



Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

held virtually via the ZOOM platform

From 3rd to 5th March 2022 (daily between 12:00 and 15:00 UTC)

Final Version 2 March 2023

Day 1

1. Opening and Welcome (Peter Eriksen)

The IGC President Mr. Eriksen welcomed the delegates, alternate delegates, and observers to Session 1 of the 2022 IGC Plenary meeting. He then specifically welcomed FAI President Mr. David Monks.

Mr. Eriksen regretted the meeting could not take place in Copenhagen in particular because he was missing the opportunity to have informal chats in the breaks.

He explained that the IGC Bureau took the decision to have the meeting online as there was a risk it would become a meeting with mainly European participants, which would be unfair to the rest of the world.

1.1 Roll Call

A roll call of Delegates was undertaken by Mr. Foltin, and it was determined that 37 voting members were present (no proxies).

1.2 Administrative matters

- The IGC Secretary Vladimir Foltin reminded the meeting about the guidelines to be followed during the remote meeting that are also available on the cloud.

- The President informed the meeting participants that the meeting was recorded. Recordings will be deleted once the minutes have been approved.

1.3 Declaration of Conflict of interest

The following declared Conflict of Interest:

Lars Rune Bjørnevik, Delegate, Norway, represents several gliding equipment and instrument manufactures in Scandinavia

Alexander Georgas, Delegate, Greece, is involved in Crosscountry.aero

Vladimir Foltin, Delegate, Slovakia, is employed by EASA

Uys Jonker, Delegate, South Africa, is involved in glider manufacturing.

1.4 Final Glide

The President mentioned that on the 31st of December 2021 we lost Tor Johannessen, former IGC President. Tor served IGC for almost half a century. His work, his attitude to the sport is a great loss. Tor would always remind us of where we are coming from and what we are trying to achieve. Finally, the President asked the meeting to spare a moment to honor all the friends we have lost in the last year.

2. Minutes of previous meeting, On-line 4th, 5th, and 6th March 2021

The Minutes were approved without remarks.

3. IGC President's report

The IGC president referred to the written report.

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

The Secretary presented the list of decisions taken by the Bureau. The Decisions are available in the FAI cloud (available [here](#)).

No remarks were received by the Plenary.

3.2 Discharge of Bureau responsibility for decisions since the last Plenary

The Bureau was discharged unanimously.

4. FAI Matters

The FAI President Mr. David Monks addressed the meeting participants.

Thank you for your invitation to join your meeting. I would have preferred joining you in person this time. COVID appears to become less relevant in many nations as far as travel restrictions are concerned and we are learning to live with it. This organization never ceases to be presented with its challenges and currently the conflict in Ukraine has a significant effect on the members of FAI. We hope this situation is temporary and hope it is resolved as soon as possible. The situation of suspended NACs is under constant review. I know your agenda, you have a lot of work to get through, and I wish you a successful Plenary.

The IGC President thanked President Monks for joining the meeting. "I know that you have a number of meetings to attend to today and cannot stay very long. We have been working together some time now, and it has been a pleasure from my side. I believe FAI is moving in the right direction."

The IGC President then gave the floor to the FAI Secretary General, Mr. Markus Hagganey. "It's a pleasure to be part of the IGC Plenary meeting. My report will be really short as a lot of information has been shared recently. First of all I would like to thank you, Peter, for the very frequent contacts you have with the office and especially with me. I would like to share that with Vladimir also as well as Parick Pauwels on finance matters and Brian Spreckley on Sailplane Grand Prix matters. We have quite a lively relationship and I thank you for the hands-on cooperation. My report is a summary of what has been discussed at the General Conference."

The Secretary General presented a list of the reports given at the General Conference. The main messages have been made available in the public domain through the draft minutes that will be approved at the next General Conference. The minutes are password protected, but the password has been shared with NACs, Commission Presidents, etc., and you are welcome to ask for the password through your NAC or through IGC.

The audited result of 2020 is a minus of 75.000 SFR. It is considered a good result, as it was a year with the Pandemic. It shows that a turn-around compared to previous years and the situation has been stabilized in 2021. The result, not yet audited, indicates a gain of around 100.000 SFR, which is good for the second year of the Pandemic, and largely due to significant cost savings throughout the organization, in the commissions, the Executive Board as well as in the office, reducing staff level and reviewing contracts. The trend is continuing in the budget, but we don't know how the Ukrainian conflict will impact this. We will likely see 3 years in a row with a stable development of the financial situation. Provided members will continue to pay their subscriptions, we are confident that we will continue to be in a positive situation.

To reconfirm what Peter already mentioned, the decision on the appeal has been communicated by CAS, the case was withdrawn by the court, technically terminated. It will cost FAI money, as we have had to work with a significant level of legal consultancy. It was definitely not a cheap case. The CASI president has distributed the two documents received from the court.

On the situation in Ukraine, as already mentioned, it is a very difficult time for all of us. The EB decided, with reference to the FAI Statutes paragraph 2.4.2.1 to suspend the membership of Russia and Belarus. It is a very serious hot topic that takes a lot of time to deal with. We of course want to continue air sports as soon as possible, the situation will be monitored and

reviewed when it is possible. We stay committed to assist all air sports to return to a normal situation once this is possible.

There were no questions to the Secretary General. The IGC President thanked Markus Haggoney for a good briefing and for taking the time to join the IGC Plenary.

5. Finance

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2020 Financial Statement

Mr. Pauwels referred to the published financial report (available [here](#)) and its Annex (available [here](#)) and related documents, added that:

The original budget was changed due to the ongoing COVID Pandemic and the change in the competition calendar.

The income and expenses are in line with the updated budget. We have made further investments in the IGC trackers and the Ranking List System.

The 2021 account was closed with a loss of 27.000 SFR.

Note: The figures are preliminary until the accounts are audited and approved by the General Conference (Oct/Nov. 2022)

The 2022 budget assumes that we will have a normal year, but this is of course uncertain. The budget shows a loss of 25.000€ in 2022. 2023 looks like 2022, with a loss. The reason that we must present the 2023 budget already now is that the budget shall be approved by the General conference in autumn 2022, which also means that our 2022 IGC budget already has been approved by the General Conference in the autumn of 2021.

Mr. Henderson (NZL) Delegate asked if the budget figures for 2023, where there are two columns, one based on unchanged Sanction Fees and one based on the Bureau proposal with an increase in Sanction Fees, could be considered as approved subject to the Bureau proposal.

Mr. Pauwels responded that we would have to come back to this. The view of the Bureau is that we need an increase in Sanction Fees already in 2022, but also that we must rethink the Sanction Fee structure, and that the Bureau must come back with a proposal at next year's meeting.

Mr. Brian Spreckley (GBR) had the same thoughts as Mr. Henderson. If we approve the increase in Sanction Fees in 2022, we de facto have approved the budget based on the new Fees.

The President proposed to come back to the one line in the budget concerning Sanction Fees once the Bureau Proposal to increase Sanction Fees had been discussed.

Mr. Henderson noted that the trackers were paid for, but that there was a planned 7.500 for Bureau meetings, and wondered if the Bureau would continue with online meetings

The president responded that the Bureau meets online once a month, which is very good for the IGC, keeping a high level of activity. It is still the plan to have one face-to-face Bureau meeting in October. The Bureau meeting cost will remain stable in the coming years.

The President then considered the budget approved with the remark that we would have to come back to the 2022 income once the proposal for an increase in Sanction Fees had been discussed. The president also noted that the aim was not to build a big reserve, but the fact that we had reserved has been helpful during the Pandemic. We do need a lot more than we have right now, but we do need to have an operating budget in balance.

6.1 Year-2 Proposals

6.1.1 Same day record claims (IGC/SC3)

Mr. Howard Mills, member of the Sporting Code Committee presented the proposal (available [here](#)). on behalf of the SC3 Committee. The aim is to avoid a potential problem as a matter of fairness. The Committee believes that on the day, the pilot with the best performance should get the record. Mr. Mills asked the delegates to support the proposal.

Mr. Frank (DEN) asked if this was not covered by the FAI SC General Section 7.6 this situation is considered and assumed this also applied to Section 3 of the Sporting Code

Mr. Mills responded that the Sporting code Committee found it necessary to clarify this in Section 3 of the Sporting Code, even if it was already in the General Section of the Sporting Code.

Mr. Georgas (GRC) supported the proposal but was worried that claims received on the same day, but maybe with 23 hours difference due to different time zones and was wondering if this had been considered by the Committee.

