



*Fédération  
Aéronautique  
Internationale*

---

# Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the  
**FAI Gliding Commission**

**held in Potchefstroom, South Africa**  
Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> and Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2012

*Maison du Sport International  
Av. de Rhodanie 54  
CH-1007 Lausanne  
(Switzerland)  
Tél. +41 (0)21 345 10 70  
Fax +41 (0)21 645 10 77  
E-mail: [sec@fai.org](mailto:sec@fai.org)  
Web: [www.fai.org](http://www.fai.org)*

Version 1.1/ 18<sup>th</sup> April 2012

*Note: The agenda together with all reports, documents and proposals, as well as nominations for people having received awards, can be found on the FAI web:*

<http://www.fai.org/igc-about-us/igc-meetings>

## **1. Opening**

IGC President Bob Henderson called the meeting to order and requested the observation of a moment of silence in honour of friends and colleagues lost in the previous year.

The President then welcomed the Delegates to the 2012 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked the South African hosts, especially Mr Dick Bradley, for the invitation to Potchefstroom for the meeting and introduced new Delegates, Alternate Delegates and Observers at the meeting. He also welcomed Mr Reiner Rose, the CEO of Segelflugszene gGmbH (the OLC) and 2010 Lilienthal Medal winner, to the meeting.

### **1.1 Roll Calls**

The FAI Members and Services Manager, Ségolène Rouillon, performed the roll call for the meeting. It was determined that 28 votes were present including 4 proxies (from Canada to the USA, Ireland to the UK, Hungary to Italy and Portugal to Spain), thus 15 votes would be required for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 19 for a 2/3rds majority.

The FAI Members and Services Manager again called the roll at the beginning of the second day, Saturday 3th March. Delegates and proxies present totalled 29, an absolute majority required 15 votes, and 2/3rds majority required 19 votes.

Apologies were received from IGC Presidents of Honour Mr Peter Ryder and Mr Tor Johannessen, IGC Delegate Bruno Ramseyer, Mr Hans Obermeyer, Ms Angela Sheard, and the IGC Secretary Mr Peter Eriksen.

### **1.2 Administrative Matters**

A dinner was held on the Friday evening at the NWU Sports Centre and Delegates and families were hosted to a South African Braai, by SSSA President Mr David Mortimer, at the Potchefstroom gliding club, on the Saturday evening.

The IGC President requested leave to move the vote on Championships Bids (Item 7.6) to the first order of business on Saturday the 3<sup>rd</sup> of March. There were no objections.

Mr Loek Boermans and Mr Reiner Rose were appointed to oversee the counting of ballot papers during the meeting.

### **1.3 Conflict of Interest**

The President asked the meeting participants to declare any conflicts of interest, which was done. The President then advised the meeting that he would be handing over the duties and responsibilities of IGC President to 1<sup>st</sup> Vice President Eric Mozer, following the meeting, to enable him to concentrate on his portfolios as an Executive Board member until the FAI General Conference in October. He noted that the IGC was very well served with competent, enthusiastic and dedicated people at all levels, but especially in the Bureau and that the organisation was in very safe hands.

## **2. Minutes of previous meeting, Lausanne 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> March 2011**

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Lausanne 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> March 2011.

The minutes were unanimously approved.

## **3. IGC President's report**

The IGC President referred to the report circulated before the meeting and added his congratulations to Bureau member Visa-Matti Leinikki on his appointment as the IT Manager at the FAI, commencing on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2012, which the Delegates endorsed by acclamation. The President also noted that a number of significant developments were occurring within the IGC and urged Delegates to follow the presentations and reports that would be presented over the course of the meeting.

The President's report was approved unanimously.

## 4. FAI Matters

### 4.1 Update from the FAI Members and Services Manager

On behalf of the FAI President and Secretary General, the FAI Members and Services Manager presented an update on FAI activities in the past year

FAI Subscription Fees were increased by 2% at the last General Conference but the 2012 Budget is anticipating a deficit of CHF 21'000, due mainly to a significant reduction of sponsorship income from the Red Bull Air Race.

New financial accounting procedures were implemented in 2011 to provide a more accurate picture of the FAI's accounts and financial situation and to allow the Executive Board to better exercise its statutory financial responsibilities. Some fine-tuning might be needed before the next budget round is started later this year. Mr. Dick Bradley was thanked for his work and involvement in this project.

Work continues on three projects. Regional Vice Presidents are being introduced on a trial basis to improve FAI presence in South America, South and East Asia, and the Middle East. A series of Expert Groups are being formed to improve and encourage the sharing of information and know-how within FAI. Expert Groups for Airspace and Navigation Systems have already been launched and in 2012 Safety and Regulation EGs and, later on, Marketing & Communication and IT & New technologies EGs will be formed. Finally, the development of a new Sports Strategy and Branding Guidelines are in progress to improve the visibility of FAI events and their presence on the market.

The Sports Strategy is aimed at improving the quality and attractiveness of our events, improving the visibility of air sports to media and public, increasing awareness of public, media and potential hosts to our sports and developing and promoting new types of events. At the same time the EB is currently considering creating a new FAI Sports Marketing Agency, which will aim at hiring external expertise to develop, promote, fund and market new events

On the 1<sup>st</sup> of November 2011, Mrs Françoise Gyps joined the staff as the new Sports Administrator and Mr Rob Hughes will take over the lead of the Sports Department from the 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2012 and will be the first point of contact for all sports matters. On the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2012 Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki will also arrive at the FAI Office as the new IT-Manager, replacing Mr. Marcel Meyer who reached the official age of retirement last year.

Shortly after the General Conference 2011, a completely new FAI website was implemented. Apart from its new graphic layout, navigation system and content management system, the new website is again providing information and documents lost during the last few months/years (competition results, world records etc). Work is still in progress to fine-tune some parts and features of the new website and further developments will continue to be done.

At the end of 2010, shortly before the official implementation of the FAI Sporting Licence Database, a significant security problem became apparent when downloading information from the Database. The FAI immediately switched the database off, and an external IT company had been mandated to work on the problem. The webserver crash that occurred last spring forced a change of priorities, but a new, improved Sporting Licence Database is now under final testing. In the meantime paper Sporting Licences still remain valid.

In the absence of a bid for the World Air Games 2013, the Executive Board has decided that the next possible year would be 2015 and then the World Air Games will be held on a 4-year cycle. This shifts the timing of the World Air Games away from the IWGA World Games and avoids any conflict of dates.

The FAI is an IOC-recognized federation and, as such, is a signatory of the WADA Anti-Doping Code. A temporary working group, under the leadership of Exec Director Bob Henderson, is currently conducting a risk assessment among our sports. Updated FAI Anti-Doping Rules will be developed, in close cooperation with the WADA European Office, and implemented later this year. Competitors who need to take medication must ensure that they properly register a TUE (Therapeutic Use Exemption) with the FAI before participating in competitions.

Following fatal accidents at a recent World Championship, the FAI was requested to provide advice on the cancellation of approved FAI-sanctioned 1<sup>st</sup> Category Events. The FAI Executive Board has tasked CASI with amending the FAI Sporting Code General Section, but in the meantime the Board decided to implement guidelines on the process to be followed should the cancellation of an event be considered necessary for reasons such as substantial risks to the safety of participants, major financial uncertainty, or other reasons that may arise from time to time.

International sport is moving and changing every day and our sports need to evolve to meet the expectations of potential hosts. If we want to maintain a place in the world of sports and improve the visibility and attractiveness of our sports to the public, media, host cities and potential sponsors, we definitely need to continue adjusting, modernizing and simplifying our rules and competitions and to make them safer for our competitors.

The President expanded on the FAI update regarding the FAI Anti-Doping Plan noting that he believed that there was the opportunity to establish an Out-of-Competition testing programme and “whereabouts” requirements that would enable the FAI to test for doping at the most likely times that this would be of benefit to air sports athletes, rather than conducting purely random testing during the year.

Mr Angel Casado (Spain) raised some questions about the IT support at the FAI and noted that he believed that the organisation would benefit from the presence of Mr Leinikki.

Mr Marcus Graeber (Columbia) drew the Delegates attention to the differences between the “World Air Games” (an FAI initiative) and the “World Games” (a sports meeting of non-Olympic sports).

Mr Ian Strachan (CANS) noted his personal opposition to the formation of “Expert Groups” by the FAI.

## **5. Finance**

### **5.1 Treasurers Report and 2011 Financial Statement**

The IGC Treasurer Mr Dick Bradley presented the 2011 Finance Report and the 2012 budget.

The 2011 income was lower than budgeted due to reductions in income from the Ranking List and the Continental Championships. He noted that the Ranking List was some 5,000EUR below budget and this could be due to a combination of the changes to the structure of Ranking List fees in 2011 combined with an apparent loss of information about invoice billing and payments due to the website failure during the year. He reported that an audit of all Ranking List transactions was being undertaken to ensure that invoices were raised and paid for all ranking list activities during the year.

The reduction in income from the Continental Championships was due to the number of entries being lower than budgeted.

On the expenses side, the treasurer noted that expenses were some 17,000EUR below budget due to IGC Officials being careful with their expenses while attending IGC events and the specific budget items provided for Tracking, Safety Videos and Doping testing being under spent.

The balance for the year, with the audit on the Ranking List yet to be completed, was a deficit of 1,279.24EUR

Mr Casado asked why there was no income shown for interest on the IGC fund balance. The Treasurer replied that the FAI did not charge a fee for the administration of the IGC accounts, but also did not pay interest on the account balance. He noted that there was always the question of the cost of the change in value of the currency, the IGC working in EUR but the FAI accounts being in CHF. The changing relative value of the two currencies could always have the effect of either inflating or devaluing the IGC funds.

Mr Ian Strachan, GFAC Chairman, advised the meeting that an additional payment had recently been received for a new Flight Recorder certification.

Mr Patrick Pauwels (Belgium) asked what had happened to the outstanding invoices shown in red, in the 2009 accounts. The Treasurer responded that they had been collected in 2010 and recorded in the income for that year.

The Financial Report was unanimously approved.

### **5.2 2012 Budget and 5 year planning**

The Treasurer presented the budget for 2012 and out to 2014.

Mr Brian Spreckley (United Kingdom) noted that the budget was an “Income and Expenditure” budget, not a capital budget. He made the point that this meant that planned capital expenditure was not included but he believed that it should be.

The Treasurer pointed out that unexpended component of capital expenditure, for the production of the safety videos was shown in the budget.

The President advised the meeting that the FAI accounting software had been updated during the past year. This had significantly increased the workload for the FAI Financial Officer, Ms Cosette Mast because she had to resurrect the accounts from the server crash and incorporate the new accounting system.

Mr Bradley expressed his thanks to the FAI Financial Officer for her assistance and support with the IGC accounts.

The Budget was unanimously approved.

## **6. Reports not requiring voting**

### **6.1 OSTIV report**

The OSTIV President, Mr Loek Boermans, presented his report. He noted the loss to the soaring movement world-wide, of Dr. Dr Joachim P. Kuettner and briefly outlined his service and impact on the aviation scientific community. He also reported that the OSTIV Board has updated the OSTIV-Dr J.P. Kuettner Prize and Trophy for a 2500km straight line distance flight. Details are available at [www.ostiv.org](http://www.ostiv.org).

Mr Boermans noted that Prof. Edward (Ward) Hindman, after serving in the role for seven years, had stood down from the position as Chief Editor of the OSTIV Technical Soaring journal at the end of 2011.. Dr. Judah Milgram is the new Chief Editor of Technical Soaring.

The OSTIV President reported briefly on:

- The Training and Sailplane Panel (TSP) meeting in September 2011 and that publication of a paper by the TSP on safety initiatives considered by the TSP as being valuable to the sport of gliding
- The Sailplane and Development Panel (SDP) meeting which discussed topics including standards for repairs, load relief, the “safety pays” initiative, winch launches and cooperation with EASA and the continuation of OSTIVAS
- The Meteorological Panel (MP) meeting in September 2011 which included specific options to support the forecasting of soaring conditions in Turkey.

The IGC President thanked Prof. Boermans for his report and advised that the IGC Delegates would be sent a copy of the TSP report.

Mr Spreckley, stated that there had been many initiatives developed over the years by the IGC to make the process of managing competitions more robust, for example the creation of the position of “Chief Steward”. He expressed surprise that the TSP did not consult with the IGC experts (especially the Chief Stewards) before writing their paper. He urged that consultation was vital to ensure that a coherent picture was created from an understanding of the many safety initiatives that had been undertaken or were in progress.

