

69th FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, LILLE, FRANCE, 26 - 27 JANUARY 2019

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

I would like to thank you all for giving me this opportunity to lead IPC and I would particularly like to thank you for giving me a bureau comprising some wonderful people. The fact that we are all women has made FAI history but gender is not the most important thing. Our different skills, our motivation and our capacity to work together as a team has made us confident, strong and efficient and, I hope you will agree, able to lead IPC towards an exciting future.

In spite of all my years in IPC, this first year as President has nevertheless been a road of discovery. It has brought me closer to our athletes, our organisers, and to some of you, our delegates. It has also given me a new and different perspective of our relationship with FAI.

My report will cover various aspects of the above.

At the start of our work together we determined our key objectives for the coming two years. These are as follows:

- New Image of IPC to incorporate Indoor Skydiving (review documents, review name and logo)
- Challenge Committees to review their disciplines in line with FAI objectives to have exciting, audience friendly,
- Female Participation (to align with IOC objective of 50% participation)
- Olympic Project
- Media Focus and use of Skydive TV
- Liaison with Professionals (Swoop Tour, Tunnel Operators,..)
- Extended Bureau Workshop to develop a strategic plan for 2019 and beyond.

New Image You will find in the Agenda together with the proposal from the Netherlands following on from the proposal submitted by France last year but not voted on, a presentation that I made to the Executive Board, the ASC and NAC Presidents concerning the re-branding of IPC. The presentation received an enthusiastic response from all and I confirm that if I had been in a position to formally request the relevant updates to all the documents, they would have been approved. As it stands, we now have to vote on the proposals and if they are accepted, present them to CASI and the General Conference for approval and incorporation into the relevant FAI documents in 2019. This will be discussed in the Open Meeting.

Challenge to the Committees. Documents were sent to the Committees for response in time for the Plenary. Any received in time will be incorporated into the Agenda for further discussion but the subject will also be part of the Workshop.

Female Participation. This is also a discussion for the Committees to see how to encourage female participation and also to consider whether we still need separate Male/Female events in some disciplines. A subject for the Workshop.

Olympic Project. See under.

Media Focus and use of Skydive TV. This question will be part of the Workshop and then discussed during the Open Meetings.

Liaison with Professionals. See under

Extended Bureau Workshop. Each year the extended bureau meets before the start of the Plenary and then we spend several days working altogether in our Open Sessions sharing what we have been doing in the past 12 months and looking at ways to evolve our disciplines. What we do not do is pause and take the opportunity to look at the wider picture and check that we are using all our wonderful volunteer energy to point our sport in the right direction. So this year, the Bureau decided to try a different concept and use the day and a half prior to the start of our 5-day marathon to work as a team to determine the direction to which we will point IPC in the coming years.

69th FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, LILLE, FRANCE, 26 - 27 JANUARY 2019

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

It is something different, does have a cost but we feel that it is a worthwhile exercise to kick-off some new thinking and perhaps, in a safe environment, generate some new ideas. We did not want to wait for another year before kicking off this initiative, but wanted to start now. We often express fear that the FAI will use the ASC reserves for their own purpose, we propose to use some of that reserve for our own purpose. We have engaged a facilitator to help us through the process and we will feedback the outcome of our work to the Plenary for approval. The extended Bureau is invited together with a representative of FAI, our CISM delegate and five other guests who have been chosen because we feel that they have something additional to contribute. We hope this will be exciting for the participants, fun and, more importantly, that it will give us a path to follow for the next few years.

We have also had to work on the day-to-day functioning of IPC and this has led to a number of Interim Bureau Decisions, 20 as I write. These cover various subjects and were all thoroughly discussed prior to the final decision being taken. We felt it important that every decision taken by the Bureau be properly recorded and hope that you will ratify our decisions when the time comes during the Plenary.