Mr. Mills had no answer to the question.

Mr. Frank noted that the General Section of the Sporting Code simply referred to the date.

Mr. Mills did not consider this a problem. If we receive multiple claims the same day, the pilots had most probably been flying in the same region.

Mr. Henderson (NZL) noted that the dateline, being between two continents with a time difference of 5 hours would assure that flights would be made on the same date. There is a small risk for an anomaly, but this is between regions where gliders records are not normally made. Mr. Henderson supported the motion.

Mr Sheppe (USA) asked if this proposal would make it impossible for two pilots to have a shared record.

Mr. Mills responded that two pilots could share a record, if the e.g. declared the same triangle.

Mr. Sheppe supported the proposal but suggested that the language should be clarified concerning joint records.

Mr. Mills promised to make a note on this

The proposal was adopted with 1 vote against and 27 votes in favor and 6 abstentions.

6.1.2 Energy control at the start

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) presented the proposal (available [here](#)) that is unchanged since 2021. Several delegates were involved in discussing the year-1 proposal.

The problem is that pilots try to stay as high as possible before the start, creating big gaggles. The new procedure has been tested in Germany and France. It is an optional procedure that the Competition Director can choose to use.

Mr. Filla (SWE) noted that the friendly amendment that were made last year had been removed this year. Sweden wishes to make an amendment to take away the possibility to start with excess height as this would be difficult for the scorer to deal with and at the same time create additional stress for the pilot during the finish.

Mr. Christian Roine (FIN) supports the proposal but would like to make an amendment. The purpose of penalty is that it should be so severe there is no benefit from breaking the rule. The proposed penalty here is so elegant that there is no real penalty. My question is why this is so complicated. We already have an altitude penalty in the Sporting Code. If you exceed the altitude with more than 100m, you get no valid start. Less than 100m, you get a penalty of 1

point per meter. I suggest using the same limits here. Up to 50km/h, you receive two penalty points per km/h, more than 50km/h you get no valid start. I support the Swedish amendment. There is almost always an incentive to start 50 meters higher, and come back 50 meters higher, so in reality, the start line is moved up 50 meters.

Consequently, my amendment is to remove sub-paragraphs “I” to “iv” from the proposal and replace them with a new penalty scheme:

From 0 to 100m excess height 1 pt/m. More than 100m above start altitude, no valid start

From 0 to 50km/h above max start groundspeed 2 pt/kmh. More than 50 km/h, no valid start.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) was of the opinion that the Swedish and Finnish delegates were missing the point. The major objection to the proposal has been the workload on the pilots. The intention behind allowing a small excess of height or speed is to reduce the workload on the pilot. I think that is a correct assumption and I don't think it is correct to say that pilots always would start 50 m higher. What is important is that this is not difficult. All the scoring software and the onboard computers can deal with this and can automatically adjust your finish height once you have started. We must use the technology to make life easier for us. I am not against having a simple penalty of one point per meter, but I would rather have some sort of buffer zone, where the pilots do not have to focus absolutely on being at an absolute altitude, and I think it would be wrong to remove this part of the proposal. GBR supports the original proposal.

Mr. Eriksen (IGC President) stated that we now were in exactly the situation the Bureau wanted to avoid. If the amendments are included, the proposal has fundamentally changed, and many delegates would not know how to vote. That's why the debate should have taken place before the meeting. You have had 45 days to provide written comments on this, but we did not receive comments.

Mr. Filla (Sweden) had expected that all the friendly amendments that were proposed last year and adopted as part of the Year-1 proposal would have been part of the Year-2 proposal. We were also expecting an invitation to have an online discussion. This did not happen.

Note: The initial Y-1 proposal was submitted in 2020. After the discussion about the Y-2 proposal in 2021 FRA agreed to postpone the Y-2 proposal to 2022 in order to reflect on the feedback received.

The President accepted this and proposed to vote on the Finnish amendment that also included the Swedish amendment.

This was contested by Sweden, that insisted that their amendment should be voted on first.

Note: The amendment by SWE was proposed first and was not in conflict with the FIN amendment but rather it was its subset. The rationale behind was that if the amendment by SWE would have passed and the FIN amendment would have failed, at least a small improvement would still have been achieved.

The Swedish amendment, to remove subsection ii and subsection iv, was seconded by Norway.

Mr. Henderson (NZL) noted that he was surprised to see that the paper brought forward was identical to the paper that was discussed both as Year-1 proposal in 2020 and as Year-2 proposal in 2021. When thinking about the intent to reduce the demand on the pilot to be very precise on the start altitude and allowing the pilot to correct an error on the start altitude by adding altitude to the finish, there is a reasonable and sensible logic behind allowing that buffer. I am concerned that the amendment eliminates the whole purpose of the paper and I wonder if that is the right way to manage the situation.

The President found it difficult to answer the questions from NZL.

Mr. Uys Jonker (RSA) thought that the proposed amendments had created confusion. We are trying to consider two aspects, one is safety, the gagging on top of the thermals and second is the finishes. I don't think we have considered that gagging at the start, all competitors will still be compressed. We must either decide that this proposal is addressing the safety at the start, or we will allow a buffer at the start allowing a small margin at the start. We should consider if this proposal is going to add value. We should maybe only define the maximum start altitude and minimum finish altitude and then let the pilots decide. Pilots could then decide to start well above the start altitude and finish higher. It would mean that we could get very high finishes, but I don't think this is a safety issue.

The problem is that we now are thinking differently, and this creates confusion about what the proposal is supposed to do.

Mr. Roine (FIN) noted that if the Swedish amendment passed, Finland would remove that part from their amendment.

The Swedish amendment received 18 votes for, 3 votes against and 11 abstentions. The Swedish amendment was adopted.

The Finnish amendment, now only with the adjusted penalty scheme, seconded by Sweden. The Finnish amendment received 20 votes in favor, 1 vote against and 12 abstentions.

The amended proposal was then voted on.

The amended French proposal received 22 votes in favor 4 votes against and 6 abstentions. The amended proposal passes (available [here](#)).

6.1.3. Remove periodic calibration of Flight recorders (France and Denmark)

The proposal (available [here](#)) was presented by Mr. Frank (DEN).

Many documents have been exchanged since the proposal was presented. To avoid confusion, a summary of the documentation was presented.

Flight recorders are sports equipment used to document sporting performances.

We will still use pressure altitude and we will still use calibrated FRs. We also need to distinguish between drifting and inaccuracy of FRs.

We talk about the Sporting Code Chapter 2, Badges, and Chapter 4, Records. In the discussion in the year 1 proposal, it was proposed not to include records in the proposal. We will still consider that as a friendly amendment, but it has also been proposed to keep it simple and have the same procedures. That's the reason for records still being in the proposal.

Annex A are the rules used for World Gliding Championships. In Annex A, calibration is only mentioned one time, where it states that if you do not have a baseline in your calibration. It is not stated in Annex A that you have to use a calibrated FR. Many pilots believe this, but Annex A does not say so.

The other thing is Annex B, the technical document. We make a reference to para. 2.2.2 where there is a reference to the general Sporting Code.

FRs are not intended to be used for assuring operations in controlled airspace.

We may use FRs to verify that the pilot has not penetrated prohibited airspace.

What we propose is to find another way to assure that the FR works correctly. We store a new log every second. In each log, we can see the difference between the GPS altitude and the pressure altitude. In the example shown, a flight of more than 3 hours and more than 12.000 logs. Considering the elevation of the start aerodrome and the QNH, a maximum difference

between the GPS altitude and the pressure altitude of 77 meters, and average difference of 59 meters, we can consider my Flight Recorder as correctly working.

FLARM is not calibrated. Factory calibration remain valid. We want to make things simpler, and to avoid pilots being disappointed when they make their first Silver Badge attempt without having the calibration, when we know that it is not required.

Mr. Georgas (GRC): Personally, I have considered how we do the scoring. We are the only group of people in the world that are so obsessed by making an accurate altitude measurement. When a FR leaves the factory, we can see the accuracy of the FR, but I don't think calibrations are ever used in reality. From that perspective there is a scientific debate on how to measure altitude correctly, but from a sporting perspective, we must ask ourselves what value the calibration every 5 years brings to our sport. A calibration that can be quite costly. I support the proposal as it stands.

Mr. Bjørnevik (NOR) supports the proposal in principle but lacks information of how to handle the difference between older and newer and more accurate pressure sensors. We also know from experience that GPS altitude can vary a lot. If you had differentiated between old and new FRs, I would have been in favor.