Mr Boermans noted that the Chairman of the TSP contacted Mr Spreckley, which was confirmed, but Mr Spreckley also noted that it had been only one email. He also told the Delegates that we need to find competent people to oversee safety initiatives for our sport.

The IGC President confirmed the need to collect appropriate people together to share the concepts and to develop them further.

## **6.2 Standing Committees**

### **6.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3 Report and 2011 version**

Mr Ross Macintyre presented his report and noted that he had nothing to add.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3, Annex A**

Mr Goran Ax presented his report. He noted that a significant amount of work had gone into the review of the removal of the mass limit for the Club Class, which had proven to create a number of unforeseen issues and that this research had resulted in the Year 2 proposal, presented to this meeting, intended to make the management of the Club Class as simple as practicable for organisers. He expressed his thanks to Mr Roland Stuck for his work on the subject.

Mr Strachan, (GFAC) expressed concern that the Earth model had been changed, in the Sporting Code, to a sphere and that this was inappropriate. He urged that it revert to the ellipsoid model.

The President noted that the subject of the Earth model had been raised during the Bureau meeting on the 1<sup>st</sup> of March and that representatives from the Annex A, GFAC and ANDS committees had been requested to review that situation and provide a recommendation to the Bureau.

The Annex A report was unanimously accepted

### **Sporting Code Section 3, Annex A Handicaps**

Mr Christof Geissler presented his report and noted that he had nothing to add.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.2.3 Sporting Code Section 3, Annex D Ranking List**

Mr Spreckley presented his report and noted that he had nothing to add.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.2.4 Air Traffic, Navigation, Display Systems (ANDS) Report**

Mr Bernald Smith, Chairman of the ANDS Committee, nominated Mr Hans Trautenberg (Germany) and Mr Tim Shirley (Australia) for re-election to GFAC. Mr Trautenberg and Mr Shirley were re-elected for 3 years (till 2015).

Mr Smith reported on the current situation with *Light<sup>2</sup>*, the proposed new digital phone system, and the risk of interference with GPS signals due to the proximity of the frequencies. The *Light<sup>2</sup>* company has been prevented from activating their system operation following world-wide concern, including at the level of the United Nations, but is seeking legal redress.

Mr Smith also reported on the activities of the RTCA meetings and the slow progress towards ADS-B as an air traffic surveillance system. He also drew the Delegates attention to the new “Power” FLARM product which has the ability to receive and display data transmitted by TCAS systems on other aircraft. The enables FLARM units to provide collision avoidance information to glider pilots on GA and air transport aircraft as well as other FLARM-equipped gliders.

He also noted the acceptance of the FAI as an “Associate Member” at the United Nations International Committee on GPS (ICG), to which the FAI had appointed him as their representative.

Mr Spreckley questioned the legality of FLARM in the USA.

Mr Smith replied that it was not operating on an approved aviation frequency and was not certificated in the United States.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.2.5 GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Committee (GFAC) Report**

Mr Strachan, commenting on the ANDS report, noted that FLARM units were approved at the lowest level as flight recorders and that the Power FLARM units were undergoing assessment for an IGC approval as a flight recorder. He then gave a power point presentation to update the Delegates on the situation with low ENL jet and electric engines and the ENL recorders now available to enable these engines to be detected.

Mr Strachan also updated the Delegates on the decisions taken to reduce the approval levels of some Flight Recorders due to concerns about their data security. He noted that this would always be an on-going problem and that data security would have to be routinely reviewed.

Mr Graeber asked how many FRs were affected by the downgrade. Mr Strachan said he was not sure of the numbers of individual units but noted the manufacturers were no longer providing support to those models affected even before they were downgraded.

Mr Artur Rutkowski (Poland) asked what the fractions shown, in the power point, for FRs being downgraded meant. Mr Strachan replied that this was the number affected out of the total number of IGC approved FRs.

The President commented that the GFAC proposal that would be considered later in the meeting was intended to provide clarity on the process of changing approval levels. He also noted that the decisions to downgrade FRs were made by the Bureau on the recommendations of the experts within GFAC.

Mr Smith commented that there were many people who worked well “*beyond the pale*” to provide expert counsel for the IGC. The President endorsed Mr Smith’s comment.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report**

Mr Eric Mozer reported that, since the writing of his report, IGC Officials for championships in 2013 and 2014 had now been identified. He also noted that the bid for the 2015 FAI 13.5M World Championships had been withdrawn and that bids for this competition would be re-opened.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.3 Working Groups**

#### **6.3.1 Continental Records**

The report from Mr Hans Obermeyer was presented by the President.

Mr Macintyre (Chairman, Sporting Code Committee) noted that a CASI Working Group had made a decision on Continental Records which did not fit with the way the IGC wished these records to be managed. He stated that he was working closely with the WG to ensure they understood the IGC position.

The President stated that IGC needed to submit their arguments to CASI and to work with CASI on this issue.

Mr Graeber asked why the FAI Office was sending out notices for continental records claims that did not fit the IGC protocols.

The President responded that this was due to a misunderstanding between the FAI Records Officer and the staff member responsible for sending out the email notifications and that this had been resolved.

The report was unanimously accepted

#### **6.3.2 Country Development**

Mr Alexander Georgas presented his report and also reported that he had made a presentation at the recent EGU Working Group on Membership and Club Development. The Country Development presentation had, by all reports, been well received by those present at the EGU WG.

The report was unanimously accepted

#### **6.3.3 Grand Prix Development**

Mr Roland Stuck provided a power point review of the 2010-2011 SGP series, pilot involvement and results. He noted that two tasks had been achieved in a single day for the first time at the SGP in Nummela, Finland.

The SGP Final at the Wasserkuppe had been well organised and successful despite not having a sponsor. There were lots of spectators even though the weather was not the best. Five short races were completed in conditions where a conventional gliding contest would probably not have been able to achieve any tasks. The tracking had worked well.

For the 2012-2013 series seven bids had been accepted for qualifying SGPs, including a late bid from Sweden approved by the Bureau at the meeting prior to the Plenary meeting. The protocols for qualification had been updated to remove the option of having reserve pilots.

No bid had been received for the SGP Final in 2013. The Bureau had decided that the IGC would provide the sporting organisation for the Final and would seek an organiser who would be responsible for the supporting the event.

For the future there was a need to resolve the tracking situation, provide a better presentation platform, create a focal point for the event and spectators, enhance publicity, coordinate promotional efforts and generate funding. Mr Stuck finally reported that responses to a call for tenders to provide trackers for the SGP had been for some 20,000EUR which was too expensive at this stage.

Mr Graeber stated that there should be a GP partition within the FAI website to support the presentation of the SGP. Mr Stuck replied that this may have to be developed externally in the first instance and the President noted that this subject would be discussed later in the meeting.

Mr Casado asked what the issue was with providing tracking and why it was so expensive. Mr Spreckley replied that there was no technical barrier to a tracking solution but that the problem was the methodology used to transmit the data. Currently all solutions use satellites which is expensive costing approximately 5-6,000EUR per event. He noted that new technologies using ADS-B, wireless and VHF frequencies would be available shortly and that to proceed right now with the purchase of trackers might result in a low return on investment compared to what may be achieved in the next year or so.

The report was unanimously accepted

#### **6.3.4 History Committee**

The report from Mr Tor Johannessen was presented by the President.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.3.5 Scoring Software Testing**

Mr Visa-Matti Leinikki presented his report and noted that, in 2011, there had been a number of problems with incorrect QNH settings. He advised that the QNH setting requirements needed to be clearly stated in the Local Procedures and on the Task Sheet to ensure that the pilots and the scorers were using the same value. He also noted that Chief Stewards should ensure that the version of the scoring software being used was stated in the Local Procedures so that everyone was using the same software.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.3.6 Safety Pays**

Mr Rene Vidal presented his report. He noted that the working group had analysed the OSTIV SDP report to consider how to proceed and that, as the idea of using championship points to encourage conformance was controversial, the group had decide to not make any formal proposal this year. Rather they wanted to get the ideas discussed during the coming Northern hemisphere season and then look to provide a formal proposal in 2013. He commented on the challenges the Safety Pays initiative faced, including rumours that the concept was going to create a barrier to entry to competitions by increasing the costs for pilots by requiring them to modify their aircraft. He stated that this was not true and the intention was to reduce injuries using options currently available. The ideas from the safety pays concept were being rejected by pilots so there was a need to educate the pilots to create buy-in. He would coordinate with the Chief Stewards, OSTIV and the FAI Safety Expert Group in future.

Mr Mozer (1<sup>st</sup> Vice President) stated that we should not let resistance from the pilots create a problem and that we needed to be firm about driving ahead with safety initiatives. Mr Vidal agreed and noted that there were points in the report that required Bureau support to deliver.

The report was unanimously accepted

## **6.4 IGC Representatives**

### **6.4.1 CASI Report (Air Sports Commissions)**

Mr Leinikki presented the CASI report having attended the meeting in Belgrade in the absence of Mr Johannessen. A major topic of discussion had been the proposed disbandment of CASI and the transfer of CASI functions to the ASC Presidents Group. The CASI members had been very clear that CASI should remain as it is.

The President reported that the Executive Board had recently confirmed that CASI would be retained.

Mr Strachan (GFAC) had attended the CASI meeting and had been concerned that CASI had decided that a World Record still had to first be a National Record, which was not what the IGC wished.

Mr Leinikki responded that this was in his report and that a proposal to change the status of the World Record had been rejected.

Mr Macintyre noted that a CASI working group had proposed that a World Record need not be a National Record but that CASI had not accepted this recommendation. A new working party has now been formed to review the question and Mr Macintyre is involved in the debate.

Mr Stuck noted that the General Conference in Incheon, 2009, had decided to delete the National Record requirement for World Records. Mr Lennikki said that this was why the initial CASI working group was formed.

The President stated that IGC needed to make a submission to CASI to ensure that it's opinion and current process with Continental Records, was supported.

Mr Strachan stated that the reason that CASI had rejected the working group recommendation was because of concerns by the NACs that they would have to cope with the bureaucracy of processing records that were not their records.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.4.2 EGU/EASA**

Mr Patrick Pauwels presented the EGU report. He noted that the EGU officers had a very high workload often under tight deadlines. March 2013 is intended to be the date of final implementation of the EASA Rules however there were still problems., The definition of "commercial" was unclear and this needed to be resolved. The Licensing and Medical requirements, which were a major piece of work, were scheduled



for implementation on the 8<sup>th</sup> of April 2012 but that this timescale was impractical and that many countries were implementing a delay of 12 months on their implementation schedule. The FCL for gliding was required to be in place in 2015 which meant that, with countries delaying the implementation of licensing rules until 2013, there would be only two years to enact the new FCL for gliding. He noted that existing medicals would remain valid.

Mr Pauwels also reported that approved training organisations must be operational in 2014, which gave them only one year after the delayed implementation of licensing rules.

There is a “Conversion Report” report required to transfer existing licenses to the new system. He made a plea for everyone to study and understand the rules.

He noted that there had been workshop organised by EASA to review Part M and a task force was now proposing amendments to Part M to resolve a number of items.

Mr Pauwels commented on a number of other items:

- The EGU database provided the statistics on incidents etc
- EGU had good relationships with IGC, OSTIV, EAS, ESM
- The membership of the EGU was 22 with 4 Associates; some European countries were still not members
- The EGU finances were healthy
- Communication continued via newsletters and the website and documents were available on the website
- A one-day workshop held, prior to the 2012 EGU meeting, to discuss membership and club development, had been constructive and helpful but more information was needed and an exchange of experience was vital. It was suggested that a working party be formed in coordination with the IGC with a meeting in Sep/ Oct 2012. All presentations from the workshop were on the EGU website
- Mr Patrick Naegali had been elected EGU President at the congress on the 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> of February
- The next EGU meeting would be the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the formation of the EGU and would be held, on the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of February 2103, in Strasbourg, the location of the founding meeting

The President thanked Mr Pauwels for his report and congratulated him on his term as President of the EGU and on the initiative shown by the EGU in organising the workshop and expressed the wish that the IGC be involved this initiative in the future.

#### **6.4.3 Environmental Commission Report**

Mr Smith presented his report and thanked Mrs Rouillon for her assistance in managing the ENVC. He noted that there were different opinions about the threat to the future supply of Low Lead fuel; some countries being concerned and others not. TOTAL had stated they would continue to provide LL fuel for Europe.