In the IPC Internal Regulations, one of my tasks as President is to attend, if possible, all Committee and Working Group meetings (IR 5.1.2 (8)). There must be a reason for this? I would guess to enable the President to be aware of what is going on so as to be able to represent IPC fully at all times but also to fulfil IR 5.1.2 (5). I would like to interpret this as meaning not only physical meetings but also virtual ones since technology now allows meetings to be virtual. In fact, this bureau has held all but one of its meeting via technology. To be able to fulfil these obligations, I need to know when such meetings take place and then decide whether it is appropriate/possible or not to attend. That was not always the case this year and I will bring this question up with the Committee Chairs and also have it as part of the discussion in the Workshop.

IPC COMPETITIONS

2018

This year was a World Championship year for outdoor events (except Paraski) and all were held successfully thanks to the event organisers and the host NACs. Thanks also to the various volunteer IPC Officials whose dedication contributed to their successful outcome.

Indoor events included a European Championships and a World Cup, two separate events that were both very successful and strongly promoted the discipline through excellent media coverage including both regular television and internet broadcasting.

Having both Outdoor and Indoor competitions (and this year two separate Indoor competitions) gives us an opportunity to include more judges into the judging panels thus enabling more people to keep up their skills and ratings. However, it also highlights the difficulty that some disciplines encounter in finding enough available qualified judges. This question needs to be addressed by the Judges Committee even if resolving it is not easy due to both a shortage of suitable, qualified candidates and a limited number of willing hosts of Judge Training courses.

2019

Next year we will hold an Indoor World Championship in Lille, Fra and Paraski World Championships in Vrclabí, Cze. and World Cups in all other disciplines The Indoor event will be very important in view of the Olympic Project (more on that below). A big thank you to all the future Organisers. It is still not always easy to find hosts for our World Cups and I'm grateful for those who have bid, including two that still need Plenary approval (Wingsuit and Speed).

69th FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, LILLE, FRANCE, 26 - 27 JANUARY 2019

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

Other Competitive Events

World Air Games

Due to the unavailability of Patrice Girardin and all the other suitable people suggested, I accepted to participate in a tour of all the sites that would be used for the World Air Games to be held in Turkey in 2020. This was a 1400 km trip by bus over 4 days. Although I initially thought that it was not necessary to participate in the whole tour, it turned out to be very worthwhile as it gave me insight to issues that the other Commissions have with the World Air Games and was most useful for networking. Two locations were considered for parachuting and both Exi and Patrice had already visited one or the other. The site that was used in 1997 in Ephesus, the only drop zone in Turkey, will be used again, the other site, Eskisehir, planned for Canopy Piloting, is, as I write, no longer being considered.

The Turkish Aeroclub has undergone restructuring following elections and the outcome is to postpone the WAG until 2022. This will give us an opportunity to plan for a really special event and also to ensure that no other event clashes with it or detracts from it. I am also awaiting a bid from Turkey to host the IPC Plenary in 2020.

CISM World Military Parachuting Championships

I was invited to attend the CISM World Military Parachuting Championships held in Szolnok, Hungary in August. This was a new experience for me and I was impressed by the organisation of this big event. It was also interesting to see the high number of participants and the levels of performance which were also impressive. Our relationship with CISM remains strong with shared interests especially in Judging.

FAI World Swoop Freestyle Championships

We have continued our relationship with ASport and we provided an FAI Controller and a Jury (2 members of which were off-site) for the two events held in 2018: Copenhagen and San Diego. I had the pleasure to attend the event in Copenhagen which enabled me to see just how important it is for FAI/IPC to be part of this event. We have a lot to learn from the way this event is run and promoted and it is an excellent way to show off our sport even if the competition rules are a little different from our usual events. Together with the Canopy Piloting Committee, we will renegotiate the MoU we have with ASport in the coming months, hopefully before the Plenary Meeting, covering such things as competition rules and athlete selection.

It must not be forgotten that, although this event has a World Championship title, it is actually considered as a second category event organised by a third party. A recent conference that was attended by the FAI Secretary General highlighted the changing sport landscape and the need for International Federations to be more flexible and agile meeting the needs of the sports people, while considering that sport events are more and more often being organised by people outside of the usual Federation environment. Our relationship with ASport is a good example of such a situation and the flexibility IPC has shown in enabling this relationship is a positive step in the right direction but that needs to be overseen carefully.