Mr. Sheppe (USA) is uncertain about the correct procedural way to move forward, but on behalf on four delegations, SPA, IRE, GER and USA, Mr. Sheppe presented a motion to delay the debate and voting on the proposal to 2023, where the delegates can be together and debate this very complicated and impactful proposal. It's clear from the presentation made by DEN and the comments made by NOR that there are nuances about which we cannot reach a common understanding. It's an important debate and we are still in the middle of it, which has been clearly demonstrated by the 3 position papers that have been presented by Standing Committees. We propose to delay the debate to next year.

Mr. Frank (DEN) noted that this process had been difficult. We have reached out to the Standing Committees. The first advice we got from the Committees was to withdraw the proposal.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) wanted to know what the effect of the motion would be.

The President responded that if the motion passes, there probably would not be sufficient support to the proposal, and it would be better to delay the debate on the proposal to 2023. The proposers should be aware that if there is a vote on the proposal, and it is lost, there will not be a second chance in 2023.

Mr. Gerbaud: We are all using old FLARMS for safety reasons, we accept that. When manufactures re-calibrate old FRs, they either find FRs that work correctly, or FRs that simply do not work. The FRs do not drift, they are still accurate. I have been flying WGCs for more than 20 years, the calibrations are simply not used. We spend a lot of money on calibrations that are never used.

Mr. Howard Mills (Sporting Code Committee) had two comments. I hear that we do not need calibrations within competitions. If you are only concerned about competitions that's another thing. The IGC has set up a number of expert groups and committees. These groups have come up with a number of conclusions. If the vote is going to overwrite these, then you have put the wrong people into these groups. Maybe one should listen to the committees more than the popular vote.

The President reacted to the statement of Mr. Mills, stating that Committees have no political power. Committees are technical experts that can give advice, they can ask and answer questions, but they cannot have an opinion on a proposal from a delegation. There have been things in the discussion about this proposal that are not right, the proposers have not always

been treated in a fair way. This is the Bureau's view on this. We are happy to receive advice from the Committees, but the voting takes place at the Plenary meeting.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NLD) had a question if the proposal is only for competitions

The president clarified that the proposal, as it stands, is for all performances where a FR is needed.

Mr. Frank (DEN): The question has already been discussed. There is no requirement in the current Annex A that states that a FR needs to be calibrated every 5 years. This is only stated for Badges and records. Only if you do not have a baseline before the start during a competition, the calibration could be used.

Mr. Casado (ESP) Rather than having this discussion now, the four delegations want to postpone this discussion to next year.

Mr. Ramseyer (IRL) I support the statement of Mr. Casado. We should only discuss the motion right now.

The president asked the delegates to vote on the motion to postpone the debate to 2023.

25 voted for the motion. The proposal will be discussed at the 2023 Plenary meeting, where we will have the technical discussion at a dedicated session before the Plenary meeting.

The President then closed the formal part of the 1st meeting day. The formal meeting will adjourn Friday at 12:00 UTC.

IGC Country development activities - Presentation of the latest activities of the IGC's Country Development Working Group including recent statistics and recommendations followed by discussion

Mrs. Mandy Temple (AUS) chaired this part of the meeting. Presentations are available in the FAI cloud.

There are no minutes from this more informal part of the meeting.

Day 2

The President opened the 2nd meeting day and welcomed all delegates, observers, and guests. Then he clarified one information presented during Day 1, i.e., the decision on suspension of Russia from the FAI activities will last until further notice instead of one year as it was presented.

1.1 Roll Call

A roll call of Delegates was undertaken by Mr. Foltin, and it was determined that 36 voting members were present (including 1 proxy). The numbers changed to the total number of votes present to 37 voting members (including 1 proxy) after the delegate from Bulgaria joined the session before the first vote on item 6.2.1. As a result, the majority required 19 votes and 2/3 majority required 25 votes.

1.3 Declaration of Conflict of interest

No additional Conflict of Interest were declared.

6.2 Year-1 Proposals

6.2.1 NAC approval of Official Observers for record claims (IGC/SC3 Committee)

Howard Mills presented the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the SC3 Committee. The requirement for additional approval of the Official Observer by an NAC became obsolete as there are no actions foreseen in the Sporting Code since digital methods of proof of performance based on certified GNSS flight recorders are being used nowadays.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) clarified the requirement was introduced a few years ago to control the independence of the performance approval process and queried what changed since then.

Mr. Mills (SC3 Committee) confirmed that if Official Observer is acting in another country there is a need for approval by the local NAC. This practically concerns mostly diamond and diploma performances. The requirement the local NAC confirming that the flight was conducted legally (e.g., vis-à-vis airspace) is not affected by this proposal and will remain valid.

The proposal received 24 votes in favor 2 votes against and 9 abstentions. The proposal passes.

6.2.2 Minimum championship days (Finland)

Mr. Koskiniemi (FIN) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)). The purpose is to remove operational pressure put on the Championships Directors in case of fewer than required number of valid days close to the end of competition and allow them to focus on safe and fair decisions. As a side effect it would also allow to declare Champions in case a lower number of valid days was achieved during the competition period (such a situation happened in the past) and that is good for promotion of our sport. This requirement was removed from the national rules in Finland with a positive effect (no attempts to fly when the weather is not favorable) and we received good feedback from pilots.

Mr. Georgas (GRC) stated that one valid day only requirement can create even more pressure than what we have now, not sure whether this will improve the situation.

Mr. Filla (SWE) can understand Finland in proposing the change, but believed it is too radical as it would introduce several random effects to become champion.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) supported the proposal and mentioned own experience from the past that created a high pressure for him as the Championships Director to achieve fourth valid competition day in a very marginal weather condition during the reserve day. He added the champion could not have been declared (the attempt was not successful eventually) even

after three valid competition days were achieved. That resulted in a big frustration for the teams and the organisers especially after all the efforts they had made. The situation with only one valid day is highly unlikely to happen. He concluded that this example invalidates the rationale mentioned by Greece because the same pressure existed in the circumstances mentioned.

Mr. Frank (DEN) added that there is a valid point made by Finland but is not sure about whether this addresses the root cause. He mentioned example of WGC 2021 in France where several days were flown in weak weather conditions.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) asked for more details about the positive effects after introducing such a change in the national rule.

Mr. Koskiniemi replied there is no hard statistics available, but a number of positive effects was observed like fewer outlandings or fewer cancelled tasks after launches were executed. There is also less waiting situations for weather on the grid, which makes pilots less tired and that is quite appreciated by them.

The proposal received 17 votes in favor, 16 votes against and 2 abstentions. The proposal failed.

6.2.3 Positive Means-of-Propulsion record (Denmark)

Mr. Frank (DEN) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)). The current rules require a proof of engine recording right after the release from aero-tow when pilots are busy finding lift and flying in proximity of other gliders. The proposal makes this procedure safer by simply extending the period for engine run until the time 5 minutes before the start. As the result pilots can do engine check at higher altitudes and when away from other gliders. Another change is reduction of maximum time for running the engine from 2 to 1 minute. With introduction of 1 second recording interval instead of 5 seconds this there is now 5 times more Means-of-Propulsion logs than before. A short discussion within Annex A group revealed there are several countries who use different procedures than in Annex A. We use of this procedure in Denmark for several years without any problem.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) stated that he has a sympathy for the proposal. However, the procedure as worded would allow for running the engine out-of-range of the contest site. That could be unfair especially to pilots flying pure gliders. This would need to be addressed at least in the Year-2 version of the proposal.

Mr. Filla (SWE) also supported the proposal and stated Sweden is already using it as part of their national rules. However, Sweden proposed the amendment of the proposal so that the limit to run the engine “5 minutes before the start” will change to “10 minutes before the start” to limit tactical misuse of the rule at the competitions.

Mr. Geissler (DEU) supported the proposal as a whole with the originally proposed times as the rationale presented showed this would be sufficient.

Mr. Georgas (GRC) asked for comments on 1 minute limitation (from 2 minutes currently) and its operational consequences in-flight as there seem to be no benefits from introducing such a change.

Mr. Mills (SC3 Annex A) informed that usually there is MOP record collecting input from an external unit (mostly in case of jet or electric engines) and ENL record recording surrounding noise level. Therefore, it would be beneficial to refer to both “MOP/ENL” in the proposal (i.e., as Year-2).

The proposed amendment by Sweden was seconded and in the subsequent vote it had received 25 votes in favor. The amendment passed.

