proxy from Latvia) joined the meeting and the proxy from Chile to Spain has been confirmed and accounted for. The quorum therefore changed to 37 votes present including 8 proxies, 19 votes required for an absolute majority on any ballot and 25 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

That quorum remained the same for the rest of the meeting.

1.3 Administrative matters (Vladimir Foltin)

- The IGC Plenary appointed Professor Peter Ryder to oversee the counting of ballots during the meeting.
- The IGC Secretary Vladimir Foltin briefed the meeting about the administrative matters including the new proposal templates and about possibility to use FAI cloud services for submitting and sharing proposals among the IGC bodies and IGC Delegates, while reminding that the IGC meeting cloud is a private workspace only for delegates
- The Secretary recalled the privacy laws in Europe which require persons' consent to share their pictures or other records and asked the meeting participants if there are any privacy related concerns or remarks in that sense (no concerns or remarks were raised).
- The Secretary also informed about practicalities for the IGC social event on Friday evening, where all delegates, meeting participants, companions and FAI staff were invited.

1.4 Declaration of Conflicts of Interest (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President asked the meeting participants to declare any conflicts of interest, which was done.

2. Minutes of previous meeting, Istanbul 8 and 9 March 2019 (Eric Mozer/Vladimir Foltin)

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Istanbul 8 and 9 March 2019 prepared by IGC Secretary Mr. Vladimir Foltin and asked if there were any comments. There were no comments and the minutes were unanimously approved.

3. IGC President's report (Eric Mozer)

Mr. Mozer welcomed the new participants to the IGC Plenary meeting. Then he verbally summarized information provided in the written report circulated before the meeting (available [here](#)).

The President also briefed the meeting participants about the recent developments regarding outcomes of 10th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2019, Lakekeepit, Australia and about the letter from IGC to GFA concerning the Bureau decision (available [here](#)) about immediate removal of Mr. Cubley from all his duties and roles in the IGC and that he will not be considered as eligible to hold any position within IGC until 4 March 2025.

Mr. Mozer concluded that the meeting agenda is extremely full and there are many important items for discussion therefore, he asked all the delegates to contribute to these discussions in constructive and efficient manner.

3.1 Bureau Decisions taken since the last Plenary that need the IGC Plenary approval

Finally, Mr. Mozer presented the IGC Bureau decisions taken on behalf of the Plenary since its last annual meeting in 2019. The list of relevant Bureau decisions could be found [here](#) and [here](#).

3.2 Discharge of Bureau responsibility for decisions since last Plenary

The IGC Plenary then discharged the IGC Bureau of responsibility for the decisions taken since the 2019 IGC Plenary.

4. FAI Matters

4.1 FAI's report to the IGC Plenary (Ms. Marina Vigorito, FAI Executive Director)

Ms. Marina Vigorito, the FAI Executive Director thanked Mr. Mozer and IGC Delegates for an opportunity to address the IGC Plenary meeting remotely via videoconference (due to COVID-19 related travel restrictions in Italy). Mrs. Vigorito presentation (available [here](#)) covered the following items: FAI General Conference 2019 & Budget 2020, FAI World Air Games 2022, The World Games (& Olympics), Antidoping & FAI Secretariat. She also mentioned the following:

- The budget proposal was not approved nor the proposal from Russia for membership fees increase by 10%.
- The work of the group to reshape the FAI led by Mr. Bob Henderson, the FAI President.
- Termination of FAI World Air Games 2022 contract and cancellation of the event. The result could be that a centrally organized FAI events will not be probably taking place in the longer future.
- Praised the work of IGC as a well-organized commission.
- FAI Secretariat is being reorganized, which could cause some delays. The completion of the reorganization may take at least one year.
- Unpredictability of COVID-19 situation.
- Mrs. Vigorito is acting as the new FAI Executive Board point of contact for WADA and anti-doping. She reminded pilots should always contact doctor about medicaments. The antidoping case of Russia is still under investigation by Sport Arbitration Court in Lausanne and no actions were taken yet.

The full presentation is available on the 2020 IGC Plenary meeting cloud.

Mr. Mozer thanked Mrs. Vigorito for the presentation and added:

- Since the FAI secretariat refocus to support the NACs and air sports there was no lack of communication or delays and all necessary support was provided. However, the workload may increase with coming season.
- As for doping, Air Sport Commissions (ASC) asked for implementation of random tests of athletes out of competitions because FAI was asked to participate in the overall programme.

Mrs. Vigorito responded that there were 5 out of contest checks and all were able to show not substances. She added that the next FAI GC may not be obviously in Wuhan and that FAI is in contacts with other nations offering possible alternate locations. She then concluded by wishing IGC a successful meeting and expressing a wish to meet again soon in person.

5. Finance (Mr. Dick Bradley)

Note: The 2019 Financial statement and 2020 budget is available for download via cloud.

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2019 Financial Statement

The IGC Treasurer Mr. Dick Bradley presented the 2019 Finance Report and the 2020 budget.

The 2018 report showed an estimated income of 31,288 € and the expenditure 37,272 €. The reserves decreased by 5,984 € to 84,688 €. The IGC Plenary accepted the Financial Report with a caveat that the figures are still provisional and small adjustments could be made following the final review.

5.2 2020 Budget

The 2020 budget showed expected income of 42,500 € and expenditure of 56,080 €. The IGC Plenary then accepted the Budget for 2020. The negative budget of – 13,000 € may be further affected by the impact COVID-19 measures (cancelled competitions and lower Ranking List income). Mr. Mozer thanked to Mr. Bradley for the presentation and all his work for IGC over many years. Mr. Bradley then mentioned that he started the role of IGC Treasurer in 1996 after at that time IGC president Prof. Peter Ryder volunteered him for the job. Mr. Bradley concluded by thanking for having the opportunity to serve for IGC, which allowed him to find many new friends he will have fond of memories. He then wished all the best to his successor Mr. Patrick Pauwels from Belgium.

6. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

6.1 Year-2 Proposals

6.1.1 Maximum Period and Minimum Separation of Events (Netherlands)

Mrs. Kuijpers (Netherlands) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Rutkowski (Poland) – Is the rest date defined somewhere in the rules?

Mr. Sheppe (USA & Annex A Committee Chair) – It is defined in Annex A.

Mr. Szabo (Hungary) – Official training became mandatory, that may exceed the overall period to 16 days.

Proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

6.1.2 Digital Safety Registration System (Netherlands)

Mrs. Kuijpers (Netherlands) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Eriksen (Denmark) – It will be an unnecessary burden for organizers. All Annex proposals this year are lacking overall strategy where IGC wants to go with Annex A in the future. We are just correcting and updating the code repeatedly.

Mr. Geissler (Germany) – This proposal will mean that a conventional paper box will not be possible to be used anymore.

Mrs. Kuijpers – The system is modified to respect GDPR privacy restrictions. All pilots are registered automatically before the competition. We can have many reports from pilots especially from the air and that together with the proximity tool can help in getting an overall overview of the situation better before discussing it with pilots concerned. I cannot imagine that with the paper box. If case the proposal will not be supported IGC may lose these opportunities.

Georgas (Greece) – It is a good proposal, but I have a concern with the wording. It describes in too much details the management process for championships organizers. Should this be something that needs to go to our Sporting Code?

Mr. Sheppe – I agree with Mr. Georgas, it is a good proposal, but it should not be in Annex A. Proposal was lost with a narrow majority.

It has been however suggested to put the recommendation for use of Digital Safety Registration System in the guidelines for stewards and championship organisers and that suggestion was generally accepted.

6.1.3 External Aid to Competitors (UK)

The original proposal (available [here](#)) has been amended by UK and seconded. Only the amended proposal was discussed at this stage (available [here](#)).

Mr. Spreckley (UK & IGC 1st Vice-President) introduced the amendment and added - UK has the same problem as everybody else after OGN has become widely available. Experience at the recent Championships shows that pilots are becoming busy on the phone so that e.g. the CD at Junior WGCs needed to make a statement about not to use mobile devices in flight. This proposal bans it and that is totally accepted by the pilots.

Mr. Bjernevik (Norway) – Mobile phones are used also for SAR and in similar situations.

Mr. Spreckley – The mobile phones should not be used in flight.

Mr. Rutkowski – I must disagree with Mr. Spreckley, mostly because of the enforcement issues. For example, there could be a communication of unapproved frequency or a cloud flying, what could be a supporting evidence? I am strongly against this proposal because of enforcement issues in the future.

Mr. Bjernevik – There is an issue with wording. It should be phrased as what is allowed (e.g. devices) and not as what is banned. If the device would not be listed, it will be allowed.

Mr. Schmelzer (Belgium) – I have some remarks. The rule with this wording would allow WhatsApp if it will be fixed in the cockpit. This needs to be changed. The safety is also mentioned, there needs to be a possibility to communicate with the team captain. In practice a lot of teams communicate the OGN data via voice channel, we need to see if we want to cover it in the future rules.

Mr. Koutny (Czech Republic) – I disagree because it will not be controllable. Some good instruments can show weather information and that will mean that the pilots with more expensive instruments may have an advantage.