1st Indoor Competition in China

Although I was invited as Chief Judge, the fact that I am also IPC President was certainly factored into the invitation. It is exciting to see how this discipline is developing in China and in Asia and it is important for us to be there to support and contribute to this development.

Second Category Events

The FAI Calendar for Parachuting includes a number of competitions (13) that are classified as Category 2 events (the calendar does not allow for anything other than FCEs and SCEs) and they seem to come from a small number of countries. Most of these competitions do not fulfil the requirements of an SCE which include holding an FAI

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

Sporting Licence. Other Air Sport Commissions use SCEs to build up World Series and include the results in their ranking system that generates some revenue. If we want to develop a series whether it be Indoor or Outdoor, we may need to reconsider how we manage competitions that are included on the FAI Calendar and what rules they are conducted under especially if we move towards more joint ventures or agreements with outside organisers. Food for thought.

The previous Bureau decided it was important to have Bureau representation at our competitions and this Bureau is in agreement with the principle. However, we feel that it was not necessarily the best solution to always take on representative roles so as to avoid conflict of duty (which was not possible anyway due to 2018 nominations being confirmed before our election) and consequently some of the visits were stand alone and had to be covered by a separate travel budget. These included my presence in Poland and Elisabet's in Bulgaria. The other events were indeed covered by Bureau members having another official role.

RECORDS

Competition Records

At the start of our mandate we discovered that there was a large backlog of outstanding competition records. The Jury at Voss worked through the Indoor backlog and by the end of the competition all the Indoor records including those beaten during the European Championships were up to date.

In 2018, for the majority of competitions, this process, introduced in 2016 and modified in 2017, has worked fairly well and I would like to thank all the Jury Presidents and members who have diligently applied this process.

The initial idea is without doubt excellent but this year has enabled us to identify unexpected negative effects the most obvious one being the cost this process generates. No budget was made for this work and we will probably end up with an expense of not far short of 10000€. We need to incorporate the cost of the process into the 2019 budget although it is not easy to determine the number of records that will be broken in any given year. Including Continental Records in the process adds to the cost and also increases the workload because where it is fairly easy to identify a new World Record which will then automatically become a Continental record, it is not so easy to keep tabs on all the Continental records that might be broken.

I would like to suggest that we reconsider managing Continental records as part of the IPC managed record process. This would reduce the workload and reduce the cost to IPC and give some of the responsibility back to the athlete. A World Record is something to communicate about but a Continental Record that is far below the current World Record really only interests the athlete and his/her NAC.

To continue from the above I would like to talk about records in general and highlight some of the problems that I have been faced with this year. These have mainly concerned record administration. Apart from the backlog of unfinished records (and I spent a day in Lausanne working on some of them), I have unfortunately had to request extensions to the deadline for 16 records.

All of these extensions were caused by either a lack of knowledge on how to administer a record on the part of a Jury or a Judge or, to be honest, through sheer negligence. Some of these extensions were initially rejected by either a NAC or the FAI as being unjustified. Obviously I fought my position because I felt it unfair to athletes to be penalised for the incompetence of someone they trusted and because a couple of these records had received high media coverage and it would have been incomprehensible for them never to be ratified. The resulting discussions have led to a modification of the Sporting Code General Section.

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

As a result of these issues and the resignation of the Records Officer, the Bureau decided not to seek a replacement for the position. It is preferable that the people who accept the responsibility to manage records either as an Official Observer or as a Juror have the knowledge to do the job properly and I have committed to FAI to run a short workshop during the Plenary addressing both potential Jurors and Judges. I have also asked for a process to be added to the Jury Handbook to make things clearer.

We, unlike other Commissions, have two types of Record: Competition Records and Performance Records.

Records exist for various purposes, they are stimulating (Large Formation and Large Formation Sequential records being a good example), generate athlete gratification and are a good communication tool.

Records need to be easy to understand and promote.

A competition speed record, especially as was the case of FS at the last WPC, is easy to understand by the public and the media and can be used to rouse the spectators on site. An average speed over x number of rounds does not have the same meaning or generate the same excitement. This has been introduced to several disciplines – is it a step in the right direction? Too many records dilute the value of each record.

