Proposal to the 2024 IGC Plenary

Date: 30 December 2023
Proposal submitted by: Denmark

This proposal is a: mark the boxes with ✗ as appropriate

Type the text changes in the space below (show deletions as strike-through and additions as bold underlined):

IGC PROCEDURES FOR HANDICAPPED CLASSES

Introduction

The purpose of handicapping shall be to equalize the performance of competing gliders as far as possible.

The handicap values used shall be directly proportional to the expected cross-country speeds of gliders in typical soaring conditions.

This proposal does not propose any change to the calculation of the performance of the gliders, but with the above precision, the new handicaps shall be re-calculated from the current handicap list by changing the spread factor from 0,5 to 1,0 to make the handicaps proportional to the calculated performance of the glides.

Type the reasons in the space below:

The main reason for this proposal is:
1) The current handicaps are not proportional with the performance of the gliders.
2) The current handicaps do not provide competitive handicaps to as many gliders as possible

The 2017 revision (#2) of handicaps was done, based on a comprehensive calculation and/or assessment of the performance of each type of glider in the Club class.

It was however decided to only apply 50% of the difference in performance as the handicap, i.e. a glider with 10% better performance only get 5% handicap. Logically there has subsequently been strong shift of chosen glider types towards the highest performance gliders e.g:

- All WGC’s since 2017 has been won by the glider types with the highest handicap ASW20 & LS3.
- Pilot statements and pilot choices confirm that no other than ASW20, LS3 or eventually the LS7 are relevant in the Club Class
- Gliders with low handicaps has no fair chance to compete.
Provide supporting data or reference to external documents for the proposed technical amendments in the space below:

#1 IGC 2018 Plenary Meeting, Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A Handicaps:

Citations:

“There is intent to provide a competitive handicap to as many gliders as possible that are listed in today’s IGC club class handicap list.”

“...like equivalent chance to Cirrus ... Discus, ASW15 ... ASW24, LS1 ... LS7, Libelle ... HPH304C, Jantar ... which covers a huge spread of glider designs and built dates.”

“as soon as there will be glider types showing a specific competitive advantage over others with the new handicap list, the handicap committee will interfere and will have a closer look, and correct with one of the next updates as soon as it proves to be necessary.”

“There should not be a specific type of club class glider as the “must fly” to win”


Citation:

“The spreading of the handicap factors was then reduced by a factor in order to continue using the current scoring system and the evaluation software at competitions.”

This is: The handicap was reduced to “ \( H_{\text{spread}} = H^{(0.5)} \) ” meaning a glider with 10% better performance get only 5% handicap.

Citation:

“With this formula, the spread of the handicap is reduced consistent over all gliders.”

This is not a correct statement: The higher performance, the higher reduction in handicap. With handicap of 1.00 there is no reduction and handicaps lower than 1.00, get an increase in handicap.

Therefore gliders high handicapped gliders get an advantage proportional to their performance. This is in contradiction with the intent of the handicaps:

Citation:

“There is intent to provide a competitive handicap to as many gliders as possible that are listed in today’s IGC club class handicap list.”

“4.2 Adjustment of Handicap Factors in the Future

The issue, that gliders are prefered because of their handicap factor given, should be avoided in the future. No handicap factor can be completely fair. For this reason, the handicap factor should be reviewed and adjusted based on competition results and pilot statements. It should be noted, that this should only be applied to avoid having a special type of aircraft dominate the club class.”
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