Mr. Polutnik (Slovenia) – I must second the same thoughts as Mr. Koutny, such rules would be a huge step backwards for development of gliding sport. Now you can have weather information in the cockpit and that is a huge improvement for gliding. All what is proposed here is because of other competitors' visibility. I know it is not possible to always use a mobile device in gliders. But it can eliminate the differences between big and small teams like e.g.

Slovenia. We cannot have a big support team on the ground. All these small things make rules more complex and that is in the end to the disadvantage for small teams.

Mr. Richter-Trummer (Austria) – The mobile phones could be sealed in envelope before each flight and that could be checked.

Mr. Georgas – We have in front of us a decision not to use these data for sporting and regulate it through cheating.

Mr. Casado (Spain) – In my country it is illegal to do text messaging while driving, this proposal is the same as is required by Spanish authorities.

Mr. Spreckley – (in response to Mr. Polutnik) We could specifically allow meteorological data in a controlled way. But if we say no to this proposal, we will send a wrong signal.

Mr. Bjornevik – We are mixing 2 things, the data transfer vs use of the mobile phones.

Mr. Foltin (Slovakia) – Can only support what some others already said. Hands free phoning is allowed in cars. Our problem is the pilots' distraction, but it is not addressed properly in this proposal.

Mr. Frenc (Serbia)– The sealing of the mobile phone in an envelope will not work, pilots may have other mobile phones that will not be declared.

Mr. Roine (Finland) – Would UK be willing to amend the proposal to reflect on the discussion?

Mr. Spreckley – I am much more concerned about the safety issue in 5.3.3 not about the rest. I would prefer to keep the existing wording.

Mr. Bjornevik – I would like to have the mobile phone removed from the text (the motion was not seconded).

Mr. Spreckley – That would not make any change.

Mr. Rutkowski – Poland is against, we have already accepted this information before and now we want to ban it.

Mr. Georgas – Regarding the voice is data transfer, we could change the term 'mobile phone' to 'hand-held devices' and that may bring clarity. Could we have perhaps a separated vote?

Mr. Schmelzer – Taken from the pilot's perspective, the next thing the pilots will do will be mounting a handheld into their cockpits. The Annex A already states that the data transfers are not allowed as well as the exchanges with other non-competing pilots. The exception is the communication with the team. Why this was not followed properly in Lakekeepit?

Mrs. Kuijpers – In Lakekeepit only WhatsApp was allowed by the organizer to be able to reach out to the pilots flying close to smoke and fires in very long distance, too far for VHF communication. For safety reasons it should be possible to use mobile phones.

Mr. Spreckley – May I propose to interrupt the discussion to be able to amend the proposal based on the feedback and then discuss it again later during the meeting?

Mr. Eriksen - We all can agree on the safety aspect. But how do we see the 20m-two-seat class developing in the future? We must think more strategically.

The discussion was then postponed to next day of the meeting.

The discussion reconvened at the beginning of Session 7 of Day 2.

Mr. Spreckley introduced the finally amended proposal (available [here](#)).

Mrs. Kuijpers – As a Team Captain I used to warn my pilots about showers and other threats.

Mr. Spreckley - These is covered by the third sentence in point iii and text ...or as specifically allowed by organizer.

Mrs. Kuijpers – I have no clear visibility of the potential impact of the proposal. I would appreciate having more time to study it.

Mr. Rutkowski – This is a changed wording for voice transfers between team members and them and Team Captain. Why these changes were introduced?

Mr. Spreckley - We have had a discussion yesterday on newly introduced aspects. We do not want to make a rule on this in Annex A. We propose instead a general rule that can be adapted for specific competitions. This will allow some actions in case something becomes unacceptable.

Mr. Koutny – I would like to know what can be considered as acceptable and what as a not unacceptable. Some teams can have AWACS kind of aircraft flying in the contest area some other team may have other tools. Perhaps we need to allow it. Also, I would appreciate more details.

Mr. Georgas – The use of technology at our championships is a complex issue. We will need to rely on the championship organisers to enforce it. This will require Local Procedures to specify all the details and these will need to be approved by the Bureau.

Mr. Polutnik – We need to split the text into two separate paragraphs. The use of mobile phones needs to be allowed for safety reasons and that should be in the rules to send a strong message to the outside world. The second issue is about ability or inability to see gliders that are far ahead. There are developments that the team pilots want to have immediate information about climb rate etc. from their teammates.

Mr. Messmer (Switzerland) – Will this rule allow communication with Air Traffic Control or within Radio Mandatory Zones?

Mr. Spreckley – This is a very good question. Such a communication is not allowed by Annex A, but these cases would be now covered in point iii.

Mrs. Kuijpers – What about specifying a possibility to access the meteorological information for safety reasons?

Mr. Spreckley – That would not be a good way forward. We currently have a customized practice. We first need to establish what is normally acceptable and communicate before introducing it in the Local Procedures. I see this as not being specified yet unless we get some experience.

Mr. Richter-Trummer – I am very in favor of this proposal as it reverts the logic and gives the organizers and IGC a chance to say what is allowed.

Mr. Rutkowski – That was a very important point raised about interaction with Air Traffic Services in general. We have had a situation where pilots were required to monitor a specific frequency of military area. We should modify the text slightly to allow for these situations.

Mr. Schmelzer - This is much more improved text than the one from yesterday. But what about penalties?

Mr. Spreckley – These are further specified at the end of the proposal. Regarding the use of prescribed frequencies, the current rule does not allow talking to Air Traffic Services unless for landing at that airport.

Mr. Foltin – The current rules in Annex A allow organisers to add a specific requirement on communication with Air Traffic Services in the Local Procedures, thus the example made by Mr. Rutkowski can be compliant with the rules.

Mr. Gyongyosi (Hungary) – When the proposed rule refers to organizer, does it mean IGC or the championship organisers?

Mr. Spreckley - It means the latter.

Proposal was adopted by a large majority.

Day 2 of the meeting then continued with agenda item 6.2.17.

The items below were discussed on Day 1 after the discussion on 6.1.3 was interrupted.

6.1.4 Pilot Event Marker start procedure (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Poland)

The original proposal (available [here](#)) was introduced.

Mr. Spreckley then proposed to start the discussion on the amendment proposed by UK and Germany or on a separate amendment proposed by UK.

Mr. Eriksen – This approach would be waste of our time. Our rules allow one year for preparation of a good proposal. In my view there should be requirement for 2/3 majority before these amendments could be tabled. Otherwise we must start discussing the original proposal.

Mr. Casado – Just for clarification, I disagree that nothing had been done until now. Several countries were working closely to prepare the proposal.

Discussion about the original proposal:

Mr. Rutkowski – What is presented is a result of cooperation of 5 countries. What is proposed is flexible and easy to use rule for starting. I also propose an amendment to change the waiting time window from 7-10 to 5-10 minutes.

From this point onwards Lithuania (having also the proxy from Latvia) joined the meeting and the proxy from Chile to Spain has been confirmed and accounted for.

Mr. Spreckley – The text of the amendment is much simpler than wording of the original proposal. I ask for possibility to present the amendment (that was seconded by Greece). The amended text was presented.

Mr. Bjornevik – I will vote against. We have no experience with this procedure. Why to mandate only 10 minutes. I propose 7 minutes.

Mr. Eriksen – Can the pilots have two flight recorders? This proposal complicates the life of participating pilots and increases their workload. The mistakes they may make will have nothing to do with their sporting performance.

Mr. Geissler –We have tried to make the procedure as simple as possible. We wanted the pilots to use the primary flight recorded only, not both, but there was a need to incorporate also the rule about the second flight recorder because these are used regularly. Therefore, there is a 50 points penalty in case it will fail.

Mr. Georgas – We need to think carefully about the starting procedure. The original proposal is in my view way to complex. From the administration perspective it requires monitoring of the multiple devices/tasks and that increases complexity.

Mr. Rutkowski – The use of the second flight recorder is only to protect the pilot from losing completely the whole flight.

Mr. Roine – I have one comment about whole proposal. Can it be postponed by one year?

Mr. Casado – As the chair of the Scoring software working group, the manufacturers should be ready to implement the proposal, if it is approved.

Mr. Polutnik – The proposed amendment is very good. It insists on pilot to manage the process. Otherwise there may be a possibility to cheat (e.g. second logger with a different time and then destroying the file or losing the primary recording). I can agree with Mr. Eriksen. The amendment is fine from this perspective.

The amendment (available [here](#)) was adopted by a large majority.

Discussion about the amended proposal:

Mr. Roine – There are some pilots who want to have this option, but I am a little bit disappointed by the proposed approach. It requires pilot to estimate what happens in 10 mins. This does not create anything else than the option for a pilot that is followed to return and start again. Is there any broader support for this other philosophy? Designated start is now designed exactly opposite way as it was originally intended. Also, the procedure needs to be tested.

Mr. Sheppe – The original proposal was too complicated and the amended is complicated too. Cannot we postpone it and present the improved version next year?

Mr. Rutkowski – The proposal has been extensively discussed. The best way would be to introduce what we have and adjust it based on the experience. Amended proposal says 10 minutes fixed time. However, one size does not fit all and a more flexibility may be needed.