The ENVC had spent some time on document translation. Mr Smith was frustrated that the membership of the commission was not very representative of the FAI as a whole. He considered that the ENVC, along with the Education Commission and the Medical-Physiological Commission, were already composed of experts so that no change was needed to adopt the concept of “Expert Groups”.

#### **6.4.4 FAI Medical Commission**

No report was received

#### **6.4.5 On-Line Contest Report**

Mr Christof Geissler presented his report.

Mr Smith stated that the USA wished to have more contact with the OLC.

#### **6.4.6 FAI Commission on Airspace and Navigation Systems (CANS) (Ian Strachan)**

Mr Strachan presented his report. He expressed his concern about the change of Technical Commissions to Expert Groups; he felt that Expert Groups would still need a coordinator and need to meet and to take minutes therefore they would function in a similar manner to the current Technical Commissions. He

stated that he was personally opposed to the disbandment of CANS in favour of the Airspace and the Navigation Expert Groups.

## **6.5 IGC Specialists**

### **6.5.1 Membership**

The report from Mr John Roake was presented by the President.

Mr Smith urged all Delegates to read the report given to the EGU workshop by Mr Alexander Georgas on behalf of the Country Development WG.

Concern was expressed by a number of Delegates about the inclusion of statistics on fatalities when they had no knowledge of where this data had originated.

The President noted that the membership report was only intended to present membership statistics to the IGC.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.5.2 Trophy Management**

Mrs Marina Vigorito presented her report. She thanked Finland for the donation of the 20M trophy in memory of Mr Tapio Savolainen.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.5.3 Web Management**

The report from Mr Peter Ryder was presented by the President.

Mr Strachan noted that it was vital that competitors have access to the latest documents for validation of FRs. While the FAI website is being reconstructed he has hosted all the validation documentation for FRs in current use on his personal website.

Mr Artur Rutkowski (Poland) said that an archive of past files and documents was necessary to enable searches of historical decisions.

The President stated that he was initiating an audit of all documents on the web, what was missing and those that the various IGC specialists required to be on the web. A request for assistance for providing documents from individual's personal files would probably be made to reconstruct the document archive.

The report was unanimously accepted

### **6.5.4 Communication and PR**

The President presented his report and expressed his thanks to Ms Angela Sheard, Mrs Marina Vigorito and Mrs Jill McCaw for taking up the challenge of providing news to the website.

The report was unanimously accepted

## **7. Championships**

### **7.1 Past Championships**

#### **7.1.1 6th FAI Women's WGC 2011, Sweden**

There were no comments to the Chief Stewards report.

#### **7.1.2 7th FAI Juniors WGC 2011, Germany**

There were no comments to the Chief Stewards report.

#### **7.1.3 16th FAI European Gliding Championships 2011, Slovak Republic**

There were no comments to the Chief Stewards report.

#### **7.1.4 16th FAI European Gliding Championships 2011, Lithuania**

There were no comments to the Chief Stewards report.

#### **7.1.5 Sailplane Grand Prix Final Report, Germany**

There were no comments to the Referees report.

#### **7.1.6 2nd South American Gliding Championships 2012 (verbal report)**

There were no comments.

## **7.2 Future Championships**

### **7.2.1 32nd FAI World Gliding Championships 2012, USA**

Mr Rick Sheppe (USA) reported on the practice competition held in 2011. It had been a valuable proving ground and the USA was looking forward to hosting the WGC. There were currently 112 preliminary entries. Arrangements were in hand for the OSTIV congress.

Mr Frank Øjvind (Alternate, Denmark) questioned the intended start procedure and referred to the unsatisfactory experience of a maximum altitude combined with a 2 minute time period at Leusse. Mr Goran Ax (chairman, Annex A) noted that the 2 minute time limit had been abandoned in Lesno.

Mr Spreckley noted that the height limit was an option included in Annex A, but also that it could create a problem, especially if used in conjunction with additional requirements, unless the height limit is a sporting one and is set at or above the expected convection level. He stated that an explanation was needed from the organisers about how they intended to use the altitude limit.

The President advised the Delegates that the start procedures at Uvalde had been discussed in the Bureau and that the Chief Steward had been asked to coordinate with the Organisers and the Chairman of the Annex A committee to ensure that the start procedures were appropriate for the site.

Mr Terry Cubley (Australia) stated that he felt the proposed finish ring height was too high and believed that it would cause gliders to be descending into the circuit in a variety of configurations and speeds created potential problems.

Mr Louis Boudier (Alternate, France) noted that the penalties for the finish ring were not in accordance with Annex A. Mr Ax stated that the Annex A penalty is 1pt/m to the ground and that having a penalty of no finish if below 100m is incorrect.

Mrs Frouwke Kuijpers (Netherlands) expressed concern that pilots would be concentrating on their altimeter while on final glide instead of looking out and that the finish ring needed to be lower. Mr Ax replied that, if the finish ring is too low, then there is the risk of chaos on the ground; the Local Procedures need to cater for the local conditions.

Mr Ronald Termaat (Observer, Netherlands) asked how Delegates, nations and pilots could have an input into the Local Procedures. Mr Mozer responded that the Chief Steward is responsible to the Bureau for the oversight of the Local procedures.

Mr Bradley (Chief Steward, Uvalde) commented that the site at Uvalde limited the alternatives available to the organisers and that the procedures proposed had been used successfully in other Uvalde competitions.

Mr Pauwels (Belgium) asked what was required for licensing and airworthiness as there was a question about having to have a licence issued in the same country as the glider was registered. Mr Mozer stated that there had been a document provided by the contest manager. Mr Sheppe noted that it was not necessary to match the pilot to the country of glider registration for licensing pilots to fly in Uvalde. Mr Spreckley noted that the FAA would issue an FAA Licence, but that it was an onerous procedure that had to be followed precisely. Mr Ax suggested that it took three months to complete the FAA licensing process. Mr Mozer noted that Mr Huffstadler has contacts within the FAA and that he would be advised of the concerns over licensing. Mr Cubley reported that pilots from Australia, which does not issue an ICAO compliant glider pilot licence, experienced no undue difficulties with obtaining an FAA licence, apart from the length of the process. Mrs Vigorito stated that papers received from the organisers required the licence to be from the same country as where the glider was registered. Mr Sheppe stated that this assertion was incorrect.

Mr Spreckley suggested that there seemed to be some difficulty with communication with the organisers and that these questions needed to be resolved. Mr Sheppe undertook to convey the Delegates concerns to the organisers.

Mr Mozer asked for concerned parties to communicate their questions to the Chief Steward, Mr Bradley, and to Mr Sheppe. Mr Bradley acknowledged that there had been some communication issues with the organisers but that this had been recognised and procedures updated in the previous two weeks.

### **7.2.2 32nd FAI World Gliding Championships 2012, Argentina**

Mr Eduardo Toselli (Argentina) provided an update on preparations for the WGC in Argentina on Power Point. He noted that the airfield was now capable of accepting a total of 140 gliders for the event

(Standard 50, Club 50, World Class 40). He advised the Delegates that a request to allow 3 pilots per NAC in the World Class would be raised that in the meeting. Mr Toselli reported on the plans for the importation of gliders, noting that pilots could arrange this privately or through the contracted FAVAV agent WAIVER Logistics Argentina, SA. This company had previously arranged the importation of the cars for the Dakar Rally. The details would be available within a week. In addition, the organisers were coordinating glider hire and working to ensure that the aircraft offered were suitable. The camping facilities and restaurant on the airfield were being upgraded.

Mr Rutkowski asked what restrictions there were on the sale of per-paid sim cards for mobile phones. Mr Casado responded that the organisers were offering to supply phones and Mr Spreckley commented that European mobiles do not work in Argentina.

Mr Cubley asked for an estimate of the cost of transporting the gliders to the competition site. Mr Toselli replied that it would be approximately 7,500EUR to transport the glider to and from the site, including taxes but that this could be up to 10,000EUR depending on options. In addition there was the cost of the shipping. He stated that pilots needed to contact WAIVER Logistics as soon as possible. The organisers were also looking at providing trailers for rent so that only the gliders needed to be shipped.

Mr Toselli confirmed that information would be on the competition website next week.

Finally, Mr Toselli stated that FLARM was recommended and also, because there were some areas that had limited mobile coverage, it was recommended that pilots carry a rescue device such as SPOT.

### **7.2.3 7th FAI Women's WGC, 2013, France**

Mr Stuck noted that there was little to report apart from the fact that the clubhouse had been updated.

### **7.2.4 8th FAI Juniors WGC 2013, Poland**

Mr Rutkowski provided a verbal report covering the 2013 Junior WGC, 2013 European GC and 2014 WGC. Pre-events were being organised for 2012 and it was intended that the key staff for 2013 and 2014 would run the 2012 event. There were on-going investments in infrastructure. Airspace applications had been lodged with the authorities; no difficulties were expected regarding airspace access. The President of Poland was the Patron for the 2103 Junior WGC. Glider rentals would be available for the Juniors and the web pages were already on line for 2013. The start date for the 2103 JWGC was being clarified as the incorrect date had been recorded in the 2011 Minutes and in the FAI Calendar of Events; the start date should be the 5<sup>th</sup> of July 2013.

### **7.2.5 33rd FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Poland**

See above

### **7.2.6 33rd FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Finland**

Mr Leinikki reported that the Finnish Nationals would be held at the same site in 2012.

### **7.2.7 17th FAI European Gliding Championships 2013, France**

Mr Stuck reported that Provence Glide would be held as a "pre-European" event at the site in 2012.

### **7.2.8 17th FAI European Gliding Championships 2013, Poland**

See above

## **7.3 Approval of Competition Officials (Eric Mozer)**

### **7.3.1 Approval of Officials for 2012 Competitions**

32<sup>nd</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2012, USA

- Chief Steward: Mr Dick Bradley
- Steward: Mr Art Grant
- Jury President: Mr Peter Ryder
- Jury Members: Mr Tomas Milko and Mr Hannes Linke

32<sup>nd</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2012, Argentina

- Chief Steward: Mr Brian Spreckley

- Steward: Mr Renato Tsukamoto
- Jury President: Mr Max Bishop
- Jury Members: Mr Arturo Diaz and Mr Angel Casado

### **7.3.2 Approval of Chief Stewards for 2014 Competitions**

33<sup>rd</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Poland

- Chief Steward: Mr Robert Danewid

33<sup>rd</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Finland

- Chief Steward: Mr Axel Reich

## **7.4 Sailplane Grand Prix**

### **7.4.1 2012-2013 Qualifying Sailplane Grand Prix**

The President introduced this topic stating that the Bureau had lodged a business case with the FAI Executive Board regarding the management of the SGP and also a request for capital expenditure to create a web portal to host the SGP events. In addition, he reported that the Bureau had decided, at the meeting prior to the Plenum, that the SGP Final in 2013 should be operationally managed by the IGC and that a host would only be required to provide the necessary logistical and peripheral support for the event. He asked Mr Spreckley to provide a report to the meeting.

Mr Spreckley provided an overview of the situation:

- A business case had been written for the establishment of an IGC Company owned by the FAI
- It would be a non-profit, limited liability company
- The purpose would be to manage the SGP in the future
- The board members would be appointed by the IGC Bureau and would include people with skills and experience appropriate to the various challenges of delivering an SGP event

Mr Georgas asked if the company would be able to make contracts with media and sponsors etc or other commercial entities in order to run the GPs. Mr Spreckley replied that the company needs to belong to the FAI and the intention was that it be able to sign contracts. There was no intention that it makes a profit above the funds necessary to run the SGP. It was intended to enable the full development of the SGP so would need to hold the rights to the SGP.

Mrs Kuijpers asked what was happening in other air sports and Mr Spreckley replied that other air sports are going down a similar path.

Mr Bradley noted the parallel with the attempt to create a contract previously. Mr Spreckley responded that the FAI rights needed to be accommodated and that this would be done within the articles of the company to ensure that it could operate and also to protect the FAI and the IGC. This was work that still needed to be done.

Mr Strachan noted that the FAI is the legal entity not the IGC. Mr Spreckley responded that the IGC needs its own promotion company and has to do this itself but that at the moment has no ability to negotiate.

Mr Georgas supported the idea and noted that the model that works is a for-profit company owned by stakeholders. Mr Spreckley replied that this is all work in progress on defining the details.