Mr. Frank then responded to input from Slovakia and confirmed it will be introduced as part of Year-2 proposal provided this Year-1 passes.

The proposal received 27 votes in favor, 1 vote against and 5 abstentions. The proposal passes.

6.2.4 Altitude scoring (France)

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)). The proposal will clarify presentation of altitude / height / Flight Level (FL) information to pilots. It introduces the same principle as is used in Sailplane Grand Prix (SGP) competitions for some time already.

Mr. Spreckley (SGP management) informed that this issue has been identified in SGP competitions some time ago. Following the discussion, it was decided to align the use of this information with the Naviter scoring software. Although, this may not be specifically stipulated in the SGP rules.

Mr. Sheppe (SC3 Annex A) informed there is nothing about this in the Annex A nor in the SGP rules. There is a need to verify e.g., by the Scoring Software Working Group that the software used is in conformance with IGC rules.

Mr. Rutkowski (Poland) asked for clarification about how the calculation of daily FL offset from fixed QNH used today at conventional contests and variable QNH calculation at SGP contests will be affected.

Mr. Gerbaud stated that the proposal is to clarify how the QNH is used by the scoring software. This is not the case today.

Mr. Georgas (GRC) clarified that this proposal affects only airspace when vertical limitation is in FL. In such case we can take the actual reading from the GNSS Flight Recorder as all altitude recordings and calibrations are against standard pressure setting. There are however different ways of correcting QNH changes. The proposal will clarify the correct way in the rules (it is the same method of correction as is used by Naviter for scoring the championships today).

Mr. Filla (SWE) confirmed the explanation by Greece. He also mentioned that divergence in GNSS Flight Recorder calibrations had been observed in the past. The currently used scoring software can minimize these divergences to acceptable levels by using recorded altitude at point of launch. There have been at least two reports submitted to IGC about this point in the past.

Note: Those documents were - Finish altitude calculations at WWGC 2011 in Arboga, Sweden – submitted in 2021 and IGC Stewards Report - Airspace infringements during WGC2004 – submitted in 2004).

Mr. Geissler (GER) recalled this is still Year-1 proposal and not an amended or Year-2 proposal. Following all the technical explanations, it is not entirely clear what the essence of the proposal and its consequence. He asked for a clear paper about the change when presented as Year-2 proposal next year.

Mr. Casado (Scoring Software Working Group) added that the trigger for this was not a real issue, but a theoretical discussion of experts about what could happen when scoring competitions. He also confirmed that the explanation provided earlier by Greece was very clear and correct.

Mr. Georgas clarified that irrespective of the result of the vote the next championships will be scored as it was explained.

Mr. Gerbaud confirmed the intention is not to change the way of scoring is done today but to clarify it in the rules.

Mr. Ramseyer (IRL) following the latest inputs asked for confirmation this vote will be on Year-1 proposal and not on “Other” proposal that would be applicable immediately. This was confirmed.

The proposal received 30 votes in favor, 2 votes against and 5 abstentions. The proposal passes.

6.2.5 Management of GNSS Secondary Flight Recorder (France)

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)). The proposal clarifies the use of secondary flight recorded in situation it will have no impact on score.

The proposal received 28 votes in favor, 2 votes against and 6 abstentions. The proposal passes.

6.3 Other Proposals

6.3.1 Finances - Sanction Fees (IGC)

Mr. Pauwels (IGC Treasurer) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)). The proposal reflects the current IGC’s financial situation. There are more expenses and less income and that must be reflected in the fees IGC sanctions to the organisers. The proposal has two elements: The first one introduces 25€ increase of sanction per pilot already in 2022 (the organisers will be able to increase the entry fee by that amount). The second one proposes an overhaul of the sanction fee structure to be presented as the proposal to the 2023 IGC Plenary.

Mr. Motuza (LTU) asked for clarification of whether this will affect the already selected organisers.

The President clarified the direct impact will be on participating pilots who will need to pay a slightly higher sanction fee as part of entry fee.

Mr. Casado (ESP) asked about when the current championship sanction fees have been established.

Mr. Pauwels informed that the fees have not been changed over the last 20 years. He added that there was no adjustment to inflation over those years and the proportion of sanction fees to overall championship costs is nowadays extremely low. In conclusion, the increase of the fees in 2022 is important for keeping the quality of existing service by IGC to organisers and further increase from 2023 onwards will be necessary to increasing the quality and level of such a service.

Mr. Frank (DEN) asked for clarification about what championships will be affected and how. This has been clarified (no direct impact on organisers).

Mr. Motuza informed that the proposal has impact on the statements and budgets made by organisers and already presented to local authorities. He expressed support for the proposal to increase the fees in 2022 despite some administrative impact on the organisers.

Mr. Henderson (NZL) confirmed there were no changes to fees for years and reminded the delegates there are essentially two incomes for IGC: The championships sanction fees and the IGC ranking list fees. He stated he is very pleased to see the Bureau coming up with this update of fees which is reflecting the IGC’s financial situation.

Mr. Motuza proposed the amendment to start the increase of sanction fees from 2023.

Mr. Ramseyer (Ireland) added that the IGC also receives some income from the approval of GNSS Flight Recorders.

Mr. Pauwels confirmed that and added that the impact of those fees on the overall income is nowadays negligible. Therefore, this proposal focuses only on the increase of championship sanction fees.

The amendment by Lithuania was seconded.

Mr. Casado (ESP) challenged the logic of the proposed amendment because the original proposal covers only the increase of the fees for one single year i.e., 2022.

The President clarified the amendment will result in increase of the fees only in 2023 (not beyond) and proposal for a new sanction fee scheme from 2024 (instead of 2023). He concluded that the amendment is therefore valid.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NLD) supported the original proposal given the current financial situation and the outlook for the next year.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) added that the proposal is result of special circumstances in 2022 and warned about the negative impact in case the amendment will be accepted. Vote for the amendment will mean the original proposal is not valid.

Mr. Motuza clarified the proposal for amendment as the earliest increase of fees from 2023 to remove any impact on the championships in 2022.

Mr. Henderson asked for clarification that the proposal is about increase of pilot sanction fees in 2022 and not the organisers sanction fees. Therefore, it is perhaps hard to understand the logic of the Lithuanian amendment (referring to impact on organisers). Furthermore, there is no need to ask for permission for the Bureau to prepare the new sanction fees proposal for the next year as that is part of the normal business of the Bureau. Voting against the increase of the fees in 2022 will have a negative impact on the IGC's capabilities to support the competitions in 2022. He asked the delegates and the Bureau to avoid such a situation as much as possible.

The President confirmed the proposal concerns only pilot sanction fees increase by 25€ and only in 2022. He repeated this is important to keep the current level of service by the IGC, The other part of the proposal indicated there will be an additional yet undetermined increase in 2023 and onwards, but such a proposal will be presented and discussed only at the 2023 IGC Plenary.

Mr. Vidal (CHL) reminded of the slightly negative impact of the proposed amendment because of fewer championships in 2023 than in 2022.

The proposed amendment by Lithuania received 2 votes in favor thus it failed.

The original proposal received 31 votes in favor, 0 votes against and 1 abstention. The proposal passes.

The president thanked the delegates for a large support for this important proposal for the IGC.

6.3.2 Rating of E-Concept competitions (IGC/SC3 Annex D Committee)

Mr. Filla (SC3 Annex D Committee) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) through the presentation (available in the Cloud) comparing the three existing scoring systems – points, place and time based. He concluded by proposing to use place based conversion for converting the results of E-concept competitions into IGC Ranking List.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) asked for clarification that the conversion of results will be based on the place based system in the same way as it is done for the SGP competitions. This was confirmed.

The proposal received 31 votes in favor, 1 vote against and 1 abstention. The proposal passes.

6.3.3 FAI/IGC International Virtual gliding competition series (IGC)

Mr. Spreckley (IGC Bureau) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)), which builds on the success of the last virtual SGP Final competition and increasing popularity of virtual flying – two clear success factors in favor of the proposal. The proposal clearly indicates intention of the IGC to develop virtual gliding competitions as another global gliding sport discipline.

The President added that the IGC's intention is initially to organize virtual gliding competitions, which may eventually develop into Virtual World Gliding Championships. However, before that can happen IGC and FAI need to find a solution for managing sporting licenses for the participating sportsmen as there may be some interest for participation by pilots even from countries that are not FAI members. He concluded that the delegates are invited to observe and discuss the demonstration competition that will take place immediately after the Day 3 of this IGC Plenary meeting.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) supported the proposal. The establishment of this discipline as official sport under IGC is very important for French Gliding Federation. Otherwise, another organisation may take over. He informed about intention to organize the French virtual national gliding championships very soon and a positive decision of the IGC will help in getting it under the umbrella of the federation.