Mr. Frenc – The 10-minute limit is too exact. We would need to test it before this can be a rule.

Mr. Foltin – Will this be one of the starting options or the compulsory starting procedure?

Mr. Mozer – It will be an option, not mandatory.

Mr. Schmelzer – We can see again that the rules are not tested before being implemented. We in Belgium always test the rule at our national championships before proposing them to IGC. This should be the normal practice. Belgium will test this procedure this year. If it will be optional, we can share the experience and results and the Championships directors can decide based on that information.

Mr. Mozer – Just a reminder, IGC regulates only the rules for World and Continental Gliding Championships. IGC does not have a test facility. Now this is the Year-2 proposal, if some delegates have an experience, please share it with the meeting now. All we talk about is an option to be introduced in our rules. All what IGC is deciding in this moment is to have it in the rules for a possible use.

Mrs. Kuijpers – I agree with Mr. Mozer and want to emphasize the same, it is an option. If it is in the rules, the countries could test it. It is important that this is introduced first in the rules as an option. When we will have more evidence, we can apply it at World Gliding Championships (WGC).

Mr. Foltin – The local procedures are always accepted by the Bureau and this allows for a phased implementation after proper testing of the procedure.

Mr. Rutkowski – We have tested it in Poland recently and the proposals are built on that experience. We think it is mature enough for testing at Continental Gliding Championships (CGC) or eventually at WGC. I propose the amendment to read “5-10 minutes” instead of exactly 10 minutes.

This has been accepted as a friendly amendment.

Prof. Ryder – Can this latest amended proposal be properly displayed?

Proposal was adopted by a large majority.

The next agenda items discussed in sequence were new 6.3.5 a. and 6.3.5 b. (originally numbered as 6.2.8 and 6.2.20) followed by item 6.1.5 here below.

6.1.5 Distance Handicap Task (Australia)

Mrs. Temple (Australia) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and stated that it works well in Australia and pilots like it.

Mr. Roine – There are too many rules designed for specific classes. We have experience with this kind of task and it could be used with the current rules. I Does not like it being just for one class.

Mr. Motuza (Lithuania) – The task can work in flat land, but there are certain difficulties with it in the mountains

Mr. Bjornevik – I can agree with Mr. Roine, the task should be possible for all classes. In the Nordic countries it is very popular and pilots like it.

Mr. Georgas – There was a strategy discussed in the past to have a different task designed for each class. I would welcome to see this being materialized as it would provide more value to our competitions.

Mr. Geissler – Just one clarification, this task is not only for club class, but also a possibility for 20m two-seat class at CGC. Maybe it does not work in mountains, but the Championships Directors have also other tasks as options.

Mr. Richter-Trummer – I can agree with Mr. Roine. I have just one remark, the task may increase density of gliders (gaggles) because it allows low performance gliders to stay longer with higher performance gliders.

Mr. Spreckley – This would not work with AAT rules. We support this task and our pilots love it. The argument about one class is not completely valid as that class has already different rules. We strongly support the proposal.

Mrs. Kuijpers – This task has been tested and the feedback is positive, so why not to introduce it?

Mr. Gerbaud (France) – Could you please confirm the applicability is in June 2020

Mr. Mozer – I would like to confirm that the proposed applicability is indeed in June 2020.

Proposal was adopted by a large majority.

6.1.6 Early Bird Bonus (UK, Australia)

Mrs. Temple introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and stated that it is another option for reducing the gagging.

Mr. Koskiniemi (Finland) – The Pilot Event Marker proposal (6.1.4) is also an option. Can these two options be used simultaneously?

Mr. Mozer – One option is not prohibiting the other.

Mr. Frank (Denmark) – If one considers safety, there are usually 30-40 gliders in start position. I am wondering how this proposal can substantially improve the current problems.

Mr. Spreckley – This is the right question. Therefore, this proposal is an option. On a day when everybody waits until the very last moment the result will be the same and all will fly together. It is important that Stewards and Championship Director make good decisions.

Mr. Schmelzer – The pressure before the penalty period can create some safety problems.

Mr. Gyongyosi – If the penalty would be 1 point per minute it could be acceptable. I propose it as the amendment.

The amendment was seconded.

The amendment was lost with a tight majority.

The discussion continued about the original proposal.

Mrs. Temple – Most in-flight incursions occur during the pre-start period. We know that is dangerous. We have the data and we need to stop that happening.

Mr. Roine – We have already voted for the Pilot Event Marker proposal (item 6.1.4). We should not have just another rule for the same problem. We should see first what the use of Pilot Event Marker during starting will bring.

Mr. Sheppe (representing Canada) – Whenever we change the rule, there will be an optimal strategy for pilots. Everybody who will know it will use it to his/her advantage.

Mrs. Kuijpers – This system came from hang-gliding and it was used there successfully for quite some time. It forces pilots to think before the start. It also facilitates and encourages other tactics like the early start.

Mr. Gerbaud – Many of the issues this proposal tries to address can be influenced by a proper task setting.

Mr. Koutny – At competitions we sometimes fly in the meteorological conditions in which we would not normally fly in the club environment. For the sake of safer flying we are increasing the workload for pilots. We need to think about that carefully.

The proposal was lost with a clear majority.

6.1.7 Place Scoring System (Australia)

Mrs. Temple introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Frank – On behalf of annex A Committee I would like to express that we have many scorings already in the rules.

The proposal was lost with a tight majority.

6.1.8 Finisher Marking Time Calculation (Poland)

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Frank delivered the presentation on behalf of Annex A Committee. He presented a practical example showing that the proposal can be influenced by only one pilot who can devalue the value from 1000 points to some 600 points. The presentation is available on the 2020 IGC plenary meeting cloud.

Mr. Rutkowski – The image is worth of 1000 words. Such a case can happen of course, but on the other hand the polish proposal can remove the anomaly in the scoring where only a second of difference makes a huge difference in the pilot's score. In other words, the pilots will lose a lot of points. This proposal makes it more proportionate.

The proposal was lost with a clear majority.

6.1.9 Distance Assigned Area Task (IGC)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Frank delivered the presentation on behalf of Annex A Committee. The presentation is available on the 2020 IGC plenary meeting cloud.

Mr. Roine – This proposal takes the complications to another level. It is a way too complicated to optimize this task. It is nearly impossible to know what is the optimum to fly. It will become speed task to maximum distance point.

Mr. Georgas – I am not sure I can agree with that. I can understand that some may not be clear about the objectives of this proposal, but for me it is clear.

Mr. Kuijpers – When I saw this proposal for the first-time last year, I was quite enthusiastic about the possibility to have a better task for the open class. Apparently, the Annex A Committee discovered some flaws in the proposal, while also understanding its intention. Could you please share your opinion?

Mr. Sheppe (on behalf of Annex A Committee) – I can agree with the objectives, but I do not see this other than that this proposal is trying to sort out the task setting problem. Setting a long enough task will make it the distance task anyway under the current rules.

Mr. Spreckley – Many pilots are trying to fly the shortest possible task if the task is under set. I can agree with Mr. Sheppe. Regarding the comment of Mr. Roine on whether making it complicated is an issue, we are trying to make this task challenging. I am interested to know more about this reason and would welcome Annex A Committee's views on that.

Mr. Sheppe (on behalf of Annex A Committee) – There is already a penalty for coming home too early, there is another one for coming home late although that one is not that severe. There are other ways to improve it e.g. by reducing the penalty. If we can insert the amount of time it takes one to fly the task into the scoring formula, we would be able to eliminate the penalty.

Mr. Mozer – Aren't we just removing the anomaly?

Mr. Sheppe – Yes. It would be hard to optimize this one. Pilots do not have those skills.

The proposal was lost with a clear majority.

6.1.10 Scoring with 95% of the total distance (Argentina)

Mr. Toselli (Argentina) – introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that its objective is to allow for elimination of flaw in a situation that weather improves dramatically.

Mr. Roine – I know that this kind of scoring is used in Australia, but is it necessary to have the limit at 95%? Cannot it be another number? Australia could you please comment and share the experience?

Mr. Toselli – The value could be slightly lower or higher, it is just a tool.

Mrs. Temple – The pilots can use it as a tactic and 95% is about a right figure.

Mr. Sheppe – We have tried it in US, and it works, but pilots then after 3 years of its use started to complain about too much calculations. A better task setting can address the same issue.

Mr. Eriksen – That are exactly my words, a better task setting can achieve the same objective as this proposal.

Mr. Geissler – With all airspace restrictions in Europe this may make sense and could be fit for purpose in specific cases.

Mr. Gerbaud – I have a question regarding the wording. What if the pilot's task time will be 3:15 (i.e. 15 minutes overtime), but has flown 95% of the maximum possible task distance, what happens to the scores of other pilots?

Mr. Roine – I propose the amendment to change 95% to 90%.

The amendment was seconded.

Discussion continued about the proposed amendment.

Mr. Rutkowski – I would like to echo opinion of Mr. Sheppe, why to enter the same river again. This proposal really creates a potential for tactical flying. We should aim for otherwise.

Mr. Roine – I can understand the point raised by Mr. Geissler, in case there will be a forbidden area in the task area, but I also understand the point made by Mr. Rutkowski, therefore I am against the proposal.