Mr Geissler asked how the company would work with the host or organisers of an event and Mr Spreckley replied that it was envisaged that the local organiser would do exactly what they do now, that the Organiser Agreement would be with the Company and the local Organisers and that it would all be done in cooperation to streamline the process.

Mr Boudierique asked who would head the company and Mr Spreckley noted that this was part of the work in progress on the details.

Mr Sheppe asked what the start-up cost were expected to be and Mr Spreckley replied that the budget was 5,000EUR including legal costs, which were expected to be the bulk of the expenses.

Mr Casado commented that checks and balances would be necessary and that members of the Plenum should have an oversight of the actions of the board. Mr Spreckley replied that it was intended that the company would report to the Plenary and that the board may be replaced at any time by the Bureau.

Mr Spreckley then asked the Plenary if there were any strong objections to the plan and there were none, although Mr Rutkowski expressed caution that the IGC should not lose control of the SGP in the same way that FIA had lost control of the F1 race.

Mrs Kuijpers asked where the 5,000EUR was coming from and Mr Spreckley replied that it was capital expenditure from the IGC reserves. Mr Pauwels considered the sum as being unrealistically low but Mr Spreckley expressed confidence that the company could be formed for less than this amount.

Mr Strachan raised concern about the potential for liability and that proper legal advice needed to be taken and Mr Spreckley agreed.

Mr Spreckley then went on to discuss the web portal. The Bureau considered that a promotional vehicle was needed for gliding and that a lot of effort spent on the SGP was wasted. The SGP series needed to be coherent and visible so the intention was to develop a website, initially dedicated to the SGP, which would host all SGP events including web hosting for organisers, tracking and results. This web portal needed to be designed to enable it to expand to provide the same services to all IGC sanctioned competitions in due course. It was now necessary to look for suitable providers and consider the alternatives for development and whether this be done with internal resources or externally.

Finally Mr Spreckley spoke about the tracker project and the current frustration, knowing what the IGC requirements are and having developed the system at Wasserkuppe, including commentary which worked well. However negotiations with potential suppliers had shown that an SGP web site was needed first for the output the trackers and that finances needed to be found to pay for a competent tracker system. This meant that the web portal needed to come before the tracker system. The two could then be developed together to improve the attractiveness of the SGP and to encourage viewers. He noted that a capital expenditure of 30,000EUR for the combined web portal and tracker project had been approved by the Executive Board in 2011.

Subsequently a late proposal was put to the Delegates on the Saturday to enable the Delegates to formally express their opinion on the formation of the SGP Company.

The proposal was accepted for debate unanimously.

The proposal from the Bureau was:

*The purpose of this proposal is to seek a commitment from the Plenum for the formation of a corporate organisation managed by IGC and committed to further development of the Sailplane Grand Prix (SGP) series*

A short power point presentation was made by the President using extracts from the Business Case that had been lodged with the Executive Board. The presentation is at Appendix A.

Mr Casado stated that he agreed in principle but believed that the Plenum should have the opportunity to have an opinion about the details. Mr Spreckley replied that this was the reason the Bureau had made this proposal, so that the Delegates could give their opinion now, including the right for the Bureau to appoint the board. He also noted that the Bureau would have to work closely with the FAI in the process of creating the company.

Mrs Vigorito noted that the Plenum had already given authority for the Bureau to manage the SGP. Mr Casado asked that the Plenum have a governance role in the company and Mr Spreckley suggested that the IGC Treasurer would have such a role. Mr Sheppe stated that governance in this case meant having independent observers.

Mr Georgas considered that the SGP needed to run by a professional team with the authority to make decisions without having to go back to the Plenum. Mr Stuck stated that the current FAI and IGC management processes were not fast enough to enable effective management of the SGP and that there was also the question of protecting the FAI from financial risk. Mr Spreckley noted that the SGP has now been running for 10 years and that all decisions are already taken by those running the event, with oversight by the Bureau, and that the next logical step was to commercialisation.

The President reminded the Delegates that many of the IGC sanctioned championships are managed by commercial entities set up for the purpose of running the event and to protect the host club and federations from financial risk and that this was the same model being proposed for the SGP.

Mr Stuck noted that the level of activity in the SGP meant that a management team needed to meet for more than the two days a year that the Bureau was currently able to devote to the SGP because of the time pressure involved with decision-making associated with each event.

Mrs Vigorito commented that the Plenum had trusted the Bureau up to now with the management of the SGP. Mr Vladimir Foltin (Slovak Republic) stated that he liked the idea but could see the point made by Mr Casado about having Plenum members in the loop.

Mr Spreckley asked that the Delegates take the vote on the proposal and that, if it was supported, the Bureau would then be able to get on with making the necessary hard decisions about how to proceed.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

## **7.5 World Air Games (Brian Spreckley)**

### **7.5.1 Update on World Air Games 2015**

See the FAI report

#### **Guest Speaker: Mr Reiner Rose, CEO of the Segelflugszene gGmbH (the OLC)**

*Note: The presentation is available for download from the IGC web site.*

Mr Rose thanked the Delegates for according him the honour of the Lilienthal medal in 2011. He then discussed the OLC and the success of the website, noting that there were 2.7M different users in the last year and that there had been 92M discrete clicks recorded on the site in the same year. A new website is under development and Mr Rose showed screen prints of how the website would look. It included the capability to show the calendar of sanctioned FAI gliding competitions.

Mr Rose then talked briefly about the *Barron Hilton Challenge* which had been developed as an on-line competition, using the same rules, to replace the Barron Hilton Cup. He noted that it was unfortunate but the prize for the winners did not include a trip to a soaring ranch!

The OLC team is now looking at an individual decentralised competition, including providing flight forms, in each of the main FAI classes, starting in 2012 with a trial in the Netherlands.

Mr Rose expressed the wish that he be able to attend the IGC Plenary each year to represent the OLC and the President responded that he would be welcome.

The President thanked Mr Rose for his presentation and expressed his opinion that the OLC created significant motivation for club pilots to go out and fly and that this was very valuable for the sport. Mr Greaber supported this opinion stating that the pilots in his club would encourage each other to fly to gain OLC points.

#### **Discussion Paper: Mr Brian Spreckley – Future Technology and its impact on gliding sport**

*Note: The presentation is available for download from the IGC web site.*

Mr Spreckley started his discussion by observing that the Annex A Rules are, in some parts, obsolete and no longer appropriate to the sport today. The objectives of the World Gliding Championships are to find the “best pilot” but what does this mean? Gliding is a sport that embraces new technology and the definition of “the best” might be changing with the technology. In the past we have seen problems, such as leeching, gaggle flying and team flying, all employed as tactics to gain an advantage over another pilot. The limiting factor in each of these tactics is the need to maintain visual contact with the other glider(s). The advent of FLARM and ADS-B have changed this situation; it is now possible to keep in “contact” with another glider electronically.

Some facts:

- FLARM is in common use now and ADS-B is becoming more widely available.
- The data from these types of devices can be interfaced with other computing devices and potentially provide integrated information such as rate of climb, heading and groundspeed
- Software filters can be used to provide selectable outputs to the pilot and to the support team on the ground

So it is likely that it will be possible for a pilot to: select a specific target to follow; or, select thresholds for data to be displayed such as all glider climbing at or above a certain rate of climb; or, calculate inter thermal glide path data to determine arrival height in the targets thermals; or, to track areas of positive airmass energy from the tracks of other gliders.

He then posed a number of questions to facilitate discussions. Opinions expressed included:

- FLARM/ ADS-B would increase safety in our favour and we might all be equipped with these devices

- Competitions need to remain fair and as long as there is a demand there will be competitions, even if the format changes
- There is a risk that the information flow could be overwhelming and look out could be adversely impacted
- Maybe it is suitable for 2-seat classes only where one pilot flies and one watches the screens
- We need to embrace the technology
- We need to manage the safety issue of cloud-flying apps on iPhones and android phones
- 1 pilot per nation may make the competition fairer in that it would prevent electronically enhanced team flying
- We still need to structure the tasks to find the best pilot
- We should encourage technological develop; try it and see what happens
- The air mass is constantly changing so being able to “see” what someone is doing 10km away is of little real value
- The experience with GPS is that people now fly closer to the straight line between waypoints and that final glides have less safety margin

He then conducted a straw poll on three questions:

1. Do we want to control or ban the use of air-to-air technology? The consensus was No
2. Do we want to prevent that transfer of data ground-to-air? The consensus was Yes
3. Do we want to develop new competition structures:
  - a. 1 pilot per class? The meeting was evenly divided on this point
  - b. Different structure of tasks? Again the meeting was evenly divided on this point

## **7.6 Presentation of bids for future championships (max. 10 minutes each)**

### **7.6.1 7th Woman’s FAI World Gliding Championships 2015**

Zbraslavice, Czeck Republic

Arnborg, Denmark

### **7.6.2 8th FAI Junior’s World Gliding Championships 2015**

Narromine, Australia

### **7.6.3 18th FAI European Gliding Championships 2015**

Ocseny, Hungary (Open/ 18M/ 20M Multi-seat)

Rieti, Italy (15M. Standard/ Club)

### **7.6.4 1st FAI 13.5 Meter World Gliding Championships**

Haguenau, France

Mr Roland Stuck (France) advised the Delegates that France, regretfully, had to withdraw their bid due to unforeseen difficulties with airspace in the vicinity of the planned contest site.

### **7.6.5 Questions on Bid Presentation**

Mr Leinikki asked the Italian representative if there would be a subsidy for Rieti due to the new luxury tax imposed by the Italian Government or would the pilots have to pay the tax.

Mrs Vigorito replied that she did not know, but with Government elections due in 2013 anything could happen. She also reported that the President of the AeCI had recently met the Minister of Tourism and that the outcome of that meeting was not yet public.

Mr Rutkowski asked if the pilots would have to pay the full 450EUR and Mrs Vigorito replied that the amount was pro-rata, the 450EUR being the charge for a full 12 months.

Mr Geissler asked the Danish representative why no costs were shown in the presentation and Mr Øjvind replied that they were available in the bid document.



Mr Sheppe asked the Australian representative whether there was any risk of the contest being moved from Narromine and Mr Cubley replied that this was a possibility but that the Australians were experienced in moving competitions at short notice if they had extreme adverse weather affecting the site.

Mr Spreckley asked Mr Cubley if there was any flexibility with their dates to avoid/ minimise any conflict with the Northern hemisphere University semesters. Mr Cubley confirmed that they had considered this and that they could either move the dates closer to Christmas (which potentially created other conflicts) or start the competition in early January.

## **8. Reports and proposals requiring voting**

### **8.1 Year 2 Proposals**

#### **8.1.1 Future World Gliding Championships structure**

##### **a. Proposal from the Bureau**

*It is proposed that the IGC Competition Structure and Calendar is adapted as follows:*

- 1. No changes are to be made to the following classes; 15 Meter, 18 Meter, Open, Standard, Club*
- 2. No changes to the IGC Competition Calendar are recommended to the Multi-Class World Gliding Championships comprised of the Open, 15 Meter, 18 Meter. This event is recommended to remain in EVEN years.*
- 3. The Multi-Class World Gliding Championship that has the current configuration of Standard, Club and World classes will be changed. The World Class will be deleted and the 20 Meter Two-Seater Class will be added.*
- 4. The Multi-Class World Gliding Championship comprised of Standard, Club and 20 Meter Two-Seater Class classes will be competed in EVEN years. The entry configuration for this WGC will be as follows:*
  - Standard Class – 2 entries per NAC*
  - Club Class – 2 entries per NAC*
  - 20 Meter Two-Seater Class – 1 entry per NAC*
- 5. The 13.5 Meter Class will have its own World Gliding Championships to be held for the initial time in 2015 and be competed bi-annually in ODD years*
  - 13.5 Meter Class – 4 entries per NAC*

Mr Mozer presented the proposal.

##### **b. Proposed amendment from Poland: Move WWGC to even years**

Mr Rutkowski presented the proposed amendment from Poland:

*To move the Women's World Gliding Championships to even years in order to balance event calendar*

Mr Rutkowski argued that odd years in the IGC calendar were congested with the Women's, Juniors and 2 Continental (European) Championships.

Mr Stuck noted that the major championships were in the even years and that the Women's and Juniors had been scheduled in the odd years to allow them to participate in the major championships.

Mr Boudier commented that an alternative would be to only have one European Championships not two. Mrs Vigorito supported this opinion.

Mr Mozer noted that the number of European Championships was a decision taken by the Delegates. The IGC calendar has alternative competitions. It is up to the Delegates to accept the number of competitions that they wanted. Historically there have been two bids for Europeans; an alternative could be one bid with all classes present.