The President clarified that the intention is to create a system with national virtual competitions leading to world championships. The details will be developed as part of Year-2 proposal to be presented next year.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) expressed support for the proposal, which is very important for the future of gliding sport. It will also allow to open the door for work with other communities IGC has not been in contact so far. It is much easier to start competing in virtual gliding than in real gliding competitions. Many virtual participants may eventually join real gliding world at a later stage and thus positively influence participation in gliding sport.

Mr. Georgas (GRC) expressed support for the proposal. This might be the most significant change IGC has introduced for the benefit of future of our sport.

Mrs. Caselato (BRA) informed that Brazilian federation has organized virtual gliding competitions since 2018 similarly as Argentina. Brazil supports the virtual gliding sport. However, the participation should be cost free in order not to limit number of participants and the virtual flying should be designated as a separate sport directly under the FAI and under the IGC.

Mr. Bajpai (IND) stated that it is important for IGC to move in this direction. The countries like India may benefit from it greatly. The sport can reach out to many participants some of whom may eventually join the real gliding sport. It could be also a very good opportunity to develop gliding sport in countries where it does not yet exist without the costs and burden the real gliding sport encompasses.

Mr. Han (CHN) supports this proposal very much. In that regards the letter of support by China was sent to IGC. There is a large population of virtual pilots in China, many of them are juniors. There are series of virtual flying competition organized each year, which conclude with national championships. Many university and engineering students participate in the virtual flying sport. China is very interested in participating in the virtual gliding to help developing a real gliding sport in the country. We very much look forward to receiving technical support from IGC in this area.

The President confirmed the receipt of the letter as well as IGC's intention to support the development of gliding sport including virtual gliding in China.

The proposal received 31 votes in favor, 2 votes against and 1 abstention. The proposal passes.

6.3.4 FAI/IGC International Electric gliding competition series (IGC)

Mr. Spreckley (IGC Bureau) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) through the presentation (available in the Cloud). He recalled these competitions are only for gliders with Mean-of-Propulsion (MoP). There were three Electric gliding competitions organized in the recent years run under the IGC rules (Pavullo – Italy, Großrückerswalde – Germany, Varese - Italy) and the fourth one is planned in September 2022 in Saint Auban, France. There is increasing interest among pilots in these competitions. Then Mr. Spreckley explained the background of the proposal (evolution from 13.5 meter working group, elapsed-time scoring, measurement of energy use, 300+ sailplanes available and new MOP systems coming soon). The concept allows for new contest areas, development of new MOP systems, new scoring concepts and task ideas. The goal is not a development of just another competition class. The working group to be created for this purpose will develop a detailed organisation and present it to the 2023 IGC Plenary meeting. The ambition is to organize the 1st FAI E-Glide WGC in 2026.

Mr. Motuza (LTU) asked for clarification of the statement “not to create a new class” as it is a bit confusing. The understanding is that this initiative will develop a new competition philosophy or concept.

Mr. Casado (Scoring Software Working Group) informed that the group is actively working on the development of scoring script for these competitions as well as real scoring methods based on real-time tracking technology controlling the use of energy developed for IGC.

Mr. Georgas (GRC) expressed support for the proposal and looks forward to presentation of the new ways of competing in gliding. We may even use what we learn here to change the conventional competitions in the future.

Mr. Alvaro de Orleans–Borbon (FAI Companion of Honor) expresses support for this very important proposal. The new technology may allow for completely new tasks or challenges to be flown, which could be very similar in essence to the early days of aviation (e.g., gliding equivalent of Gordon Bennett Cup in ballooning). The whole SGP concept could be seen as the preparation for these new competition concepts. He urged the delegates to support this development with all the enthusiasm and capacity to innovate.

Mr. Cernezzi (ITA) supported the development of E-Glide. However, this is a new philosophy and 2026 may be too early for organizing the World Gliding Championships. There is also a difficulty to see the value of IGC Ranking List if such a new competition is included in the system. Perhaps a new system will need to be used, this and some other aspects require further discussions.

Mr. Bajpai (IND) fully supports this proposal. The environment in India does not always facilitate safe outlandings due to very small fields. Electric engines may help to overcome such a disadvantage. The proposal also offers the opportunity to develop a new way of flying gliders and use of energy in flight including solar energy or energy recuperation.

Mr. Spreckley in response to the points raised by previous speakers clarified that the proposal opens the door for this concept under IGC/FAI. A new working group will be created by the Bureau to explore the opportunities and based on that to develop further details.

Mr. Vidal (CHL) pointed out the additional positive side of this proposal i.e., the use of real-time scoring including energy use and management in flight based on IGC trackers. The

conventional competitions might then benefit from the technical development and lessons learned during these developments.

The proposal received unanimous support from the delegates. The proposal passes.

6.3.5 Entry fee request Junior WGC 2022 (Czech Republic)

Mr. Koutny (CZE) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) including the rationales behind. The proposed increase is the minimum possible to make the championships financially viable and while keeping it still affordable to junior pilots.

Mr. Casado queried whether the proposal considers also the recently increased championship sanction fee just approved by this Plenary meeting. It was confirmed it does not and the new sanction fee will be added on top of the proposed entry fee.

Mrs. Kuijpers stated that the junior championships were not included in the recently adopted proposal for increase of championships sanction fees so there is no impact on this proposal.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) could understand the increase of aerotow fees due to higher costs, but the reasons presented (inflation and pandemics) seem insufficient to justify the high increase of entry fee by 20-30%. Mr. Koutny responded that just the inflation in Czechia over the last 2 years reached 16% and that the additional increase is due to higher fuel prices that have an influence on many other costs including aircraft maintenance, facilities etc. Unfortunately, the inflation and costs are expected to grow also during the upcoming months up which will have a direct effect on cost of the Championships.

Mr. Geissler (DEU) expressed similar concerns as Mr. Spreckley and added that some more details about the increase would have been beneficial to be able to vote for the proposal. Mr. Koutny in response substantiated that as another example of higher costs the energy prices have doubled in Czechia since the last year.

Mr. Motuza (LTU) informed about possible financial implications for participating teams especially if co-financed from subsidies. The proposal may result those additional costs might not be reimbursed from subsidy funds because the related financial commitments are usually made the year before.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NLD) stated that the initial expectation based on the proposal itself was the cost increase will mainly be due to pandemics and associated measures. This seems not to be the case anymore. Therefore, an additional information and justification of such a high increase of fees is necessary for the Netherlands could support the proposal. She queried if such information could be provided on the next meeting day. Mr. Koutny responded that the pandemics situation is still uncertain including the associated costs. However, the main part of the increased costs is due to inflation.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) seconded the request from the Netherlands for additional information and exact figures driving the high increase of costs that may ideally to be provided next meeting day. That could also allow the delegates to consult their NACs and exchange the views before the vote will be taken. This was accepted by Czechia who agreed to provide a more precise figures and calculations to the delegates the next day.

On Day 3 of the meeting Mr. Koutny presented additional information received from the organisers about the overall financial situation in Czechia and rationale for the proposed increased costs of the Championship (the presentation is available in the FAI Cloud).

Mr. Geissler (DEU) noted all presented information and questioned about the level of increased of entry fee which is at the same level as the entry fee of just accepted bid from Czechia that will take place in 2024. He invited Czechia to find a better solution or compromise

e.g., to increase of entry fee by 100€ instead of proposed 200€ as the fuel increase is already captured in the higher aerotow fees.

Mr. Koutny responded that all participants (incl. those from Czechia) will be affected by the higher costs and added, in relation to the perceived inconsistency between the entry fees, that the organisers expect higher number of participants at the EGC in 2024 than during the junior WGC this year.

Ms. Kuijpers (NLD) commented that the requests for increase of Championships fees became a regular practice by the organisers. The stewards' working group is aware of the problem and its consequences for the participating teams. The group is looking for a solution that could bring more transparency into the decision-making process (e.g., a more automated process based on public financial data). She also noted that the increase of costs in this case may be perceived as appropriate considering the fact that the actual bid had been presented already five years ago.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) expressed a sympathy with the organisers but questioned the way the impact of inflation is presented. He also commented that the proposal as presented (combining both entry and aerotow fees included) does not allow for a flexible decision making because its rejection could put the organisers under the unwanted financial pressure. From the initial reaction it seems the delegates could support some lower cost increase. If rejected, there may be a need for the Bureau to engage with the organisers to look for a solution.