The amendment was lost with a large majority.

Discussion continued about the original proposal.

Mr. Gerbaud – The reference time should not be longer than the minimum task time.

Mr. Polutnik – This change of the rules seems to try to correct a wrong task setting. Will we take the same approach for cases of mass outlandings? This proposal overcomplicates the tasks and thus it is not necessary.

The proposal was lost with a clear majority.

6.1.11 Removal of requirement that a World Record claim must first be approved as a National record

Mr. Mills (on behalf of the Sporting Code Committee) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that its aim is removal of a possible injustice to pilots.

The proposal was adopted by consensus.

6.2 Year-1 Proposals

6.2.1 Elimination of glider type in declaration (IGC/SC3)

Mr. Mills (on behalf of the Sporting Code Committee) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added the explanation that there is no sporting purpose to have a glider type in the declarations. This proposal will make life simpler for both, the pilots and the official observers.

Mr. Georgas – I am confused what we wanted to achieve with this proposal. I believe we had already voted on such a proposal in past. I am not entirely sure, but perhaps at that time the proposal was not properly reflected in the document. May be this just needs to be clarified in the SC3.

Mr. Sheppe – The proposal says the glider is identified by the registration number, but that will not indicate the wingspan used for the flight.

Mr. Mills – That is not necessary for the badges and for the records the official observes and the pilots make paper declarations.

Mr. Koutny – There could be situation where a pilot may fly with a wrongly declared name of the pilot e.g. the one that has previously flown the glider. The paper declaration should be able to cope with that.

Mr. Mills – Yes, the paper declarations are possible for silver and gold badge flights, but the IGC's decision in the past was that for the diamonds and higher performances we should have a proper electronic declaration.

Mr. Polutnik – The glider names are getting longer nowadays and introduces a possibility for more mistakes. Why not to put the glider registration that is always unique?

Mr. Roine – Is the change in the flight recorder itself?

Mr. Mills – Yes, electronic declarations are already required except for the silver and the gold performances.

Mr. Georgas – I have not read the latest version of the Sporting Code, but we had voted for such a proposal in 2018. Also, the official observers can correct anomalies (under 8.1.4).

Mr. Mills – This information is new to me. The Sporting Code Committee consists of seven members and we typically work on different parts of the code. I am not the primary editor for that part.

The proposal was adopted by a narrow majority.

The following proposal was discussed after items 10.2.1.a and 10.2.1.b.

6.2.2 Eliminate written declarations for badges (IGC/SC3)

Mr. Mills (on behalf of the Sporting Code Committee) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that based on the Bureau's input the Committee can consider longer implementation times to allow for adaptation of the new rules in club environment.

The proposal was adopted by a clear majority.

6.2.3 Item moved to 10.2.1 a.

6.2.4 Item moved to 6.1.11

6.2.5 Item moved to 10.2.1 b.

6.2.6 Eliminating unnecessary scaling of handicaps (IGC/Annex A)

Mr. Sheppe (on behalf of Annex A Committee) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that it will have no consequence and would only save some ink. He concluded by saying that IGC should task its experts to work out a detailed wording and then trust their work.

The proposal was adopted by consensus.

6.2.7 Requirement for 1 second recording interval possibility for all GNSS FR used at Continental and World Gliding Championships (IGC/Bureau)

Mr. Spreckley (on behalf of IGC Bureau) verbally introduced the proposal and added that it will be important in the context of the proximity analysis, which is then much more accurate.

Mr. Sheppe (representing Canada) – What is the consequence for pilots?

Mrs. Temple – I propose the amendment to 2 seconds, because 1 sec will significantly increase the scoring time and the 2 seconds are sufficient for proximity analysis.

Mr. Casado – We have been using 1 second interval in Sailplane Grand Prix (SGP) events for many years and all flight recorders have this option.

Mr. Richter-Trummer – Could you please indicate what will be consequence for pilot in case of a noncompliance?

Mr. Foltin – It will be treated as a technical mistake and that is typically a warning for the first offence.

Mr. Strachan (GFAC Chairman) – Many flight recorders have variable interval that adapts a more frequent (e.g. 1 second) recording time when the pilot is flying closer to the observation zone than the set value.

Mr. Roine – I have the flight recorder with variable recording interval, but we need to be sure that all flight recorders are suited for this requirement.

The proposal was adopted by a large majority.

6.2.8 Item moved to 6.3.5

6.2.9 Usage of competitor pilot taken videos for complaints and penalties (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Rutkowski – Poland is against this proposal, the word ‘should’ allows that it could be misused or used selectively.

Mr. Sheppe – To put the decision in the hands of Championships Director is wrong.

Mr. Polutnik – Nowadays it is possible to have a video recording from fixed cameras. We need to support this proposal to allow for better flight analysis.

Mr. Geissler – A filming with the phone is dangerous and we do not want pilots to collect evidence on other pilots to be used for penalty.

Mr. Georgas - We should do it by other means not as it is proposed here.

Mr. Frenc – We should focus on a good value it may bring and should also bear in mind it is still Year-1 proposal.

Mr. Polutnik - (responding to Mr. Geissler) the Championships Director may eventually penalize the pilot providing the video for hazardous flying.

Mr. Bjornevik – Why we deal again with the same proposal as the one in 2018 under item 8.2.5 that was lost?

The proposal was lost.

6.2.10 Number of entries in 20m Two-Seat class at World Gliding Championships (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that 20m two-seat class is getting more and more competitive and therefore is the right time to have more than one entry also at World Gliding Championships.

Mr. Foltin – I would like to remind that original objective of this class was to provide for comparison of teams performances and to eliminate tactical team flying as we know from other classes with 2 or more entries per nation. The second team was introduced in this class only later and as an option for CGC to allow for higher participation and lower costs.

Mr. Polutnik – I am against, I like the idea of only one crew in the class. I can also understand the reasons presented by Germany. But the current rules allow us to fly WGCs like in SGP with a limited number of entries.

Mrs. Kuijpers – The team flying is not happening in this class as the team is in the same cockpit. It would be a pity to change that.

Mr. Roine – 1-2 years ago we have had a proposal to decrease the number of pilots per class. We should have a vision first and then submit the proposals based on that vision.

Mr. Eriksen – I support that has been said by Mrs. Kuijpers and Mr. Roine. There is also a capacity aspect that may, in case the proposal passes, limit WGCs only to large places, so Denmark is against

The proposal was lost by a large majority.

6.2.11 Number of entries in 20m Two-Seat class at Continental Gliding Championships (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that it is about the same issue. Another reason is a high interest to fly this class not only in Germany therefore we propose to have the fixed number of entries to allow for better planning by the teams.

Mr. Eriksen (chair of the Championships Management Committee and bid manager) – We cannot require bidders to accommodate two glides in the class if they cannot. That is the completely new philosophy and it will e.g. disqualify all bids that would not be able to accommodate 150 gliders in total. We have sometimes proposals that limit the number of pilots due to capacity or other reasons, but we also have to consider future bids.

The proposal was withdrawn.

6.2.12 Validation of entries by NAC (Belgium)

Mr. Pauwels introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that it is mostly an administrative proposal that should ensure that the pilot's online registrations are properly followed by the paper (email) registrations from NACs.

Mr. Georgas - I can see the proposal also as an author of competition registration system. It is quite complicated to introduce an integration of all NACs into the registration process. It would create more problems that we would be able to solve.

Mr. Motuza – I agree with Mr. Georgas. Sometimes also some non-pilots may register and it is up to organisers to verify all entries are eligible.

Mr. Roine – This is not a problem that needs to be addressed by Annex A.

Mr. Foltin – I agree with what Mr. Roine has just said, but we should also acknowledge that the proposal was triggered by the real problem from recent past. Despite of that, I cannot support introducing it in Annex A.

Mr. Rutkowski – We should not have solutions for every possible situation in the rules, this is clearly the task of organizers.

Mrs. Kuijpers – I was the one usually stamping the forms of officially selected pilots. In certain moment in time when the registrations became digital this has evolved.

Mr. Motuza – Another option is to provide individual passwords to all NACs.

The proposal was lost by clear majority.

6.2.13 Finish ring radius minimum 10km (Belgium)

Mr. Schmelzer introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added – This has been proposed already last year. We feel an urgent need to change the finish ring procedure. The finish ring improved the situation, but not enough. Small finish circles contain narrow safety margins. The 10km radius is used in Belgium for quite some years, but the radius could be adjusted for certain locations. In addition, there is proposal in item 6.2.15 below, which is a complementary proposal to this one. We believe this change is very urgent and needed.

The presentation is (available [here](#)) was published prior to the meeting.

Mrs. Kuijpers – We have had straight finish where no turns were allowed etc. This proposal introduces a normal landing pattern and I am not sure this is a good way forward.

Mr. Sheppe – Belgium proposes two finish altitudes, but one is not defined.

Mr. Schmelzer – We also propose to increase the radius to much bigger circle than is usually used.

Mr. Rutkowski – The better is sometimes enemy of good. I can agree with the principle, but not with the 10km radius and the forced traffic pattern.