The amendment was not supported with 4 votes for, 19 against and 6 abstentions.

The proposal was adopted with 28 votes for, none against and 1 abstention.

#### **8.1.2 Proposal from the Bureau: 20m Multi-seat class – Class definition**

*It is proposed that the 20 Meter Multi-Seat Class is redefined in the Sporting Code Section 3, Gliding (Main Body) as follows:*

**6.5.7 20 metre Multi-seat Class**

- a. ENTRY - The 20m Multi-seat Class consists of multi-seat gliders having a crew of two persons.*
- b. CREW - The crew shall consist of two pilots who must represent the same NAC and have a Sporting License issued by that NAC. The winning crew shall jointly hold the title of Champion.*
- c. WINGS - The span must not exceed 20,000 mm.*

The proposal was initially adopted with 24 votes for, 3 against and 2 abstentions.

However, later in the meeting the Minutes from 2011 were checked and it was apparent that a clause regarding handicaps, added as an amendment in 2011, had not been included in the proposal.

The Delegates voted unanimously to set the original decision aside.

The proposal was then put again, with the addition of sub-clause d:

- d. Championship scoring may include handicaps for the 20 metre multi-seat class except for World Gliding Championships.*

Mr Geissler proposed an amendment that paragraph “d” be deleted.

Mr Graeber commented that this would make the class an “Arcus” class only and that a decision on this proposal affects all countries. Mr Stuck noted that this amendment would go against the decision made by the Delegates in 2011.

Mr Geissler responded by noting that using handicaps would mean there was no motivation for the manufacturers to invest in the development of 20M multi-seat aircraft.

Mr Rutkowski stated that the intention of the 20M class was to involve existing gliders in all countries. Mr Hansen agreed saying that for this to be a successful one-production class we need handicaps.

The amendment was not supported with 4 votes for, 24 against and 1 abstention.

The updated proposal was adopted with 23 votes for, 2 against and 4 abstentions

**8.1.3 Reference Weight in Handicap definition.**

**a. Club Class Reference Mass, Bureau proposal**

*New List of IGC Reference Mass of the Club Class Gliders*

*It is proposed that the Handicap List for the Club Class Gliders attached the Annex A to be replaced by the attached list including a new List of Reference Masses based on the Maximum Take Off Mass (MTOM) of the gliders without water.*

*Additionally the footnote below this list shall be replaced by the following shall be modified as follows (changes in bold):*

*~~“The pilot is responsible for providing documentation to prove that his glider will be operated within the legal weight limits.~~*

*The handicap is based on the performance at a stated glider reference weight mass based on a typical empty weight plus 110 kg **the MTOM of the glider without water. If a glider is flown at a mass not exceeding this reference mass it can be considered as operated within legal mass limits. Where a glider is flown at a higher weight mass by necessity, the pilot will have to provide documentation to prove that his glider is still operated within legal mass limits and the handicap will be increased by 0.005 for each 10 kg or part thereof that the glider exceeds the base handicap weight reference mass. However the wing loading may in no case exceed 38 kg/m<sup>2</sup>**”*

Mr Stuck spoke to the proposal noting that the original intention to delete the “reference mass” had proven to create other potential problems and so a new list of reference masses was calculated using data from the TCDS and the manufacturers.

**b. Proposed amendment from France**

Mr Boudelique presented an updated and simplified amendment to the Bureau proposal (changes in bold).

*The removal of the reference weight system is suspended until the following proposals are adopted for SC3 and SC3a :*

**SC3, 6.5.6 Club Class**

- b. **BALLAST Water ballast is permitted up to a MTOM defined in SC3a***

SC3a, 4.2 Maximum Takeoff Mass

d. Club Class – **Ballast** permitted up to the new IGC reference masses and MTOM limited to the lowest of:

Appendix 3 : IGC Handicap Lists

General rules for the IGC Club Class: - To be updated if necessary

SC3 6.5.6 Club Class

The purpose of the Club Class is to preserve the value of older high performance gliders, to provide inexpensive but high quality international championships, and to enable pilots who do not have access to gliders of the highest standard of performance to take part in contests at the highest levels.

a. ENTRY The only limitation on entry of a glider into a Club Class competition is that it is within the agreed range of handicap factors for the competition.

b. BALLAST Water ballast is ~~not~~ permitted up to a MTOM defined in SC3a.

c. SCORING Championship scoring formulas shall include handicap factors.

Remark :

SC3 6.3 TIME PERIOD for CLASS CHANGES

The minimum period between the announcement and implementation of a new class or major alteration to the rules of an existing class shall not normally be less than four years. Minor alterations not requiring design changes shall normally have two years notice. The IGC may reduce the period of notice for special reasons.

SC3a 4.2 MAXIMUM TAKE OFF MASS

d. Club Class – ~~No~~ **Ballast** permitted up to the new IGC reference masses and MTOM limited to the lowest of:

1. Maximum certified weight of non-lifting parts plus weight of lifting parts (wings without any form of ballast); or

2. Maximum certified Take Off Mass without water according to Type Certificate Data Sheet (TCDS).

Mr Boudier argued that permitting the use of ballast makes sense because the link between the reference masses and the handicaps force all the pilots to fly at the IGC reference weight. If the use of ballast is not possible, pilots will have to use lead in the cockpit to reach the reference weight. He submitted that it is dangerous to put up to 30/35kg of lead in the cockpit for light pilots in light gliders! Safety will be increased if the use of water ballast is possible. The upper limit for the use of water ballast is defined by Annex A and is the new IGC reference weight (that is the normal maximum weight without the use of ballast):

- It will be very easy and safe for light pilots to reach this weight.
- This limit only permits to make with water **or** lead, which was only possible to make with lead when the use of water ballast was not permitted.

Mr Greaber remarked that if water ballast was used then it may be an advantage to the pilot when it is dumped.

Mr Morgens Hansen (Denmark) noted the amendment had a safety feature that we might like but it changes the advantages for pilots.

Mr Geissler asked if water would be allowed in a tail tank and Mr Mozer replied that it would if the glider was certificated for tail ballast.

Mr Ax remarked that this represented a fundamental change to the concept of the class and that maybe half of the Club Class gliders could not carry water anyway. Mrs Kuijpers agreed.

Mr Cubley explained that water ballast had been allowed in the club class in Australia but that it had proved difficult for the organisers; dump valves had to have a seal placed on them so that it could be seen if the water had been dumped in flight, which then invoked a penalty. Consequently water was no longer allowed and they use handicaps to balance the performance differences.

Mrs Vigorito noted that you can always dump the water.

Mr Spreckley noted that the club class was already complicated but at least it was well understood; he questioned why we would want to make it more difficult.

Mr Greaber asked if there would be a concern about landing with water ballast and Mr Stuck confirmed that this would be a concern.

Mr Boudierique responded that it would not be compulsory to use water but that is also not safe to push pilots to use lead and that the advantage from lightening the glider by dumping ballast was small.

Mr Rutkowski noted that using water ballast made the situation more complex and suggested that the handicaps be adjusted instead. Mr Greaber asked how the handicaps adjustments impacted scoring. Mr Cubley stated that the gliders were weighed and the handicaps set at the time of scrutineering for heavy and light gliders. In Australia the delta was 0.005 for each 10kg above and below the reference mass.

Mr Ax reminded the meeting that Annex A did not permit ballast in the Club Class.

The amendment was not supported with 2 votes for, 26 against and 1 abstention.

The debate returned to the original proposal.

Mr Cubley asked why the limit of 38kg/m<sup>2</sup> had been proposed as this would make it difficult for some gliders to participate. Mr Stuck replied that there were already some very heavy gliders coming into the Club Class however it might be possible to delete this limit because the penalty was probably sufficient.

The President then recorded that the Bureau deleted the wing loading limit of 38kg/m<sup>2</sup> from the proposal. The footnote now read:

*The handicap is based on the performance at a stated glider reference weight mass based on a typical empty weight plus 110 kg the MTOM of the glider without water. If a glider is flown at a mass not exceeding this reference mass it can be considered as operated within legal mass limits. Where a glider is flown at a higher weight mass by necessity, the pilot will have to provide documentation to prove that his glider is still operated within legal mass limits and the handicap will be increased by 0.005 for each 10 kg or part thereof that the glider exceeds the base handicap weight reference mass. However the wing loading may in no case exceed 38 kg/m<sup>2</sup>*

Mr Cubley asked what the handicap change was and Mr Stuck replied that it was 0.005 per 10kg. Mr Cubley then proposed to amend the motion to include the statement:

*Reduce the handicap by 0.005/ 10kg for mass below the reference mass*

Mr Stuck noted that modelling had already been done to test this value and that an adjustment of 0.005 per 10kg had proven to be too high.

Mr Leinikki noted that the handicap value was always a compromise, an average across conditions, and that this amendment made it more complex. Mr Ax agreed and confirmed that the calculations showed the changes were very small.

Mr Hansen counselled that it was dangerous to make changes at the last minute without time to consider the wider implications. He suggested that this amendment be postponed until it could be discussed and that maybe a lower handicap change would be appropriate. Mr Sheppe agreed, commenting that the changes needed to be mathematically modelled.

Mr Cubley withdrew his proposed amendment.

Mr Boudierique asked about the date of application for this proposal and noted that the handicaps themselves would need to be reviewed. The President confirmed that the change would be valid from the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2012.

The amended proposal was adopted unanimously.

#### **8.1.4 Proposal from the Sporting Code Committee: Mandatory use of Flight Recorders for altitude records above 50.000 feet.**

Mr Macintyre advised that Alternative proposal 2 – with a transition zone, had been withdrawn by the Sporting Code Committee. The proposal was, therefore:

#### **4.5.3 Altitude evidence**

**a. Up to 15,000 metres (except for position recorders, see para A-7 of the Appendix to Chapter 4), pressure data recorded by an FR or barograph shall be used. (See 5.2.3 on alternate release altitude evidence for duration flights).**

**b. Above 15,000 metres, GPS altitude from an FR approved for high altitude use (HAFR) shall be used. See Annex B and the Technical Specifications for IGC FRs for HAFR use.**

**c. For all record altitude flights, both GPS and pressure altitudes shall be recorded. During after-flight analysis, the profiles of the GPS and pressure altitudes must correspond to ensure that no anomaly is present in the data.**

**d. Claims using altitude data from an HAFR must include evidence that there was no sunspot solar flux radiation in the preceding 24 hours that exceeded the high of the preceding 96 hours.**

**e. For gain of height record claims having a high point above 15,000 metres, the evidence for the low point shall also come from GPS data.**

**f. The altitudes at which a glider crosses a start or finish line or the boundary of a start or finish OZ are determined by linear interpolation between the altitudes at the last fix before crossing and the first fix after crossing.**

Mr Macintyre spoke briefly to the proposal.

Mr Georgas asked when the time of 24-hours applied to the solar flares. Mr Smith stated that the record attempt would have a time at which the record was actually achieved and that the time period should apply to this time.

Mr Strachan considered that the solar radiation data was too imprecise to use in the Sporting Code and that it would be better to have a cross-check with a pressure altimeter to detect any anomalies. Mr Smith stated that the check on solar activity was necessary as solar flares may affect GPS systems and that not all the solar fare activity could be filtered.

Mr Rutkowski asked where this data could be found and whether it should be the responsibility of the pilot to find the information. Mr Smith replied that it was available on the web under information in the “*PV content of the atmosphere*”. Mr Mozer asked that there be an official source provided. Mr Macintyre said that this could be included as explanatory text.

The President asked for confirmation as to who would be responsible for providing this evidence. Mr Macintyre stated that it would be up to the group making such a claim. Mr Greaber suggested that this it should be up to the NAC reviewing the claim to check for this solar activity.

Mr Cubley asked if there was a list of FRs approved for high-altitude and Mr Strachan stated that there was not as these would be new FRs designed specifically for this purpose.

The proposal was adopted with 28 votes for, none against and 1 abstention.

Mr Macintyre then called the President’s attention to the fact that there was also an amendment in the proposal to SC 3.1.3 to update the margins for record claims. The President apologised for this oversight, but noted that, since the proposal had been properly circulated in the required time that he would table in now and allow a vote.

The proposal was:

**3.1.3 International record achievement margins**

**a. A new record claim must exceed the current value by 1 km for distance, 1 km/h for speed, 3% for altitude *using mechanical barograph data, 1% using electronic pressure data, or 150m using GPS height data.***

**b. When a new international record ...etc**

The proposal was adopted with 27 votes for, none against and 2 abstentions.