Mr. Koutny responded that the organizing of the Championship using originally proposed fees will not be financially viable and thus impossible.

Mr. Spreckley added that the increase of aerotow fees is understood but the problem is the very high increase of entry fee. There will be a need for compromise if the Plenary will reject the proposal as tabled.

The IGC President Mr. Eriksen summarized the discussion and in this light invited Czechia to consider putting forward a compromise that could be accepted by majority of the delegates.

Mr. Koutny then proposed lower increase of entry fee by 150€ (to 800€) instead of initially proposed increase by 200€. This motion was seconded.

Note: There 35 voting members were present (including 1 proxy). As a result, the majority required 18 votes and 2/3 majority required 24 votes (see item 1.1 on Day 3).

The amended proposal received 26 votes in favor, 1 vote against and 7 abstentions. The proposal passes.

6.3.6 Entry fee request WGC 2022 (Hungary)

Mr. Gyongyosi (HUN) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) including the rationales behind. The financial situation and especially inflation in Hungary is very similar to Czechia. Consequently, the State funding initially committed for the Championships will not be made available to the organisers. The proposed increase of entry fee by 125€ per participant is the calculated amount reflecting the lost funds to make the event financially viable.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NLD) questioned whether the increased costs are also due to the change of location that might have triggered additional and unexpected investment costs. Mr. Gyongyosi responded that the investments are necessary in both locations and were calculated in the original bid. Thus, these do not relate to this proposal.

Mr. Frank (DEN) expressed understanding of the situation faced by the organisers given the situation in the world. Nevertheless, the delegates and the team deserve transparent and precise information about the additional costs. He concluded by stating that the problem is wider and may deserve a more systematic approach as it will unlikely disappear soon.

Mr. Geissler (DEU) queried about the amount of the originally accepted entry fee and about the details of the proposed increase. Mr. Gyongyosi informed the original entry fee in the bid was 900€ and the proposal is to increase it by 150€ of which 25€ will reflect the recently accepted proposal by the IGC for increased sanction fees in 2022. Additionally, the Championships were postponed by one year and that extraordinary fact also needs to be considered.

The proposal received 28 votes in favor, 1 vote against and 2 abstentions. The proposal passes.

7. Reports not requiring voting

The written reports under this Agenda item, when available, were published on the IGC website and stored in IGC Cloud. The reports were not presented, but the relevant representatives were available for questions.

7.2 Standing Committees

7.2.1 Report from the Sporting Code Committee

Mr. Mills (Committee member) referred to the Report from the Sporting Code Committee (available [here](#)).

7.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A

Mr. Sheppe (Committee chair) referred to the Report from the Annex A Committee (available [here](#)) and added the alternative scoring system that was approved by the Plenary in 2019 and is referred to in the Annex of the Committee's report has been successfully tested by USA and New Zealand including the development of the scoring script. However, the pandemics ruined the subsequent plans to test the system at one of the Category 1 events. Nevertheless, the Committee is committed to make the necessary testing during the next two seasons.

Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A Handicaps

Mr. Geissler (Sub-Committee chair) referred to the Report from the Handicaps Committee (available [here](#)).

7.2.3 Report from the Annex D Committee

Mr. Filla (Committee chair) referred to the written Report from the Annex D Committee (available [here](#)) and added that the Committee has some ideas how to develop the Ranking List further, which were forwarded to the IGC Bureau. The IGC president Mr. Eriksen confirmed that the suggestions will be considered by the Bureau next year.

7.2.4 Report from the Air Traffic, Navigation, and Display Systems Committee (ANDS)

Mr. Sheppe (Committee chair) referred to the written Report from the ANDS Committee (available [here](#)) and confirmed the intention to organise technical discussion about the proposal from Denmark and France to remove the requirement for regular calibration of the approved GNSS flight recorders.

7.2.5 GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Committee Report (GFAC)

Mr. Ian Strachan (Committee chair) referred to the written Report from the GFA Committee (available [here](#)) and added that since the report a new type of flight recorder is being tested and specifications of 61 approved systems were updated.

7.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report

Mrs. Mandy Temple (Committee chair) informed that there is nothing to report in addition to information disseminated in the usual email communication sent prior to the meeting.

7.3 Working Groups

7.3.1 Stewards and Jury

Ms. Kuijpers (working group chair) referred to the written Report from the Stewards Working Group (available [here](#)) and added that the main objective of the working group wants to improve quality of championships by working closely with organisers well before the events take place. Many templates were developed over the last few months to support the organizers in making a high quality events and improve standardisation of championships.

7.3.2 Report of the Safety Working Group

Mr. Vidal (working group chair) referred to the written Report from the Safety Working Group (available [here](#)) and Annex (available [here](#)). He added that the WG is still willing to organise the safety workshop together with OSTIV but the initiative is pending subject to clarification of the situation concerning the WGC 2022 in Hungary.

7.3.3 Scoring Software

Mr. Casado (working group chair) referred to the written report (available [here](#)).

7.3.4 History

Mr. Peter Selinger (working group chair) reiterated the announcement made by the group (available [here](#)) and invited the IGC Plenary to support the working group which needs new volunteers after the loss of Tor Johannessen and John Roake, the two very important members of the group. The group is particularly looking for volunteers mastering well English language who could help with documenting the IGC's history in writing. The group is also looking for any copies of documents from IGC meetings from years 1956-1958. This period is quite important for IGC because in 1956 it made the important long-term decisions to cancel the two-seater class and established the standard class. Finally, Mr. Selinger asked about the continuation of work of Mr. John Roake on collection of gliding statistics information.

The IGC president Mr. Eriksen reiterated the request for volunteers to support this important work and invited individuals or organisations interested in IGC history to contact the IGC Bureau or directly Mr. Peter Selinger.

7.3.6 IGC Media

Mr. Spreckley (working group chair) reported the information material related to IGC media will be circulated to the delegates by email after the meeting.

7.4 IGC Representatives

7.4.1 CASI Report

Mr. Eriksen informed that there is nothing to be reported.

7.4.2 EGU

Mr. Pauwels referred to the written report (available [here](#)) and informed the delegates that Mr. Arild Solbakken was recently elected as the new EGU President. He then invited IGC to contact the EGU in case of questions or visit the EGU's website (<https://glidingunion.eu/>).

The IGC president Mr. Eriksen on behalf of IGC congratulated Mr. Solbakken for being elected as the new EGU president and added that he is well known by IGC and respected for his previous engagement as the Norwegian IGC delegate.

7.4.4 FAI Medical Commission

The item was postponed to Day 3.

7.4.3 Environmental Commission Report

Mr. Eriksen informed that there is nothing to be reported and most of the last year commission's activities were not relevant to gliding.

7.5 IGC Specialists

7.5.1 Trophy Management

Ms. Gisela Weinreich referred to the Trophy Manager's Report (available [here](#)) and its comprehensive Appendixes (available here [Appendix 1 - IGC/FAI Challenge Cups](#), [Appendix 2 - IGC Challenge Cups for the next WGCs \(2022\)](#), [Appendix 3 - Chronicle of World Soaring Cup Diploma](#), [Appendix 4 - World Soaring Cup competition 2021 scoring](#) and [Appendix 5 - Challenge Cups archive](#)) and suggested that the existing World Soaring Cup Diploma to be added to the existing list of FAI gliding awards in addition to the Lilienthal and Pelagia Majewska Medals and Pirat Gehriger Diploma based on the Article 7 of the rules for the World Soaring Cup.

The IGC president Mr. Eriksen informed that IGC supports the suggestion and will coordinate the next steps with Ms. Weinreich.

7.5.2 On-Line Contest

Mr. Christof Geissler reported that there is now the new online portal called [WeGlide.org](#) available in addition to [OLC](#). The new portal provides additional innovative opportunities for decentralised competitions for international glider pilot community.

7.5.3 Sailplane Grand Prix

Mr. Spreckley informed that there is nothing to be added to the report (available [here](#)) and its Annex (available [here](#)).

The President then closed the formal part of the 2nd meeting day. The formal meeting will adjourn Saturday at 12:00 UTC.

iConspicuity in U-space and beyond

Mr. Vladimir Foltin (EASA) presented the latest *iConspicuity*¹ related developments at EASA. He introduced the relevance of *iConspicuity* to solving the airborne collision risk problem for manned aircraft as well as to safe integrating of drones into the same airspace with other air traffic that is not subject to air traffic control. The presentation (available in the FAI cloud) was followed by a short discussion.