Mr. Roine – Also Finland is against the 10km radius. There are many pilots who would prefer to have a finish line and I am not one of them. Actually, I may like this proposal, if it would be

amended. Forcing all to the 10km radius is not a right way forward. We should be able to properly set it with the current rules.

Mr. Schmelzer – The proposal will make it mandatory, the 10km radius has advantages e.g. possibility to reconnect to thermal etc. The proposal is based on experience with some near accidents. A survey among our pilots indicated that they like it. It was used at our nationals with 42 participating pilots.

Mr. Spreckley – It is a variable problem. I fully sympathize, but nothing stops us to do it now. Also, the 10km radius may not be implemented everywhere. In Musbach, they have a special procedure which works well for years and this rule would not allow them to use it.

Mr. Eriksen – I agree with Mr. Spreckley. Also, the current Annex A requires pilots to land immediately after the finish. That rule would need to change too. In my opinion this is a matter of good Local Procedures.

Mrs. Kuijpers – The proposal should have been divided to specify maximum and minimum altitude. I cannot support it in the current form.

Mr. Sheppe – The landing procedure depends on locations, sometimes you cannot make direct landings.

Mr. Polutnik – I am completely against the finish ring. The 10km radius is even worse as it requires the organizer to set check points where pilots still have high energy. All this could be solved with a remote finish line next to the airfield. It would be not only good for people and pilots, but also safe.

The proposal was lost by large majority.

The following agenda items were (unless specified otherwise) discussed on Day 2 of the meeting.

6.2.14 Extension of turn point radius to 2km (Belgium)

Mr. Schmelzer introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Roine – Nowadays, we have an optimal point of turn and everyone knows it. This will change it. This proposal will change nothing in my opinion.

Mr. Schmelzer – The change is the distance within 2km radius. It is correct that in case of Assigned Area Task (AAT) with such a radius, the result would be the same. We propose to work with Annex A Committee on how to incorporate this proposal properly.

Mr. Eriksen – It is also a safety issue. Currently I can anticipate when other pilots will turn, but that will not be possible anymore.

The proposal was lost by a large majority.

6.2.15 Penalties for incorrect finishing (Belgium)

Mr. Schmelzer introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that it is related to the 10km arrival ring proposal. This may change a lot for competitions that use a larger finish rings. It will have a little impact otherwise.

Mr. Roine – Sometime the pilot may take more points for outlanding than in case of arrival. How this would be impacted?

Mr. Sheppe – I can support it because it is good for those who use a large finish circle.

Mr. Eriksen – I can support it as an option, anyway it is still Year-1 proposal.

Mr. Spreckley – We would prefer if the proposal would allow for a flexible number of penalty points and not to specify the exact number (100).

The proposal was accepted by a large majority.

6.2.16 Delete designated start option (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mrs. Kuijpers – I would like to have this rule in Annex A as an option. We use it in the Netherlands. We worked hard to get it in Annex A and it will be bad if it would be taken away because it is not used.

Mr. Frank – It is not correct that it was not used. It was used at European Gliding Championships (EGC) in Ostrow, but not correctly and that created the dangerous situation. Maybe it is fine for 20 or so gliders, but not for many gliders like 40+.

Mrs. Kuijpers - It should not be used in a wrong situation. It is designed that pilots will not fly in gaggles for two hours and only then departing.

Mr. Rutkowski – It was used several times in Ostrow and there it has been proofed that it does not work for competitions of that scale.

Mr. Gerbaud – The objective was to have safer starts. Most of the organizers do not use this option anyway.

The proposal was lost by a clear majority.

6.2.17 Adding free gridding option (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that the idea is not to make it mandatory, but have it as an option. Sometimes there is not enough space for putting the gliders on the grid (e.g. Turbia).

Mr. Sheppe – In general I do not like the proposal, but I can accept it if it would be allowed due to safety reasons. I propose the amendment in this sense.

The amendment was seconded.

Mr. Eriksen – Mr. Sheppe, could you please explain how this proposal could be linked to safety?

Mr. Sheppe – If the runway would be otherwise too short (e.g. Hosin).

Mr. Rutkowski – I see no reason to restrict the proposal only to safety reasons. It worked well in Poland. The rule works if it is used in right conditions. It removes the pressure from organizers and pilots, I suggest leaving it to stewards and organizers for implementation in the Local Procedures.

Mr. Motuza – I would like to propose another amendment to use it only if connected with 20 minutes delay.

The amendment was lost by a clear majority.

The discussion about the original proposal continued.

Mr. Koskiniemi – If accepted, this could become a driving competition.

Mr. Richter-Trummer – We have tried it in at our nationals and it was a car competition. We have then introduced the first and the last and it worked.

Mr. Eriksen (as the bid manager) – If you do not have enough space for the proper gridding procedure you should not bid for WGC. The WGC aerodromes need to be suitable for the competition based on the existing rules.

Mr. Spreckley – I can agree with Mr. Eriksen. All effort that goes to preparation for WGC deserves fair and equal conditions.

The proposal was lost by a large majority.

6.2.18 Fixed 30 min delay between last launch and start gate opening (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that based on the previous experience in the 20 minutes are certainly not enough to complete the tow, release, climb and prepare for the start.

Mr. Eriksen – The responsibility of the Championships Director is to allow that everybody has a fair chance in the competition and that is also stipulated in the Sporting Code. Therefore, this proposal is not necessary.

Mr. Roine – I can agree with Mr. Eriksen, this proposal will not improve the situation, but will take away the 20 minutes option even in situation when it will be suitable.

Mr. Gerbaud – There is a previous example from Leszno, where the pilot lost WGC title because of being towed in a situation where there were no suitable conditions.

Mr. Eriksen – I can remember well that day and the conditions and the decisions at that time were of a very low quality. Moreover, this proposal will not improve such situations.

Mr. Geissler – If the 30 minutes would be proposed just as a general rule and the 20 minutes could be used only if 30 minutes are not suitable, then we could support it.

Mrs. Kuijpers – I can agree with Germany.

Mrs. Shalneva (Russia) – It also depends when the counting starts, from take-off or from release. It should be the latter.

Mr. Gerbaud – It is proposed to count it from the take-off. I admit that some countries use not so powerful towplanes and then 20 minutes may not be enough.

Mrs. Kuijpers – If something unusual happens during the last launch, the Championships Director can delay the start for even a longer period.

Mr. Georgas – The objective of rule should not be to give an advice to organizers, and it is equally important not to remove the flexibility from the rule if that works.

The proposal was lost by a close majority.

6.2.19 Mandating maximum altitude and maximum ground speed limit for all starts (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Spreckley – This is Year-1 proposal. We would be able to support it if that would be an option in the rules.

Mr. Gerbaud – One of the aims is to avoid gliders flying close or into the cloud. The cloud base height is not always clear at the briefing and it could be announced together with start line opening.

Mr. Rutkowski – The proposal is good in principle, but the ground speed is a problem because it could be largely affected by a strong wind. The proposal also increases the pilots' workload.

Mr. Geissler – Germany can support this proposal. The procedure has been used in Germany for some time. It's success however depends on good criteria for the speed and the altitude.

Mr. Roine – This proposal makes the procedure mandatory. Would France consider proposing it as an option?

Mr. Mozer – The details included on those areas addressed in the discussion should be considered in the development of Year-2 to proposal.

Mr. Gerbaud – (question to Mr. Spreckley) Do not we use this procedure at SGP events?

Mr. Spreckley – Yes, we do. But I can confirm that setting the right values is a very delicate task.

Mr. Eriksen – I do not understand why the cloud base predictability in the morning is still a problem today.

The proposal was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

6.2.20 Item moved to 6.3.5

6.2.21 Maximum Takeoff Mass increase in 18m Class for self-launching motorgliders (USA)

Mr. Sheppe introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that its objective is to have equal max wing loading. The 700kg value is a blunt tool to accomplish that objective. He concluded that there is a need to discuss the ways of controlling the wing loading that is very difficult subject. The US would prefer first to discuss the details with OSTIV and hear their views.

The proposal was subsequently withdrawn.

Mr. Mozer then expressed his gratitude to all for a good work on Year-1 proposals.

6.3 Other Proposals

6.3.1 Proposal for IGC Tracker project to cover the requirement for necessary tracking at all WGCs in the future (IGC/Bureau)

Mr. Casado introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) through the presentation (available on the cloud).

Poland – Will there be any safety feature function associated with the tracking like the SPOT? Also, are there any plans to do some mash function for retransmissions?

Mr. Casado – The trackers relay information from OGN and FLARM, that is already implemented and part of the OGN tracking protocol. The OGN SAR related facilities can reproduce the tracks. In several instances these already helped, for example in case of injuries after accident or phone could not be reached by the pilot etc.

Mr. Schmelzer – This is one of the biggest challenges we must face, the way forward as expressed in the proposal is right. IGC would however need to also find ways for eliminating hacked or private trackers that may be already out there.

Mr. Casado - These matters have been already identified and are reflected in the letter sent to FLARM about the random radio FLARM ID change. Those rough stations, of course in case one would be able to do it and invest substantial time and effort, will not be able to see who it who.