## **8.1.5 Remove requirement for identity of the pilot and glider in the Flight Log, SC3, 4.2.**

### **a. Proposal from USA**

The proposal is summarised as:

*To remove from the Sporting Code the requirement that the identity of the pilot and glider be included in the Flight Log for all Badge and Record claims involving electronic declarations*

Mr Sheppe spoke to the proposal noting that he was not intending any criticism of the Sporting Code Committee. He also stated that he was presenting on behalf of the USA but also as an expert in FR design.

He noted that a FR cannot actually certify the identity of the pilot or the glider which leaves it up to the O.O. to ensure the identity of both, Basically you cannot trust the record placed in the FR, you must have a paper declaration if you wish to be certain that the glider and the pilot were both together on the claimed flight. He believed that the proposal was removing an illogical rule as the identity in the FR served no purpose and that removing this requirement made the rules simpler.

#### **b. Proposed amendment from the Sporting Code Committee**

The Sporting Code Committee proposals is summarised as:

*The SC3 committee consider that to maintain the integrity of the higher level badge flights it would be wrong to have flights of diamond and diploma level treated in any lesser way than records. Pilots who have reached that stage of experience should have the knowledge and experience to correctly enter name and glider ID in the FR electronic data.*

Mr Macintyre spoke to the amendment noting that it would be a backward step to remove the electronic ID. It was the opinion of the Sporting Code Committee that flights involving higher performance should have the correct data in the FR and that this assisted to tie the whole record of the flight together in one data stream. He suggested that, if there was a desire to modify the declaration requirement, then it should be limited to Silver and Gold badge flights only. He also noted that badges can be done already using the paper record only. He also noted that the paper declaration could also be tampered with or completed post-flight so that it could also be challenged as to accuracy.

Mr Vidal noted that every fix needs to be quantified and asked if there was there a major issue around declarations.

Mr Georgas generally agreed with the USA point of view but noted that validating flights on the OLC, for example, requires an electronic identity so that the flight can be recognised. The system may not be perfect but at least it prevented the inappropriate use of flight logs once they are in the public domain.

Mr Casado noted that there was value in having an electronic record available to enable studies of flights in the future. He foresaw that there could be a paperless approval system in a few years with the O.O. providing a digital signature.

Mr Hansen recalled that there had been a long debate on this subject in 2011 and that, while the same arguments were being presented again, there were some new thoughts. He stated that Denmark supported the amendment.

Mr Macintyre responded by saying that while the Sporting Code Committee did not like the USA proposal they could accept the lower level badges being subject to no electronic ID if that was the wish of the plenum but he was concerned about the removal of information about the flight from the FR.

Mr Stuck commented that, as this was a Year 2 proposal we should only be debating the wording not the philosophy.

The amendment was adopted with 16 votes for, 12 against and 1 abstention.

The amended proposal was now summarised as:

*To remove from the Sporting Code the requirement that the identity of the pilot and glider be included in the Flight Log for all **Silver and Gold Badge** ~~and Record~~ claims involving electronic declarations*

The amended proposal was adopted with 15 votes for, 12 against and 2 abstentions

#### **8.1.6 Establish medals in Team Cup at World and Continental Gliding Championships. Proposal from Poland**

Mr Rutkowski noted that this proposal did not address a number of issues, including whether the Team Cup would be mandatory and how many Team Cups there were to be. After a brief discussion the Mr Rutkowski requested that the proposal be tabled for presentation in 2013 as a fully developed Year 2 proposal. The President agreed.

### **8.1.7 Allow for use of GPS height for Silver or Gold badge claims. Proposal from Canada.**

*A-7 Altitude*

***GPS altitude evidence alone is sufficient for a flight provided that a 100 metre error margin is applied to all pressure height requirements of the Code (example: the gain of height is at least 1100 metres for Silver altitude). See Annex C, para 2.3 for other examples.***

***If the required height is not met following the application of this margin, evidence must be provided by a pressure altitude record used in the normal way, conforming to IGC rules and procedures for barographs. For distance flights, the profile of GPS-derived altitudes from a position recorder must correspond to the profile of the pressure altitude record.***

The proposal was presented by Mr Macintyre. He noted that, in his opinion, as long as there was a sufficient margin then the concept of using GPS altitude for these badges with Position Recorders, was satisfactory. He noted that a lot of flights had been analysed and that the average error seen on the height was in the order of 80 meters.

Mr Strachan confirmed that this proposal only applied to Position Recorder and not to IGC approved Flight Recorders.

Mr Georgas agreed that the proposal was satisfactory for Silver badges but questioned whether Gold badges should be included. He noted that this would mean approved FRs would only be required for Diamond and Diploma flights.

Mr Hansen pointed out that this was aimed at making life easier for Clubs and that this proposal would help. He did not believe that it would impact on the FR manufacturers because their main market was competition pilots.

Mr Termatt agreed with Mr Georgas but asked that the altitude gain requirement be kept simple.

Mr Strachan noted that the scales for GPS are different to pressure altimeters hence there needs to be a margin of 100meters. He also noted that the GPS altitude is erratic in the cheaper GPS engines.

Mr Smith asked if a 100meter margin was sufficient.

The proposal was adopted with 22 votes for, 5 against and 2 abstentions

### **8.1.8 Proposal from Argentina to allow for 3 pilots per NAC in the World Class at 32nd FAI WGC**

*(This proposal is a late proposal requiring a 2/3rds majority to be tabled)*

The proposal was unanimously accepted for debate.

Mr Toselli referred to his earlier presentation on the preparations for the WGC in Argentina and requested the Plenums' support for the proposal.

The proposal was adopted unanimously

### **8.1.9 Proposal from the Bureau to limit the Wing loading in 13.5Meter Class to 35kg/m<sup>2</sup>.**

*(This proposal is a late proposal requiring a 2/3rds majority to be tabled)*

The proposal was accepted for debate with 24 votes for, none against and 5 abstentions.

The President noted that this proposal had come forward as an amendment in 2011 and had inadvertently been left off the agenda for 2012. He requested the Delegates support for the proposal.

The proposal was adopted with 26 votes for, none against and 3 abstentions

## **8.2 Year 1 Proposals**

The President commenced this session by informing the Delegates that the Bureau had confirmed that responsibilities for Year 1 and Year 2 proposals at the meeting prior to the Plenum. The proposer of a successful Year 1 proposal would, in future, be responsible for ensuring that the Year 2 proposal was developed and lodged with the IGC Secretary. However, in developing the Year 2 proposal any proposer would be expected to consult with the appropriate experts who would be identified by the President and the Secretary.

### **8.2.1 Proposal from Colombia Competition Rules and Safety: Implementation of “guiding principles” for safety**

*Part 1 - Amendment of Annex A with the purpose of including explicit overall guiding principles for the soaring championship rules contained therein.*

Mr Greaber presented his ideas to the Plenum. His intention was to ensure that safety-based outcomes were being adhered to and suggested that should be done by stating some guiding principles.

Mr Stuck noted that one of the objectives of the IGC Championships was to encourage the development of safe operations and procedures.

Mr Ax noted that Annex A is about Rules and it is impossible to include guiding principles in this document. There was also the question of who would write them, He stated that the Annex A did not create an unsafe environment on purpose and that all proposed changes to the Annex were debated and tested.

Mrs Kuijpers supported the idea and quoted the report from Mr Max Bishop from 2011. She noted that rules can create situations (eg gagging) and that a rule governing flying before the start was needed, which is in line with the proposal.

Mrs Vigorito stated that if we have a rule we need a penalty.

Mr Vidal commented that this proposal impacted on the area of the Safety Pays WG and that such work should not be conducted in isolation, There was a need to draw these initiatives together and take a holistic view of the situation.

Mr Bradley supported the comments from Mr Stuck and Mr Ax regarding Annex A and the statements regarding safety in the objectives.

Mr Boermans noted that the OSTIV TSP people were not competition pilots but that they had drawn similar conclusions.

Mr Spreckley commented that it was easy to forget the important issues. There was no implication that the IGC is not paying due regard to safety, but there is a implication that this work is not visible. Rules often have unintended consequences and if this is to be avoided we should document the reasons for changes.

The President compared the development of Annex A Rules and Local Procedures to the risk analysis required for aviation events and commented that a risk analysis and risk matrix might be a way to go to document the decisions taken regarding Rules and LPs.

Mr Spreckley agree and noted that there were always meetings between Chief Stewards and Organisers to consider and mitigate risks at championships.

Mr Stuck referred the Delegates to the Steward Handbook which provides requirements and guidance for Stewards in discharging their responsibilities.

Mr Graeber stated that this proposal was not a criticism of the Stewards; rather he felt that having the process would provide backing for decisions in a contentious situation.

Mr Georgas agreed and commented that the spirit of the proposal needed to be understood and asked if the Bureau could alter the Sporting Code.

Mr Pauwels stated that he was convinced this was a good idea but cautioned that we should not create more rules.

Mr Foltin offered his congratulations to Mr Graeber and stated that we need a policy statement and Safety Management System. This proposal should be received in good spirit and should be part of the work of the Safety Pays Working Group.

Mr Greaber reminded the Delegates that this was a Year One proposal.

The proposal was adopted with 25 votes for, 2 against and 2 abstentions.

*Part 2 – Establishment of Task Force to initially review the existing Annex A for compliance with the new Guiding Principles.*

Mr Graeber presented Part 2 of his proposals and noted that this was a logical follow-up to the 1<sup>st</sup> Part and the subsequent discussion that had just occurred.

Mr Leinikki replied that the Annex A committee is specialised for Rules and applying safety and that a separate working group would not be as effective.



Mr Boudier observed that it had been a major work to stabilise the rules and that it was not possible to create major changes now.

Mr Boermans reminded the Delegates that the paper from TSP also raised concerns about safety.

Mr Foltin said that he was not in favour of a parallel rule drafting group but that an alternative review of the rules from a safety perspective would be valuable and that this review could provide recommendations to the Annex A committee.

Mr Stuck suggested that we should wait to see what actually comes out of the Part 1 proposal. Mr Ax agreed and noted that we did not have the guiding principles yet and that the Annex A group is experienced and that they will do their best to ensure safety at competitions.

Mrs Kuijpers stated that it was good to have a review of the rules to assist the Annex A committee.

Mrs Vigorito asked if the Bureau would appoint the review group.

Mr Spreckley felt that this was an extension of the Part 1 proposal and that it could be useful to bring Delegates up to date with initiatives already happening. He noted that most of the Annex A group and Chief Stewards are also competition pilots or organisers themselves, they know that personalities have to be managed and the real problem is to make any rules or procedures relevant and effective. The Chief Stewards provide safety briefings at Championships designed to get the pilots attention and get them to think about their personal responsibilities and to make security a personal issue. There is also the pilot safety committee which provides feedback to the organisers and stewards. He then spoke about the safety videos now being produced from actual incidents and accidents in competitions. The first two will be available for the 2012 season and will be introduced by the Chief Steward but will have an audio track from current World Champions so as to appeal to the pilots. The videos are designed to focus the pilots on the outcomes of in-flight decisions. He then showed one of the videos to the meeting, involving a near-miss between thermaling gliders, and talked it through.

Mr Hansen asked if the videos would be available at the national level.

Mr Spreckley outlined the production plan of four videos by the end of 2012 and then an additional two every year. The videos needed to be fresh to maximise their impact at World Championships but, once they had been shown in WGCs, they would then be released for use at Continental Championships and subsequently released into general use.

Mr Spreckley summarised by stating that there are lots of current safety initiatives and that we need to link them together and coordinate the efforts rather than have independent activities occurring. He then proposed an amendment to the proposal:

*To replace “the existing Annex A for compliance with the new Guiding Principles” with “all current safety initiatives”*

Mr Greaber agreed that the intent was to bring all the initiatives together.

Mr Stuck noted that it would be useful to create a list of all the rules regarding safety and safety initiatives as a starting point. Mr Spreckley agreed that we need to look through the rules and to include all parties who are currently looking at safety initiatives.

Mr Vidal agreed that this was a high priority but that he could not say yet, from the Safety Pays group, how to do it.

Mr Boudier noted that it was not possible to vote for a proposal that implied major changes to Annex A.

The amendment was adopted with 26 votes for, 3 against and no abstentions.