There are no minutes from this informal part of the meeting.

Day 3

The President opened the 3rd meeting day and welcomed all delegates, observers, and guests.

1.1 Roll Call

¹ EASA concept enabling 'in-flight capability' to transmit position and/or to receive, process and display information about other aircraft, airspace, weather or support to navigation in a real time with the objective to enhance pilots' situational awareness.

A roll call of Delegates was undertaken by Mr. Foltin, and it was determined that 35 voting members were present (including 1 proxy). As a result, the majority required 18 votes and 2/3 majority required 24 votes.

1.3 Declaration of Conflict of interest

No additional Conflict of Interest were declared.

7. Reports not requiring voting

7.1 OSTIV Report (Dr Rolf Radespiel)

Prof. Radespiel referred to the OSTIV Report (available [here](#)) and emphasised that the main area of cooperation with IGC now is the joint work on championships safety. He also informed about the very successful OSTIV Congress where it was among other agreed that the next Congress will take place in a hybrid format from the venue of the 2024 WGC in Uvalde, USA.

The IGC president Mr. Eriksen informed about the intention to hold the joint IGC/OSTIV safety workshop in Hungary right after the 2022 WGC will conclude.

8. Presentation of Bids

Ms. Mandy Temple (Bid Manager) invited the potential organisers to present their bids to the IGC delegates.

8.1 Presentation of bids for future Championships included in IGC calendar

a. 39th FAI World Gliding Championships 2025 (Club, Standard and 15m), Tabor Czech Republic

Mr. Petr Koutny (Czech delegate) presented the bid (available [here](#)). The presentation is available in the FAI Cloud.

b. 13th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2025 (Club, Standard and 18m), Zbraslavice Czech Republic

Mr. Martin Hrivna and Ms. Barbora Moravcova from Aeroklub Zbraslavice (CZE) presented the bid (available [here](#)). The presentation is available in the FAI Cloud.

8.2 Presentation of bids for future Championships not included in IGC calendar

- 22nd FAI European Gliding Championship 2024 (Club, Standard and 15m), Tabor, Czech Republic

Mr. Petr Koutny (CZE) presented the bid (available [here](#)). The presentation is available in the FAI Cloud.

Ms. Temple concluded that all the presented bids were received complete and in time.

8.3 Questions to all presenters

Mr. Rene Vidal (CHL) queried all bid presenters about the use of tracking system and real time scoring at their events.

Mr. Koutny confirmed the organisers will follow IGC rules and will use the tracking system if requested so by the IGC.

Mr. Geissler (DEU) expressed appreciation of flexibility made by Czechia in response to the just adopted increase of costs and advised that any future increase of costs of participation should be made available the year before for teams and NACs to be able to budget the necessary funds.

Mr. Koutny responded that it was difficult to predict the costs the year before due to recent unprecedented circumstances and global situation and expressed support for the IGC's work on a process driven, objective based and more transparent calculation of cost increases in the future.

9. Votes on bids

9.1 Bids for Championships included in IGC calendar

a. 39th FAI World Gliding Championships 2025 (Club, Standard and 15m), Tabor Czech Republic

The bid was accepted without the need to vote because it was the only valid bid that was received.

b. 13th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2025 (Club, Standard and 18m), Zbraslavice Czech Republic

The bid was accepted without the need to vote because it was the only valid bid that was received.

9.2 Bids for Championships not included in IGC calendar

- 22nd FAI European Gliding Championship 2024 (Club, Standard and 15m), Tabor Czech Republic

This spontaneous bid was accepted by acclamation.

6.3 Other Proposals

6.3.5 Entry fee request Junior WGC 2022 (Czech Republic)

The meeting continued with the discussion and vote on the proposal from Czechia that was initially presented on Day 2 (for record of full discussion and the vote please refer to item 6.3.5 on Day 2).

10. Championships

For championships, general information is made available through the Championships websites and Bulletins. Only items requiring action or special attention from the Plenum were presented.

10.1 Reports from Past Championships

Ms. Kuijpers (chair of stewards' working group) introduced the session and asked for questions about the past 2021 Championships.

Mr. Frank (DEN) requested the reports to be made available earlier so that the delegates could discuss their content with the teams participated at those events.

Mr. Kuijpers acknowledged it and explained that delayed publication of reports this year was due to higher than usual workload associated to the 2022 Championships. The delegates were invited to send the comments they may have even after the meeting.

10.1.1 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2021, Montluçon-Guéret, France (Club, Std., 15m)

10.1.2 5th FAI Junior European Gliding Championships 2021, Pociunai (EYPR), Lithuania (Club, Std.)

10.2 Reports about Future Championships

Ms. Kuijpers informed that since the last Plenary meeting the stewards are reporting on progress of the Championships preparations instead of organisers (some information was complemented by updates from the organisers e.g., Lithuania). She highlighted that this year is a transition year to the new Championship structure and as a result there are five to be dealt with. Ms. Kuijpers then shared the feedback from the stewards of those competitions. Nowadays, much more documents (airspace files, self-briefing for pilots, etc.) are being reviewed by the stewards ahead of the Championships to help the organisers to improve overall quality of their events. Any noteworthy items related to a particular Championship are recorded in the following subparagraphs. All presented information is available in the FAI Cloud.

10.2.3 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2022, Matkópuszta Szeged (see item 14.4),, Hungary (18m, 20m, Open)

- The war in neighboring Ukraine created substantial problems with access to airspace, but thanks to intense collaboration between the organisers, IGC and local authorities these issues are now almost solved. One of the consequences is the proposal to change venue to Szeged aerodrome that is further away from the main military areas (for more details see the late proposal under agenda item 14.4).

- Due to above mentioned some previously agreed timelines had to be postponed. Nevertheless, the local procedures are already approved.

10.2.4 11th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2022, Husbands Bosworth, UK (Club, Std., 18m)

- The organisers are waiting for approval of EASA medical certificates by the local CAA.

- The organisers are using a specific contest administration tool which makes overall management of documentation much easier. The IGC is looking how to make the tool available to future Championship organisers.

10.2.5 12th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2022, Tabor (LKTA), Czech Republic (Club, Std.)

- The organisers have a well-established relation with a local aviation TV channel which helps in creating very useful audio visual material that is great for promotion of gliding sport to young people.

10.2.6 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2023, Narromine, Australia (Club, Std., 15m)

10.2.7 12th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2023, Soria, Spain (Club, Standard, 18m)

10.2.3 38th FAI World Gliding Championships 2024, Uvalde (TX), USA (18m, 20m, Open)

10.2.8 13th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2024, Ostrow Wielkopolski, Poland (Club, Std.)

21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2022 (15m, Standard, Club) and 4th FAI World 13,5M Class Gliding Championship 2022, Pociunai, Lithuania

- The organisers had to face some political issues due to the change of the NAC and the gliding federation leaderships, but these were solved also thanks to intervention of IGC.

- The organisers do not expect any substantial problems with access to airspace during the Championships due war in Ukraine thanks to careful planning and well established cooperation with local civil and military authorities.

10.2.10 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2022, Luís Eduardo Magalhães (SWNB), Brazil (Std. Monotype, 15m Handicapped)

10.2.11 5th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2023, Hutchinson (KS), USA

(see also agenda item 14.1)

10.2.12 13th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2023, Arnborg, Denmark (Club, Std.)

10.3 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships (Brian Spreckley)

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

- 11th Series of FAI World SGP

- FAI World SGP Championships Final 2023, Pavullo, Italy

This agenda item was covered under item 7.5.3.

11. Confirmation and Approval of IGC Officials

11.2 Approval of Competition Officials (Frouwke Kuijpers)

The Plenary approved the following officials to serve at the 2022 Championships.

11.2.1 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2022, Matkópuszta Szeged (see item 14.4), Hungary (18m, 20m, Open)

Jury President: Marina Vigorito (ITA)

Remote Jurors: Christof Geissler (GER), Reno Fila (SWE)

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels (BEL)

Steward: Øjvind Frank (DEN)

11.2.2 11th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2022, Husbands Bosworth, UK (Club, Std., 18m)

Jury President: Rick Sheppe (USA)

Remote Jurors: Bob Bickers (GBR), Angel Casado (ESP)

Chief Steward: Mandy Temple (AUS)

Steward: Frouwke Kuijpers (NLD)

11.2.3 12th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2022, Tabor (LKTA), Czech Republic (Club, Std.)