Mr. Schmelzer – We also need to enforce the existing rules and make clear communication that such practices is not possible.

Mr. Polutnik – I appreciate all the effort put into this activity. However, the 20.000+ € investment is not worth of getting the delayed visualization only. I also disagree with the proposal for an additional rent fee for organizers if the trackers will already be paid by NACs through FAI. IGC role should be to do specifications, not to purchase the trackers.

Mr. Casado – This will be IGC telemetry device, in some more years it may turn into an ADS-B kind of device, but that is not entirely sure yet. In 5 years, the intention is to be able covering positions of all devices. This proposal is only a pre-market transition device. The market will take over in medium term.

Mr. Spreckley – The business plan presentation should answer the question about the financial part.

Mr. Georgas - This proposal indicates that IGC is now capable of owning and controlling the process, we should do it for the benefit of our sport.

Mr. Roine – Can you elaborate more on the question by Belgium? Can a normal FLARM be seen?

Mr. Casado – The FLARM scheme is not known. The OGN publishes the FLARM scheme, but also encrypts it.

Mr. Richter-Trummer – Is it technically possible to make a collision avoidance warning with the tracker?

Mr. Casado – Yes, it is technically possible, but we do not do it because we want to keep our very good relations with FLARM.

Mr. Casado then presented the business plan proposal (available [here](#)) and added that he needs some direction from IGC on how to deal with the question whether to recovery (or not) the capital investment. He concluded by asking IGC approval for the proposed way forward.

Mr. Spreckley – There are now significant issues with financing at FAI. There is the need to push for this investment, otherwise it may not happen at all. Are we prepared to take the decision to fund this project for not?

Mr. Mozer – Procedurally speaking, IGC already approved 20.000 € budget for this project last year. An additional 15.000 € are required. If that would not be approved the 20.000 € investment would not make any sense with the exception for some commitments that were already done.

Mrs. Shalneva – I have a question about video production. Can data be provided from FAI server to any organizer in case there will be such a request from organisers?

Mr. Casado – The Silent Wings simulator studio gets the data, and these are for free. There is just the need to buy the Silent Wings software license. However, I am not able to predict how this may change in the future.

Mr. Gerbaud – We cannot force pilots to use OGN trackers in addition to flight recorders. Therefore, we can support the proposed approach (renting).

Mr. Polutnik – What are we going to get for the 35.000 € investment?

Mr. Casado – We will get 150 trackers and all related development, operation, insurance for 4 years. My time I have spent on this project is for free and the intellectual property will be retained by IGC.

Mr. Polutnik – I would like to make a point related to all systems. All in the proposal is based on OGN. We do not have any influence on how it may develop in the future. For example, if for some reason the OGN community decides for its own protocol etc.

Mr. Casado – That is partially true, but we also must bear in mind that all key elements of OGN are running on FAI servers.

Mr. Rutkowski – I would like to second the questions made by Mr. Polutnik. Will IGC get a working system for the 35.000 € investment? Will IGC own the intellectual property rights?

Mr. Casado – There are two persons owning the intellectual property rights, I am one of them. We both are ready to give it out, but only to IGC.

Mr. Scarlat – What about a possibility to use of such a system at regional competitions?

Mr. Casado – Yes, if IGC would approve it. It is not a problem technically.

Mr. Polutnik – The fees were paid by NACs. The source code should then become available to public and remain open.

Mr. Casado – I must make a clarification here. All development costs up to now were born by me and one additional person. No IGC funds have been spent yet. We will be donating results of our efforts to IGC. IGC did not spend any amount on this project yet.

Mr. Spreckley – The funds we intend to invest are reserves raised by IGC Ranking List activities and competitions.

Mr. Polutnik – We should have split it in two parts, one for the transmission to OGN domain and another one for the rest.

Mr. Casado – That is actually the current situation. However, we do not want to make the intellectual part public and we want to have it under the control of IGC (after donation).

Mr. Mozer then asked for vote to approve additional budget 15.000 € for the project as described.

The proposal was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

The discussion then continued about the project business plan.

Mr. Casado presented in more details the three options from the plan (A, B and C).

Mr. Bradley – What about to include it in sanction fee?

Mr. Mozer – Such a proposal not ready yet and such details still need to be developed.

Mr. Spreckley – Regarding option C, it needs to be mentioned that the current Championships organizers will not be affected.

This has been confirmed also by Mr. Mozer.

Mr. Szabo (Hungary) – Who will deal with the costs to run the system?

Mr. Spreckley – If the organisers want a tracking system at their competition, they will have to participate in the scheme by providing people on the ground to run it plus to cover an insignificant cost like shipping.

Mr. Mozer – I would like to emphasize that the live tracking is not mandatory at IGC Championships, but it is an option for organizers.

Mr. Polutnik – Not all geographical areas covered by OGN. Does it mean that the organizer will need to provide OGN infrastructure?

Mr. Casado - Yes, but that would mean only a modest investment when compares to other costs.

Mr. Spreckley – It is also worth to mention that the investment into OGN infrastructure will remains in place also after the championships

The proposal was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

6.3.2 IGC timelines (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Sheppe – It is not my job as the delegate to decide what the secretary deadlines are.

Mr. Eriksen (as bid manager) – I can understand the reason behind the proposal, but if bids are not received in time, we will risk there will be no credible bids presented to the Plenary.

Mr. Foltin (IGC Secretary) then clarified the IGC internal deadlines (see agenda item 14.2) in relation to the formal deadlines stipulated in FAI Statutes and Bylaws.

Mr. Rutkowski – I have the same understanding of the timelines as expressed by IGC Secretary.

The proposal was lost by a close minority.

6.3.3 Incorporating SGP result in Ranking List (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and examples mentioned in the proposal. He added – the Ranking List is used for qualification in many places including in France. The pilots may have a very low ranking if they are flying only at SGP events.

Mr. Spreckley (on behalf of Annex D Committee) – The Annex D committee not against the proposal because it has some merit.

The proposal was adopted by a clear majority.

6.3.4 Ranking List Competition Quality Factor reduction by age of event only (IGC/Annex D)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal on behalf of Annex D Committee and expressed his support to the proposal.

The proposal was adopted by a near-consensus.

The remaining other proposals (6.3.5 a. and b.) were discussed right after the proposal in item 6.1.4 on Day 1.

6.3.5 a. Earlier application of PEV starting procedure (Germany) and

6.3.5 b. Not allowing to test Event Marker start procedure at CGC and WGC (France)

Note: Also related to item 6.1.4

Mr. Geissler and Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposals (6.3.5 a. available [here](#), 6.3.5 b. available [here](#)).

Mr. Schmelzer – We can in principle support the French proposal. There may be some time before the WGCs in 2020 to test the procedure.

Mr. Spreckley – That is actually a very good point. It is not just matter of one competition. It is imperative that all pilots flying at WGCs and CGCs have an opportunity to test the procedure elsewhere.

Mr. Geissler – The pilots want this proposal and it is proposed as an option. Germany will not push for it if it will not work. The idea is to use it during training days and then decide if it could be used during the competition. Pilots are seeking this improvement and we will aim to implement it as soon as possible.

Mr. Kuijpers – I can appreciate the intention, but the test of completely new procedure during the training days before the WGC is not a good solution because it will likely introduce many

discussions just prior to start of the WGC which is not entirely what we and the organizer wants.

The proposal 6.3.5 a. (from Germany) was lost by a clear majority. The proposal 6.3.5 a. (from France) was withdrawn as it has been already adopted under item 6.1.4.

The Day 1 concluded by discussions and/or presentations related to agenda items 7 and 8.

7. Presentation of Bids (Peter Eriksen)

The presenters were awarded maximum 10 minutes each to present their bids.

The presentations are available in the 2020 IGC Plenary meeting cloud.

- 7.1 Presentation of bids for future Championships included in IGC calendar
 - 7.1.1 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2023 (18m, 20m, Open)
 - Uvalde, USA (available [here](#))
 - 7.1.2 13th FAI Junior World Gliding Championship 2023 (Club, Std.)
 - Arnborg, Denmark (available [here](#))
 - Ostrow, Poland (available [here](#))
 - Prievidza, Slovakia (available [here](#))
- 7.2 Presentation of bids for future Championships not included in IGC calendar
 - 7.2.1 4th FAI 13.5 Meter World Gliding Championship 2021 together with 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2021 (Club, Std., 15m)
 - Pociunai, Lithuania (available [here](#))
 - 7.2.2 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2022 (18m, 20m, Open)
 - Leszno, Poland (available [here](#))
 - 7.2.3 5th FAI Junior European Gliding Championship 2022 (Club, Std.)
 - Pociunai, Lithuania (available [here](#))
 - 7.2.4 5th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championship 2023 (Club, Handicapped)
 - Hutchinson, USA (available [here](#))
- 7.3 Presentation of bid for hosting 2021 IGC Plenary meeting
 - Copenhagen, Denmark (available [here](#))
- 7.4 Questions to all presenters

Questions about the Championship bids:

Mr. Casado – (to Lithuania about item 7.1.2) How do you plan to address the combination and potentially conflicting EGC vs WGC priorities?

Mr. Motuza – We do not see any problems to organize these events in parallel at one location.