The amended proposal was now:

*Establishment of Task Force to initially review ~~the existing Annex A for compliance with the new Guiding Principles~~: all current safety initiatives.*

The amended proposal was adopted with 25 votes for, 4 against and no abstentions.

## **8.2.2 Annex A Changes**

### **8.2.2.a. Proposal from Poland: Rest Day, SC3, Annex A, 1.2.3**

*To establish following rules regarding compulsory rest day during competitions:*

*There shall be at least one rest day every eight flying days,*

*Flying day means every contest day scheduled for competition flying,*

*Consent of all teams (Team Captains) is required to move the rest day forward.*

Mr Rutkowski presented the proposal noting that it was in line with safety principles and suggested that the rest day should be compulsory.

Mr Sheppe noted that the definition of a “flying day” was unclear and that the pilots needed a rest from flying rather than having a day cancelled after briefing or at some later stage in the day.

Mrs Kuijpers commented that, if tasks were consistently short because of the weather, then the pilots may not need to have a day free to rest.

Mr Spreckley noted that there was already provision in Annex A for the Team Captains to request a rest day. Mr Ax agreed and said that he felt there was no problem with the current rule and that it did not need fixing.

Mr Boudierique noted that a similar rule to that proposed had applied previously, that it had been removed and that he thought the stewards and organisers were doing a good job of monitoring rest requirements and fatigue.

Mr Stuck suggested that this proposal was a solution looking for a problem.

Mr Rutkowski replied that he was concerned that the interests of safety could perhaps be overtaken by financial concerns, for example the cost of ferrying tow planes and needing to have income from aerotows, and that he felt that we need to be more strict about rest and pilot fatigue.

The proposal was not supported with 3 votes for, 25 against and 1 abstention.

#### **8.2.2.b. Proposal from France: Modify the Finish Ring requirements**

*The following modifications are proposed:*

- *Finish Ring is not any longer regarded as the normal finish procedure.*
- *Minimum altitude crossing the Finish Ring is optional.*
- *Crossing the Finish Line without landing at the airfield is a valid finish.*

Mr Boudierique presented the proposal stating that France wished to allow the organiser to provide the best option for the finish so as to minimise the risks. He noted that the Annex A penalty was now 1pt/m but suggested that a maximum penalty should be added.

Mr Ax noted that the finish ring is the normal procedure in Annex A and the finish line is available if required. He also said that there needed to be a minimum altitude for finishing.

Mr Lennikki stated that there needed to be a minimum altitude, especially outside the boundary of the airfield, to ensure the safety of the general public.

Mr Øjvind asked why a pilot was considered as outlanded if they were inside the finish ring.

Mr Spreckley reminded the Delegates about the experience at Szeged where the Organisers opposed the Chief Steward’s requests to have the finish line changed to a finish ring. However, after the accident, a finish ring was applied and then the organisers thought that it was much better than the line. He stated that there was no merit in reverting to a finish line as the preferred option.

The President reminded the Delegates that it was no longer acceptable for pilots to fly fast within a meter or so of the ground on the airfield, but especially outside the boundaries of the airfield. He stated that the theory that flying in ground effect saved energy was incorrect. He also stated that he did not wish to see photographs of glider flying low on websites, U-Tube or in magazines as this exposure only covertly condoned these violations and reinforced behaviours that were not consistent with our recent debate about safety and the rewarding of safe behaviours

Mr Greaber remarked that the finish ring is the safer alternative, but that the finish line was still available if it was appropriate.

Mr Boudierique then suggested that the proposal be split into four parts: choice of finish; the requirement for a minimum altitude; that the minimum altitude should be as low as possible; and, that the maximum penalty be 25points.

Mr Termatt commented that organisers often set the finish ring minimum altitude too high and that this forced pilots to watch their altimeter to check their height as well as their computer to check the position of

an invisible line and that this created problems because pilots should be looking outside for other gliders during the finish.

Mr Spreckley commented that it had taken some time for organisers to understand how to use the finish ring properly and how to set an appropriate minimum altitude.

Mr Ax commented that not having an altitude limit could see pilots close to the ground at 150kts (280km/h) at 3km from the airfield.

The President declined to split the proposal into four votes. However he noted that, this was a Year 1 proposal only, Delegates should vote in favour of the whole proposal even if they only supported some sections of it. This would enable the whole proposal to be studied and developed into a Year 2 proposal.

The proposal was not supported with 4 votes for, 22 against and 2 abstentions.

#### **8.2.2.c. Proposal from France: Team Cup, SC3, Annex A, 8.5**

*It is proposed that one of the following methods to be developed as Year-2 proposal:*

1. *Average score in each class: That lets the possibility to award one team medal by WGC, even for women and juniors.*
2. *Olympic method that keep the system of one team cup for 2 WGC.*
3. *A proposal from the Bureau*

Mr Boudierlique presented the proposal saying that France did not support the way the Team Cup was calculated and suggested that the Olympic method would be simpler and would also better suit smaller teams.

Mr Ax agreed with the comment on the complexity of the scoring but asked if a team could consist of just one pilot.

Mr Greaber suggested that this proposal be combined with the Polish Team Cup proposals (which had been tabled for resubmission in 2013).

Mr Boudierlique agreed and said that this would allow the development of alternative methods of calculation of the team cup score. Mr Spreckley agreed that the scoring method needed review. Mr Rutkowski stated that both alternatives should be included in the review.

The President commented that combining the Polish and French Team Cup proposals in 2013 would be useful.

The proposal was adopted with 24 votes for, none against and 4 abstentions.

#### **8.2.2.d. Proposal from France: Forbidden Airspace, SC3, Annex A 1.4.4.3**

*It is proposed to suppress 3 current penalties:*

- *Flying above the absolute altitude limit defined at briefing (Sporting Limit) if excess altitude < 100m*
- *Flying above the absolute altitude limit defined at briefing (Sporting Limit) if excess altitude > 100m*
- *Entering forbidden airspace vertically or horizontally*

*And replace them by 2 new penalties:*

- *Single or multiple penetrations of prohibited airspace simultaneously greater than 200m horizontally and 30m vertically - Penalty: Outlanded at the first point of airspace entry / Day Disqual. / Disqualification*
- *Single or multiple penetrations of prohibited airspace NOT simultaneously greater than 200m horizontally and 30m vertically - Penalty: 50 pts / 50 pts / 50 pts*

Mr Boudierlique presented the proposal stating that the two-step penalty proposed was already being used in the United Kingdom and that marginal entries into forbidden airspace were accepted by the UK CAA.

The President asked what the phrase “forbidden airspace” meant. Mr Boudierlique replied that it meant sporting airspace not controlled airspace.

Mr Spreckley noted that a graduated penalty applies in the UK but also that the penalties for entry into the airspace get serious very quickly to discourage deliberate entry.

The President stated that he was opposed to the IGC suggesting that entry into controlled airspace was condoned by any rule or penalty. He clarified this statement to refer to Class A, B and C airspace. He also expressed concern about the possibility of TCAS Resolution Alerts (RA) occurring on airlines if gliders were 30M vertically inside airspace thus reducing the vertical height clearance between a glider and an air transport aircraft to as little as 120M (or 400ft) less the sum of the altimeter errors.

Mr Foltin stated that one fix inside airspace was quite different from a 200M lateral entry. He noted that ATS radar fixes were relatively inaccurate and that the radar controller would not be absolutely sure of the exact position of a glider on an airspace boundary. He also pointed out that TCAS RAs depend on a rate of closure determined by the relative rates of climb and or descent. However he expressed concern that the big message in this proposal was that we would allow flight into airspace and this has to be questioned.

Mr Ax stated that the debate was about technicalities; that we cannot allow entry into controlled airspace in Annex A.

Mr Rutkowski agreed that infringing airspace is breaking the rules, that this rule should not be softened and that we should not allow pilots the option to calculate the risks associated with entering airspace.

Mr Leinikki noted that we receive positive support from the aviation authorities for the use of airspace because we have such tight rules about airspace violations.

Mr Strachan commented that the Sporting Code General Section required the appropriate Air Laws to be complied with.

Mr Graeber spoke about the situation in the USA where VFR flight up to 18,000ft is possible and that, to protect against altimetry pressure and setting errors at that altitude, the sporting airspace altitude imposed in the USA is 17,500ft.

Mr Macintyre suggested that a buffer zone be created outside controlled airspace.

Mr Øjvind agreed but also noted that controlled airspace can be entered with a clearance from the controlling ATS unit.

Mr Morgens questioned the penalties being applied and Mr Ax responded that a lower limit is provided in Annex A.

The proposal was not supported with 4 votes for, 25 against and no abstentions.

### **8.2.3 Proposal from the Sporting Code Committee: Awarding of Free Distance records**

*The SSC recommends that either one of two changes be made by introducing a new paragraph to SC3-1.4.7:*

- *A free distance record and a declared distance record cannot both be claimed for the same flight.*
- or, if this is not acceptable, then*
- *If a free distance record is to be claimed in conjunction with a declared distance record, it must exceed the declared distance by at least 10%.*

Mr Macintyre presented the proposal noting that, with limited exceptions, free and declared records have been conjoint.

Mr Termatt asked why would you want to stop someone, who declares a distance longer than the existing free distance, from being able to claim the free distance in addition to the declared distance. Mr Macintyre replied that the declared distance is usually less than the free record.

Mr Georgas stated that we should not decide which case we certify; rather we should just certify the ultimate performances. Mr Ax responded that we should therefore drop the declared record and just have free records.

The first option, to not allow a free and declared distance to be claimed on the same flight, was not supported with 8 votes for, 19 against and 1 abstention.

The second option, to require the free distance to exceed the declared distance by at least 10%, was adopted with 15 votes for and 14 votes against and no abstentions.

#### **8.2.4 Proposal from GFAC: Flight Recorder Security - Recommended changes to FR approval levels**

*It is recommended that SC3B Appendix A be shortened to the following:*

*Changes of approval level.*

*If GFAC proposes to lower the approval level of a type of IGC-approved recorder, this will be discussed in confidence with the manufacturer and then with the IGC ANDS Committee. As much notice as possible will be given to the manufacturer so that there is the opportunity of offering an upgrade that will retain the existing approval level. The IGC Bureau may also be informed if appropriate.*

*After these discussions, if GFAC still decides to recommend a lowering of the approval level it will then make a detailed recommendation to the IGC Bureau. The Bureau will then assess all of the evidence and make a decision. To aid this process, the Bureau may decide to make a public request for comments (avoiding any confidential or proprietary information).*

Mr Strachan presented the proposal noting that it was tidying up the process for reviewing approval levels.

The proposal was adopted with 26 votes for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

#### **8.2.5 Proposal from Colombia: Extended Handicap List**

*It is proposed to task the IGC Handicap subcommittee/ Annex A subcommittee with developing an extended FAI Handicap system to allow for the use of flexible handicapped non FAI classes at FAI Continental Championships starting 2013. The extended FAI Handicap system shall cover all glider types commonly used for these championships*

Mr Greaber noted that there are not enough gliders in the vast majority of FAI nations to create formal FAI classes for championships and so local handicap lists are used. Each differs slightly. Decisions about purchasing gliders are being based on the handicap performance. Also there is no handicap list for the 20M multi-seat class and many club gliders are not on the current IGC handicap list. In addition the OLC does not have an FAI\_IGC Handicap list.

Mr Boudier commented that the IGC responsibility was to provide handicaps for the Club and 20M multi-seat classes only.

Mrs Vigorito stated that each country may have its own handicap list except when they are hosting the FAI Club Class championships.

Mr Ax confirmed that Annex A, formally, only applies to the WGCs and Continental GCs, but that it recommends that the DAeC handicap list be used if handicaps are desired. He suggested that there is no need to redo this work.

The President noted that many countries have their own handicap list. Mr Vidal noted that Chile uses the Argentinean list and Mr Ax recommended that the DAeC list be used.

Mr Graeber suggested that there should be a standard list for CAT 1 and CAT 2 events and that the current system was not transparent.

Mr Vidal stated that their local handicap list and the DAeC list created similar outcomes with the event results.

The proposal was not supported with 4 votes for, 22 against and 3 abstentions.

#### **8.2.6 Proposal from Italy: Ranking List Proposal**

*(This proposal is late proposal and requires a 2/3rds majority to be tabled)*

The proposal was accepted for debate with 27 votes for, none against and 2 abstentions.