Jury president: Wojciech Scigala (POL)

Remote Jurors: Axel Reich (DEU), Dick Bradley (RSA)

Chief Steward: Robin van Maarschalkerweerd (NLD)

Steward: Enrique Lippi (ARG)

11.2.4 4th FAI 13.5 Meter World Gliding Championship 2022 (13.5 meter) and 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2022 (Club, Std., 15m)

Jury President: Bruno Ramseyer (IRL)

Remote Jurors: Peter Ryder (DEU), Juha Silvennoinen (FIN)

Chief Steward: Robert Danewid (SWE)

Steward: Milan Kmetovics (HUN)

11.2.5 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2022, Luís Eduardo Magalhães (SWNB), Brazil (Std. Monotype, 15m Handicapped)

Jury president: Alfonso Soto (CHL)

Remote Jurors: Bruno Ramseyer (IRL), Rene Vidal (CHL)

Chief Steward: Eduardo Toselli (ARG)

Steward: Renato Tsukamoto (BRA)

The IGC President Mr. Eriksen thanked all officials for taking these roles that are very important for the overall quality and safety of IGC Championships.

7.4 IGC Representatives

7.4.4 FAI Medical Commission

Dr. Jurgen Knüppel reported about two topics relevant to gliding the commission is dealing. The antidoping related matters could be rather complex and the IGC delegates were invited to contact Dr. Knüppel in case of any need for guidance or explanations. There are several experts competent on this subject within the commission. The second topic is gender issue in the sports. This is now being discussed also among ASC presidents. The commissions are expected to be closely involved in any decision making that may affect their disciplines.

12. 2022 IGC awards

Mr. Vladimir Foltin (IGC secretary) reminded the meeting about the procedures for Awards. No recordings or minutes shall be taken during the awards process.

Marina Vigorito Galetto of Italy was awarded the Lilienthal Medal.

12.4 IGC Champion Pilot of the Year 2021

The IGC President Mr. Eriksen reminded the delegates of the rules for this award and informed the delegates that based on the scores the IGC Champion Pilot of Year 2021 is Mr. Simon Schröder of Germany.

Mr. Eriksen congratulated on behalf of IGC to both recipients of the 2021 awards in gliding.

13. 2023 IGC Plenary Meeting

13.1 Announcement of the dates and place of the 2023 IGC Plenary meeting

The IGC President Mr. Eriksen informed the delegates that the next IGC Plenary meeting will be held in Copenhagen, Denmark on 3-4 March 2023. The meeting conditions and practicalities are the same as in the bid. More details will be provided closer to the meeting dates.

13.2 Useful dates and other practical information

Mr. Vladimir Foltin (IGC secretary) reminded the meeting about the following important deadlines for the 2023 IGC Plenary:

Deadline for notification of proposals and bids: 30th September 2022

Deadline for final bids, final proposals and reports: 31st December 2022

Deadline for nominations for awards: 60 days before the next IGC Plenary

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

14. Late proposals

The IGC President Mr. Eriksen informed that all late proposals require a 2/3rd majority to be tabled.

14.1 Increase of aerotow fees - Pan-American Gliding Championships 2022 (Brazil)

The meeting voted for tabling the proposal for discussion.

Ms. Valeria Caselato (Brazil) introduced the late proposal (available [here](#)) and added that the economic situation in Brazil is similar to situation as described by other countries organizing the IGC Championships in 2022. Additionally, the change of a more remote location induced some additional costs that need to be considered to make the event financially viable.

The proposal received 24 votes in favor, 0 votes against and 3 abstentions. The proposal passes.

14.2 Bid for the FAI 13.5 meter World Gliding Championship 2024 (Poland)

The meeting voted for tabling the proposal for discussion.

Mr. Artur Rutkowski (POL) presented the late bid (available [here](#)). The presentation is available in the FAI Cloud.

Mr. Geissler (DEU) commented about collocation of the Championships and the FAI Junior WGC which are now proposed to be held together. The organization of these events in parallel cannot be supported by Germany because of differences between the two (junior and senior) teams have a different dynamics and distinct culture. As the result this collocation may negatively affect the special atmosphere and existing character of to date a very successful junior WGC. The presented rational of a lower entry cost for junior pilots is not supported due to usually very low participation at the 13.5M WGC.

Mr. Rutkowski acknowledged the existence of practice of organizing the junior championships separately. He added that the bid's intention is also to support continuation of the WGC in 13.5M class and targets the pilots flying this class who would otherwise not have an opportunity to compete at the highest international level. The two events could complement each other without distorting the unique atmosphere of junior WGC. The collocation also provides an opportunity to offer affordable conditions to the small number of participants usually attending the 13.5M WGC.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) queried whether the organisers intend to adhere to the Annex A limitation of two pilots per NAC per class.

Mr. Rutkowski responded that collocation with the Junior WGC will provide for a financially viable 13.5M WGC even if only 2 pilots per NAC will be allowed to take part.

Mr. Geissler (DEU) further to his previous comment added that collocation of events inevitably means also merging of the two teams into one combined national team with all unwanted consequences what that may bring.

Due to uncertainty of votes still present at the meeting a new roll call of Delegates was undertaken by Mr. Foltin (IGC secretary). It was determined that 34 voting members were present (including 1 proxy). As a result, the majority required 18 votes and 2/3 majority required 23 votes.

The bid received 18 votes in favor, 9 votes against and 7 abstentions. The late bid was accepted.

14.3 Guidelines for Competition Day cancellation (IGC)

The meeting voted for tabling the proposal for discussion.

Mr. Rene Vidal (Safety working group chair) presented the late Year-1 proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Rutkowski queried whether the intention is to propose some powers for FAI officials to overrule the powers of championship management team or to propose guidelines for the latter.

Mr. Sheppe (chair of Annex A Committee) this proposal will not affect the existing relations between stewards and championship management team but will provide important guidelines for the organisers how to deal with certain situations not yet detailed in the existing rules and supporting material.

Mr. Vladas Motuza (Lithuania) commented that the rules gave the right to cancel contest task to competition director who is usually a local person. The reasons for task cancellation may vary significantly and the local affiliation of competition director may influence fairness of the competition. Thus, a careful consideration of this factors in the guidelines will be necessary.

Ms. Kuijpers (NLD) reiterated that the current rules allow competition director to cancel the task in progress due to safety reasons. However, it is not always clear to what it means in practice. The purpose of this proposal is to provide help to the director to make a safe and fair decision in this regard.

Mr. Bruno Ramseyer (IRL) queried about the possible contradiction of terms guidelines vs rules. The SC3 Annex A is the rule book and should not contain guidelines.

Mr. Sheppe clarified that this duality already exists in the current Annex A which contains both, the rules and the guidelines. The latter are usually in italics to clearly differentiate them from rules.

Mr. Aldo Cernezzi (ITA) based on his experience as competition director expressed his support to the proposal.

The late proposal received 30 votes in favor. The proposal passed.

14.4 Change of venue - 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2022, Hungary (18m, 20m, Open)

The meeting voted for tabling the proposal for discussion.

Mr. Andras Gyongyosi (Hungary) introduced the late proposal (available [here](#)) and reiterated the reason for the change. He also informed about the recent positive decision of Szeged municipality who is the owner of aerodrome to host the Championships there. Based on that Mr. Gyongyosi asked the IGC Plenary (instead of initial request to IGC Bureau) to approve the relocation of the WGC 2022 to Szeged.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) queried whether the dates will remain the same.

Mr. Gyongyosi confirmed that all other conditions will remain the same.

The proposal received 31 votes in favor. The proposal passes.

11. Confirmation and Approval of IGC Officials

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

Mr. Vladimir Foltin (IGC secretary) presented the actual list of IGC Officers to the IGC delegates. The IGC President Mr. Eriksen asked for approval of the presented list of the IGC Officers by acclamation. This was supported by the Plenary meeting.

15. Meeting Wrap-up and Closure of the formal part

The President then closed the formal part of the last day of the 2022 IGC Plenary meeting. The President looked forward to finally meeting everyone in person in Copenhagen in March 2023.

Virtual gliding competitions - Demonstration of virtual gliding competition to IGC Delegates

Mr. Antoine Havet (FRA) introduced to topic to the IGC delegates.

There are no minutes from this more informal part of the meeting.

End of the meeting minutes.

Vladimir Foltin

IGC Secretary