Mrs. Kuijpers – (to Poland) I would like to get some clarification about the towing fee as indicated in the bids. May it increase and if yes, under what circumstances? Also, the last time during the EGC in Ostrow there was a fair for kids that was too close to the campsite. Do you intend to make it similarly again?

Mr. Rutkowski – Unless there will be major economic changes we will adhere to the towing fees as indicated in our bids. Regarding the fair, there will not be event like that again during the Championships.

Mr. Roine – In case of juniors we have switched from EGCs to WGCs some time ago and now this new bid is a bid confusing especially when it concerns the Junior EGC.

Mr. Eriksen (as the bid manager) clarified the bidding process, in relation to CGCs (i.e. no invitation for these bids) and added that the plenary may decide to accept these bids by a majority. Similarly for the bid from Uvalde, this time there is no priority to non-European bidders and it is up to IGC to decide whether to accept the bid from outside Europe.

Mr. Spreckley – Could a delegate make a proposal next year that for five or so years the Plenary will not accept other bids than those in the calendar?

Mr. Casado – I can understand the reply from Lithuania, but what about the rotation of classes to take-off? How is it will be treated in terms of priorities. These issues if left unresolved may open the door for protests. It is not about the size of the site, it is about the protocol and procedures used for event.

Mr. Motuza – My answer would be that we have had such a situation in the past, e.g. two WGCs in 2003 (Junior WGC were eventually combined with WGC in world class).

Mr. Geissler – What are the prices for renting of the gliders in Australia?

Mr. Toselli answered by quoting the prices from the bid document.

Mr. Eriksen – (to all bidders) What you put in the bid is binding and no change is allowed unless there is strong reason and the change will be approved by the Bureau.

Questions about the 2021 IGC Plenary meeting venue:

Mr. Koskiniemi – To keep the cost down would it be possible to offer a package also for 2 nights or eventually 1 night in addition 3 nights package?

Mr. Eriksen – Yes there will be such a possibility and delegates please do not hesitate ask if you will have any special requests.

8. IGC Medal and Diploma award ceremony (Eric Mozer)

French pilot Mélanie Gadoulet has been awarded the IGC Champion Pilot of the Year 2019. She received the World Soaring Cup 2019 from IGC President Eric Mozer.

Dick Bradley from South Africa has personally received Lilienthal medal award for 2019.

9. Votes on bids

This agenda item has been dealt with on Day 2.

9.1 Bids for Championships included in IGC calendar

9.1.1 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2023 (18m, 20m, Open)

The Championships were awarded to USA.

9.1.2 13th FAI Junior World Gliding Championship 2023 (Club, Std.)

The Championships were awarded to Poland.

9.2 Bids for Championships not included in IGC calendar

9.2.1 4th FAI 13.5 Meter World Gliding Championship 2021 together with 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2021 (Club, Std., 15m)

The Championships were awarded to Lithuania.

9.2.2 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2022 (18m, 20m, Open)

The Championships were awarded to Poland.

9.2.3 5th FAI Junior European Gliding Championship 2022 (Club, Std.)

The Championships were awarded to Lithuania.

9.2.4 5th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championship 2023 (Club, Handicapped)

The Championships were awarded to USA

9.3 Bid to host 2021 IGC Plenary meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark

The hosting of the 2020 IGC Plenary meeting was awarded to Denmark.

10. Reports not requiring voting

The presentations that were delivered during the Plenary meeting to complement the reports are available in the cloud. The all reports were necessarily presented, but the Committee representatives and Specialists were available for questions.

10.1 OSTIV report (Dr Rolf Radespiel)

Dr Radespiel verbally reported on OSTIV activities since the last IGC Plenary. He highlighted the request for improving the safety of competition sailplanes where there are the three things to report:

- Two different groups of sailplanes competing, the microlights (or ultralights) and EASA certified gliders: There is a need for minimum safety requirements so that all competitors can compete on safe and fair manner.

- Safety workshop outcome: There is a need for continuous effort to improve safety at competitions, a need for next level of safety practices that are derived from commercial operations. There are no low hanging fruits and possible approach that could be offered is to create more effective safety operation that will in the end act as a protection layer.

10.2 Standing Committees

10.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3D Report (represented by Howard Mills, member of the committee)

Mr. Mills presented the report (available [here](#)). Then he referred to the two particular agenda items (below) that must had been brought to the attention of the IGC Plenary meeting.

12.2.1 a. FR declarations requirement for Diamond & Diploma claims (IGC/SC3)

This agenda item was discussed on Day 1 before the discussion on item 6.2.2.

Mr. Mills introduced the topic (further details are available [here](#)).

Mr. Spreckley – The Sporting Code Committee decided not to allow paper declarations at club level e.g. for diamond performances. We can agree that eventually IGC needs go for all electronic declarations one day, but a proper path needs to be defined before that happening. All information should be at one place.

Mrs. Temple – We in Australia use the online claims for some time already. The young pilots especially use it very successfully, also the Federation has found it very good. As a result, we do not use the paper declarations anymore.

Mr. Sheppe - Thank you for sharing this experience from Australia. (responding to Mr. Mills)
The paper scheme should be eliminated.

Mr. Spreckley – This is presented because of Bureau’s request that any changes of the Sporting Code to be approved by the Plenary.

Mr. Georgas – What does the proposal mean? To reinstate the previous text or to keep the existing text of the code?

It has been confirmed that this is about keeping the existing published text in the code, which will result that diamond and diploma performances will have no requirement for written paper declarations.

The current text of the Sporting Code Section 3D has been endorsed by a clear majority.

12.2.1 b. Clarification of inadmissible FRs (IGC/SC3)

This agenda item was discussed on Day 2.

Mr. Mills introduced the topic (further details are available [here](#)).

Mr. Strachan (on behalf of the GFAC Committee) – I want to clarify that IGC acts on its own specifications and relies on own experts despite there are sometimes some external validators.

10.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A (Rick Sheppe)

Mr. Sheppe introduced the report (available [here](#)) and expressed the frustration as reflected in the report. He concluded there is a need for strategy for the future of IGC competitions.

Mr. Mozer – I call for inputs and papers from the IGC in this regard. This needs to be a bottom up process.

Mr. Eriksen – I propose the Bureau to take the lead on this.

Mr. Mozer – The Bureau can make decisions between the Plenary meeting and do normal business, but the Bureau is also prepared to take actions, if this is what the IGC Plenary wants. I have noted that simplification and more strategy would be welcome and the Bureau will act on that.

Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A Handicaps (Christof Geissler)

Mr. Geissler verbally reported that the main work was finished last April 2019 and since then there were three handicapped competitions (EGC, Junior and Women WGCs). The committee monitored the use of handicaps. There seems to be no need for changes in club class and 20m class handicaps. Mr. Geissler thanked the committee members Mr. Cheetham, Mr. Guerin and Mr. Geiger for their dedicated work and contributions.

Mr. Frank – When the committee will be publishing a new version in the future, please consider the timing and do not publish it during ongoing Championships (e.g. last EGC in Slovakia).

Mr. Sheppe – I assume we will have a new handicapped class by introduction of the Distance handicap task.

Mr. Geissler – The Committee has not yet discussed that proposal.

10.2.3 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex D (Reno Filla)

The Committee’s report is available [here](#).

10.2.4 Air Traffic, Navigation, Display Systems (ANDS) Report (Rick Sheppe)

Mr. Sheppe introduced report (available [here](#)) and expressed his thanks to all involved.

10.2.5 GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Committee Report (Ian Strachan)

Mr. Strachan introduced the report (available here) by delivering the presentation (available in the cloud).

Mr. Rutkowski – I have a question on publication of information about intended degradation of approved flight recorders for records. Would it be possible for the Committee to notify that some 6-12 months in advance?

Mr. Strachan – The last time the Committee first contacted the manufacturers, then published the information in public domain. The committee will anyway try to do it in the future as much publicity as possible.

Mr. Rutkowski – May I propose to do it the same way as we do it for the Sporting Code (i.e. by 1 October)?

Mr. Frank – There were some anomalies discovered during competitions. However, the specifications are not always necessarily precise enough. There may be sometimes a need for correction.

Mr. Casado – In this specific case, once the issue was discovered, the manufacturers were made immediately aware and asked to correct it. In addition, the proximity analysis tool is able now to convert the anomaly based on the version of the flight recorder.

Mr. Frank – What will happen with a flight recorder that is not in accordance with the specification?

Mr. Strachan – The manufacturers were in the past asked to correct it, but some are out of business already.

Mr. Mills (note about the publication of the Sporting Code) – The Committee is not using a 6 months notification, but the report to the Plenary serves the same purpose (notification).

10.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report (Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen verbally reported that the bids are of a good quality and that Italy had asked to look at the suitability of the site, which has been done. The delegates look closely at the Championship in 2021 (the item was presented later).

10.3 Working Groups

10.3.1 Stewards

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers is the new chairman of the working group. The last meeting took place in March and the group covered several topics like new leadership, process of reviewing local procedures and feedback from the recent competitions.

10.3.2 Safety (René Vidal)

The report was available (Mr. Vidal was unable to attend due to the situation in home country).