SC 3 - Annex D -Paragraph 5.6

*It is proposed to change:*

*The Pilot Rating Score for two seaters entries and entries shared by more than one pilot will be awarded to the pilot with the highest Ranking at the start of the competition. If neither pilot has a current Ranking it is the pilot nominated as first pilot or P1.*

**to read:**

*The Pilot Rating Score for two seaters entries and entries shared by more than one pilot will be **assigned proportionally to the Ranking score of each pilot** at the start of the competition. If neither pilot has a current Ranking it is the pilot nominated as first pilot or P1.*

Mrs Vigorito noted that there was now a separate 20M Ranking List, but that it would be valuable if the results from the 20M class could also be integrated in the main Ranking List.

Mr Spreckley commented that the 20M competition is a team competition and the intention always was to create an independent ranking list for this class. He questioned whether the 20M class is about team flying or just 2 people in a glider and he confirmed that the pilots in the 20M class do not get their results incorporated in the main ranking list. He suggested that the proposal should be voted to provide feedback on how the Delegates felt on the question.

Mr Termatt noted that the ranking list identifies the best glider pilot in the world and that using different lists dilutes this message.

Mr Cubley asked who was ranked and Mr Spreckley replied that, in the 20M class the “team” gets ranked to which Mr Cubley commented that he preferred the Italian proposal.

Mr Lennikki pointed out that there would need to be dedicated teams to make this successful so in the future we would see pairs of pilots and Mr Stuck agreed that this concept fitted with the spirit of the 20M class.

Mr Boudier commented that the proposal would get all top pilots to the top of the ranking list.

Mr Georgas supported the team concept and Mr Lennikki noted that the proposal was not so much an option but rather an addition to the existing situation.

The proposal was adopted with 16 votes for, 9 against and 4 abstentions.

## **9. IGC Strategy**

### **9.1 Update on the IGCs strategic Plan**

Mr Henderson updated the Plenary on the IGC Key Performance Indicators.

*Note: A presentation is available on the IGC web.*

## **10. Votes on Bids**

### **10.1 7th FAI Woman’s World Gliding Championships 2015**

The 7<sup>th</sup> FAI Women’s WGC was awarded to Arnborg, Denmark. The competition dates are the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> of August 2015.

### **10.2 8th FAI Juniors World Gliding Championships 2015**

The 8<sup>th</sup> FAI Juniors WGC was awarded to Narromine, Australia. The competition dates are the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2015.

### **10.3 18th FAI European Gliding Championships 2015**

The 18<sup>th</sup> FAI European GC in Open, 18Meter and 20Meter Multi-seat classes was awarded to Ocseny, Hungary. The competition dates are the 13<sup>th</sup> to the 24<sup>th</sup> of July 2015.

The 18<sup>th</sup> FAI European GC in 15Meter, Standard, and Club classes was awarded to Rieti, Italy. The competition dates are the 3<sup>rd</sup> to the 14<sup>th</sup> of August 2015.

### ***Discussion Paper from Colombia: Future FAI Class Structure***

Mr Graeber introduced his paper by noting that the headline run by the Gliding International magazine did not reflect his opinion on the subject. He pointed out that he was only talking about competition classes and that the IGC had design classes (Open/ 20M/ 18M/ 15M/ Std and 13.5M) and also legacy classes (Club and handicap). The purpose of the Club class, as stated in the Sporting Code 6.5.8, was to enable competitions but he noted that many gliders fall under this concept but have no home. In addition, handicap racing creates a range of handicap issues. The Standard and 15M classes have seen little development in the immediate past and fewer new gliders in these classes are being sold. This potentially creates a problem for manufacturers.

Mr Sheppe suggested that it was a mistake to try to stimulate gliding (for example the experience of the World Class) but that this was not a success and pilots drive the demand, as seen with the 18M class. This means that the popular classes are determined through inclusiveness.

Mr Stuck pointed out that the Standard class was created by the IGC and that it has been the most popular class of all. The experience of the PW5 situation should not stop political decisions being made in favour of the gliding movement as a whole.

Mrs Vigorito commented that there were too many classes and, if we want to have fewer, we need to decide which ones we concentrate on.

Mr Stuck responded that he did not understand what was meant by “too many classes” as the number of pilots competing was increasing and we should be happy that the competition scene is strong. The real problem is that the competitions do not provide any real benefit to the sport, as indicated by the reduction in membership numbers.

Mr Termatt challenged the objectives of the WGC and asked whether we actually achieve these objectives.

Mr Stuck stated that he had never seen a proposal to delete a class.

Mr Cubley considered that we were trying to develop the sport and increase membership. Sport development means increasing the number of competition opportunities. To support and grow membership we need to provide choices and incentives.

Mr Boudier suggested that the only way to suppress a class was to increase the number of NACs supporting championships.

Mr Rutkowski asked how many of our champions anyone could recall. He suggested that fewer competition classes would increase the visibility of the champions. He also noted that it was difficult to find sufficient bidders and organisers to fill the competition calendar.

Mr Greaber reminded the Delegates that there were a limited number of countries flying pure FAI-classes.

Mr Stuck asked if we wanted to move to 50 pilots per classes in four classes to reduce the number of competitions, but that this would mean 200 pilots flying at a single site.

Mr Vidal considered that providing opportunities for pilots was good. We should be looking at the other factors affecting competitions – for example shortening the length of competitions might be good.

Mr Spreckley challenged whether we had too many championships and where were the statements or proposals saying that we had too many. However, we are limited as to where we can go and, that while we were pleasing the pilots quite well, it was time to review the situation.

The President closed the discussion stating that the Bureau took note of the concerns and would look at facilitating a review of the championships calendar.

## **11. IGC awards**

### **11.1 Lilienthal Medal**

The Lilienthal Medal was awarded to Mr Georgio Galetto, Italy.

### **11.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma**

The Pirat Gehriger Diploma was awarded to Mr Andrea Tomasi, Italy.

### **11.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal**

The Pelagia Majewska Medal was awarded to Mrs Gill Van den Broeck, Belgium.

## **Confirmation of Committees and Committee Chairmen**

The President advised the meeting that, due to the pending appointment of Mr Leinikki to the position of IT Manager at the FAI on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May, the IGC Treasurer, Mr Bradley would be co-opted as a voting member of the Bureau until the elections in 2013. He noted that there was no constitutional requirement for an election to be held to replace a vacant Bureau position.

Also, with Mr Leinikki moving to the FAI Office, the chair of the Scoring Software Testing Working Group would be vacant and the President was pleased to announce that Mr Rick Sheppe had agreed to take over chairing this WG.

The full list of Committees and Working Groups Chairmen and the IGC Representatives and Specialists is at Appendix B.

## **12. Announcement of date and place for the 2013 IGC Plenary Meeting**

The Bureau asked leave to bring forward a late proposal on the next meeting location.

The proposal was unanimously accepted for debate.

The Bureau proposal was:

*That the IGC Plenary may be held in a location other than Lausanne if suitable facilities, accommodation and hosting can be found.*

*That the Bureau be empowered to make a decision no later than end of August of the year preceding the meeting. This decision to be communicated to the Delegates no later than mid-September.*

The President introduced the proposal by noting that the IGC needed to be more conscious of the cost constraints faced by many members and that ease of access to a location combined with lower prices for the facilities and accommodation relative to Lausanne, could well result in increased attendance at the IGC meeting.

A suggestion from the floor that the date of decision and notification should be July, to facilitate travel and leave planning, was accepted by the Bureau.

The proposal was amended to require a decision by the Bureau in July, which was adopted unanimously.

The 2013 IGC Plenary will take place on the 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> of March 2012 in a location to be confirmed.

### **12.1 Useful dates and other practical information**

Notification of proposals shall be sent to the Bureau by Monday 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 at the latest.

Bids for the 2016 WGCs and the 2015 13.5M WGC shall be sent to the Bid Specialist by Monday 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 at the latest.

Final proposals, nominations and reports requiring voting shall be provided not later than Monday 31<sup>st</sup> December 2012.

Reports not requiring voting shall be provided on Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

All material will be made available for Delegates and NACs on Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2013.

### **13. Closure**

The IGC President Mr Bob Henderson thanked the SSSA and especially Mr Dick Bradley and Mr Oscar Goudriaan for organising a very successful meeting in Potchefstroom, which was endorsed by the Delegates with acclamation.

The President also thanked the Delegates and the Bureau for their active participation in the debates and their contributions to the sport over the past year. He then wished all the meeting participants a safe journey home.

R Henderson

President, IGC

Appendices:

A Presentation on the Business Case for the IGC Company

B IGC Committees and Working Groups, Representatives and Specialists



### **Presentation on the Business Case for the IGC Company**

The following extracts from the IGC Business Case, in support of the creation of an IGC Company, were presented to the Delegates.

#### **Proposal**

- It is proposed that the IGC/FAI create a commercial organisation that has the authority and flexibility to seek partners to facilitate the development and promotion of the SGP.
- To be effective, this organisation must be given the rights to develop, promote and organise SGP events, potentially in conjunction with municipal authorities.
- The company would have a relevant and appropriate name such as Sailplane Racing Ltd or Sailplane Grand Prix Ltd.

#### IGC/FAI requirements for the SGP Management Company

- It will be controlled and owned by IGC/FAI
- It will have limited liability status
- It will have the capability to include stakeholders who become part of the SGP management and organising team.
- It will have financial autonomy and the authority to enter into contracts and agreements.

#### Objective of The Company

The primary objective of the Company is to raise sufficient financial support to ensure that the Sailplane Grand Prix race is properly funded and provides a platform for the further growth of the event.

#### Roles of The Company

- To operate the SGP series, including, if appropriate, the creation of an Operational Management Team
- To recruit motivated and appropriately experienced persons, preferably from within the Gliding community, to further develop the commercial profile of the SGP.
- To seek sponsors and patronage for the SGP series.
- To create media interest in the SGP series.
- To involve the organisers of qualifying SGP events in the promotion and financing of the series

#### Strategies of The Company:

The SGP Company will work closely with local organisers of SGP events to maximise income from the event or peripheral activities.

The sources of finance targeted by the company will be:

- Direct requests for sponsorship or patronage within the gliding movement.
- Involvement of the municipal authorities in financing SGP events.
- Raising sponsorship for each event locally and internationally.
- Improving the attractiveness to spectators of the SGP events by seeking to build relationships with other compatible airport events.
- Advertising on the web portal

**Appendix B**

**IGC Committees and Working Groups**

8th March 2012

Updates in **bold**

<b>Standing Committees</b>	<b>Chairman</b>	<b>Members</b>
ANDS	Bernald Smith	Angel Casado
Championship Management	Eric Mozer	Brian Spreckley Matti Leinikki*
GFAC	Ian Strachan	Angel Casado Trautenberg
Handicaps	Christof Geissler	Stefan Ronig Russell Chee
Sporting Code 3 D, Annex A	Goran Ax	Axel Reich; J
Sporting Code 3 D, Annex B	Ian Strachan & Bernald Smith	
Sporting Code 3 D, Annex D	Brian Spreckley	Keith Nicholas
Sporting Code 3 D, Main Section and Annex C	Ross Macintyre	Tony Burton; Ruprecht

<b>Working Groups</b>	<b>Chairman</b>	<b>Members</b>
Continental Records	Hans Obermeyer	Goran Ax; Kla Bradley; Judy
Country Development	Alexander Georgas	Visa-Matti Lei Markus Graef
GP Development	Roland Stuck	Brian Spreckley
History Committee	Tor Johannessen	Angela Shear Angela Shear
Scoring Software Testing	<b>Rick Sheppe</b>	Peter Platzer; Peter Ryder;
Safety Pays	Rene Vidal	Vladimir Foltin Vigorito (Corr Brian Spreckley Markus Graef

\* To stand down on the 30<sup>th</sup> of April 2012

**IGC Representatives**

CASI (Air Sport Commissions)	Tor Johannessen
EGU/ EASA	Patrick Pauwels
Environmental Commission	Bernald Smith
CIMP (FAI Medical Commission)	Jürgen Knüppel
OLC	<b>Reiner Rose</b>
OSTIV	Loek Boermans

**IGC Specialists**

IGC Treasurer	Dick Bradley
---------------	--------------

Membership	John Roake
Sailplane Grand Prix	Roland Stuck
Simulated Gliding	Vacant
IGC Trophy Management	Marina Vigorito
Webmaster	Peter Ryder
Communications and PR	Bob Henderson
Ranking List	Brian Spreckley
IGC Journalists	Angela Sheard                      Marina Vigorito                      Jill McCaw