10.3.3 Scoring Software (Angel Casado)

Mr. Casado stated that there is nothing noteworthy to report.

10.3.4 History (Peter Selinger)

No report was available (Mr. Selinger was unable to attend).

10.3.6 IGC Media (Brian Spreckley)

The report was presented together with the following agenda item 10.3.7.

10.3.7 E-Concept (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the report (available [here](#)) and delivered the presentation for both, the IGC Media and the E-Concept working group activities (both are available in the cloud).

10.4 IGC Representatives

10.4.1 CASI Report (FAI Air Sport General Commission)

No report was available.

10.4.2 EGU (Patrick Pauwels)

Mr. Pauwels introduced report (available [here](#)) and added that EGU has just had a successful conference in Copenhagen. He also highlighted that EGU had developed the simplified Sailplane Rule Book for EASA and invited the European nations to join EGU to support future work.

Mr. Mills – Is the EGU website up to date?

Mr. Pauwels – EGU is relying on many volunteers and we are currently looking for a webmaster. The EGU Secretary is anyway preparing a new website that should be made available soon. Therefore, the currently published information may not be always fully correct.

10.4.3 Environmental Commission Report (Bernald Smith)

No report was available.

10.4.4 FAI Medical Commission (Jürgen Knüppel)

The report is available [here](#).

10.5 IGC Specialists

10.5.1 Trophy Management (Gisela Weinreich)

Mrs. Weinreich presented the report (available [here](#)) and referred to the other published documents: IGC/FAI Challenge Cups (available [here](#)), Chronicle – IGC Champion pilot of the Year – World Soaring Cup (available [here](#)) and IGC Plenary 2020 – the World Soaring Cup score (available [here](#)).

10.5.2 On-Line Contest (Christof Geissler)

Mr. Geissler provided a brief verbal report and highlighted that OLC could provide some useful help more to improve SAR activities about missing gliders.

10.5.3 Youth Gliding (Nina Shalneva)

Mrs. Shalneva delivered the presentation about youth gliding activities in Russia (available in the cloud).

Mrs. Kuijpers – I am enthusiastic about these developments. We should do it also in the Netherlands. Are there any other countries having such activities?

Mrs. Shalneva – Yes in Lithuania.

10.5.4 Sailplane Grand Prix (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the report (available [here](#)) and referred to the SGP Final referee report (available [here](#)). He also referred to amended schedule of FAI/SPG national events in 2020 due to COVID-19 and concluded that the overall ambition is to set up an FAI owned company to manage the whole SGP program in the future.

Mr. Rutkowski – (supported by presentation available on the cloud) I admire all work done on SGP, but there are also a few bitter words that must be said. In the referee statement there

are scandalous statements accusing pilots of cheating and that is contrary to what IGC tries to achieve (i.e. good treatment of volunteers).

Mr. Spreckley – I cannot comment because I was not the referee at that competition, and I have not written that report.

11. Championships (Peter Eriksen)

11.1 Reports from Past Championships

For past championships, the Jury President's and/or Chief Steward's reports that are available were published on the website. The reports were not be presented. Only items requiring action or special attention from the Plenum have been presented

11.1.1 3rd FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2019 Pavullo, Italy

11.1.2 11th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019, Szeged, Hungary

The steward's report is available [here](#).

11.1.3 10th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2019, Lakekeepit, Australia

The steward's report is available [here](#). The situation that has developed at the end of the Championships was very unfortunate and resulted not only in serious penalties for some competing pilots but also in new tasks and new start procedures proposals as well as the removal of the official from IGC duties for a prolonged period of time (for more details see agenda items 3.1 and 3.2).

11.1.4 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019, Turbia - near Stolowa Wola, Poland (18m, 20m, Open)

The steward's report is available [here](#).

11.1.5 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019, Prievidza, Slovakia (Club, Std., 15m)

The steward's report is available [here](#). The Jury President's report is available [here](#).

11.1.6 3rd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2019, SW Ontario, Canada (18-Meter and Handicapped Classes)

11.2 Reports and officials about Future Championships

For the future championships, general information is available through the Bulletins; only items requiring action or special attention from the Plenum have been presented.

11.2.1 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Stendal-Borstel, Germany (18m, 20m, Open)

11.2.2 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Châlons-en-Champagne, France (Club, Std., 15m)

11.2.3 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2021, Matkópuszta (LHMP), Hungary (18m, 20m, Open)

11.2.4 11th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2021, Husbands Bosworth, UK (Club, Std., 18m)

11.2.5 12th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2021, Tabor (LKTA), Czech Republic (Club, Std.)

11.2.6 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2022, Narromine, Australia (Club, Std., 15m)

11.2.7 12th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2022, Spain (Club, 18m)

Mr. Casado informed the IGC Plenary about the change of the venue from Fuentemilanos to Soria (already reviewed by the Championship Management working group and accepted by the Bureau).

Mr. Casado asked IGC to accept the change of location (caused by unfortunate loss of life of the intended Championships Director).

The change of the venue was adopted by a near-consensus.

11.2.8 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2021, Pociunai (EYPR), Lithuania (Club, Std., 15m)

11.2.9 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2021, Luís Eduardo Magalhães (SWNB), Brazil (Std. Monotype, 15m Handicapped)

11.3 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships (Brian Spreckley)

- FAI World SGP Championships Final 2021, Saint-Auban, France

This topic was reported under agenda item 10.5.4.

Vladimir Foltin will speak about European approach to airborne collision risk with particular focus on uncontrolled flights in visual meteorological conditions.

11. Championships (continued)

12. Confirmation and Approval of IGC Officials

12.1 Confirmation of Committees and Working Groups (incl. Chairs), Representatives and Specialists

The IGC Plenary confirmed the composition of Committees and Working Groups (incl. Chairman), Representatives and Specialists as listed their reports and summarized in the Annex to these minutes.

12.2 Approval of Competition Officials

The officials for the following Championships were appointed unanimously. The complete list of appointed officials is available in the list of decision taken by 2020 IGC Plenary meeting (available [here](#)).

12.2.1 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Stendal-Borstel, Germany (18m, 20m, Open)

12.2.2 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Châlons-en-Champagne, France (Club, Std., 15m)

13. 2020 IGC awards (Eric Mozer)

13.1 Lilienthal Medal

The Lilienthal Medal was awarded to Mrs. Gisela Weinreich from Germany.

13.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma

Not awarded.

13.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal

Not awarded.

14. 2021 IGC Plenary Meeting (Eric Mozer)

14.1 Announcement of the dates and place of the 2021 IGC Plenary meeting

The next meeting will take place on 5 – 6 March 2021 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

Post meeting note: Due to COVID-19 pandemic the IGC Bureau decided that the 2021 IGC Plenary meeting will be held virtually.

14.2 Useful dates and other practical information (Vladimir Foltin)

IGC Secretary Mr. Vladimir Foltin informed the IGC Plenary about important deadlines for the 2021 IGC Plenary:

Notification of proposals and bids to the Bureau and/or the Bid Specialist: 30 September 2020

Final Bids: 31 December 2020

Proposals, nominations, and reports: 31 December 2020

All material available for delegates: latest 45 days before next IGC Plenary

15. Late Proposals

15.1 Clarification of rules in Annex A - late proposal (IGC/Bureau)

This proposal was dealt with on Day 1 prior to discussion on the proposals.

IGC President Mr. Mozer asked the IGC Plenary meeting for the acceptance to table the late proposal from IGC Bureau.

This was accepted unanimously.

Mr. Mozer then introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

16. AOB

There were no AOB items discussed.

17. Meeting Wrap-up and Closure (Eric Mozer)

The IGC President Eric Mozer thanked the IGC Delegates and the Bureau for their active participation in the debates and their contributions over the past year. He then wished all the participants a safe journey home.

Recorded by

Vladimir Foltin, IGC Secretary



Fédération Aéronautique Internationale
Avenue de Rhodanie 54
CH-1007 Lausanne
Switzerland
Tel: +41 21 345 10 70
Fax: +41 21 345 10 77
www.fai.org
info@fai.org

Appendix A IGC Committees and Working Groups, Representatives and Specialists

Committee	Chair
Sporting Code Section 3D	
Main Section & Annex C:	Ross Macintyre
Annex A:	Rick Sheppe
Annex A: Handicap Subcommittee	Christof Geissler
Annex B:	Ian Strachan
Annex D:	Reno Filla
ANDS:	Rick Sheppe
Championship Management:	Peter Eriksen
GFAC:	Ian Strachan
Working Group Chairs:	Chair
History:	Peter Selinger
E-Concept	Brian Spreckley
Safety	Rene Vidal
IGC media	Brian Spreckley
Stewards	Frouwke Kuijpers
Juries	To be appointed
Scoring Software	Angel Casado
IGC Representatives	
CASI:	To be appointed
EGU:	Patrick Pauwels
Environmental Comm.:	To be appointed
Medical Commission:	Jürgen Knüppel
Specialist Officers	
Sailplane Grand Prix:	Brian Spreckley
Trophy Management:	Gisela Weinreich
OLC:	Christof Geissler
Youth Gliding	Nina Shalneva