Performance records should be something special, something to get excited about, something that is out of the ordinary, something to communicate on. They require a lot of effort on the part of the organiser and the participants both financially and timewise. Consequently, they also need to be well managed and the paperwork done in time so that the record can then be ratified.

But I do have some questions...What is the sense in having a record performed several times by varying groups of people so that they can all be in the record? How do you explain to anyone that a 32-way record is performed by 64 people or that the record is repeated several times and they all count? Is that really what we want?

Our large formation sequential records are inevitably going to hit a ceiling with the increment that is mandatory from one record to the next. We need to think carefully what we want to do with these records and how we evolve them.

I believe that this is a real subject for debate and it might be worthwhile setting up a small Working Group to look at the question during 2019.

OLYMPIC PROJECT

Following the enthusiastic acceptance of the project by the IPC Plenary last January, the French Parachute Federation, IPC and the FAI have continued to work on the subject together with input from IBA represented by Wayne Loxton.

A temporary Executive Board working group has been set up and although it has not yet had to do any work, may be necessary if we have to make rule changes outside of our usual cycle.

I attended two of the three meetings that have been held in Lausanne where a number of pertinent questions were raised. At the second meeting the FAI invited a representative from the Climbing Federation in charge of the introduction of Indoor Climbing into the Tokyo Olympics. This was to help us understand the impact of such a decision on the Federation. Questions such as budget, priorities, the impact on other disciplines within the Federation, etc. were raised and to be truthful, we had not thought of the answers.

69th FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, LILLE, FRANCE, 26 - 27 JANUARY 2019

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

Currently we do not have a budget for this project and most of my expenses have been covered by the FFP or myself but I have requested the reimbursement of some travel from IPC.

The timeframe for working on this project is limited, if we have not heard from the Organising Committee by the end of April, we can consider that our chance is gone but we must not stop there, we should also be aiming for the 2028 Olympics in Los Angeles!

Present at the third meeting that I could not attend was the new FAI President, Bob Henderson and he has shown full and complete commitment to this project recognising that this is an opportunity that must be exploited.

The key points to be retained for the coming months are the following:

- we need to determine the event(s) that will be most suited to the Olympic environment.

The FFP held a test event in Paris for a new format for FS that I attended. This was based on the principle of Dynamic and was scored using the Dynamar system. The athletes loved the format and it certainly changed from what we do now. However, it was evident, even to the athletes, that FS is not a suitable discipline for the Olympics. Another test event is planned for Freestyle and Dynamic early next year but maybe too late. These two disciplines are better suited to our aims but the rules, especially for Dynamic, need to be reviewed to make them more Olympic friendly.

- we must give visibility to this project.

A link will be installed on the FAI Home page that will lead to two sites: the FlyIn2024 site and the FFP site. This will remain for as long as necessary, it should be under the main news to the left of the screen.

- we should invite the Organising Committee to our Plenary. We might need to adapt the order of our agenda to accommodate this. They probably won't come but if they do, we need a budget !!!

- we must send VIP invitations to attend the WISC: IOC President Thomas Bach, IOC Sport Director Kit McConnell and the COJO. Again, if they accept, will require a budget.

- the WISC will be our showcase

FAI is prepared to help out with the marketing budget. It is an event that must be successful and we should all work to that end.

- Continued visibility.

The next SportAccord meeting is to be held on the Gold Coast in May 2019, the FAI will have a stand there and will include a presentation on Indoor. Even if our hopes are dashed before then, we should still be present in preparation for the next opportunity - 2028.

It is still important for IPC to embrace a more global approach to Indoor and the idea of organising a World Series or something similar must be pursued. Tentative talks with IBA have not yet had an outcome and we need to see how we can work with all the tunnel operators. The environment is very different to that we are used to working in and we may need to be more flexible in our solution than our usual competition formats including perhaps introducing a notion of International Team to fit with the fact that flyers from many countries work together in the tunnels and build up teams. It might help us to look at the approach taken by the Aeromodelling Commission when managing Drones. The participants, the audience and the organisers being very different to what they are used to. I hope the revised Indoor Committee will take this on.

IPETA

Whereas the initial reason behind the setting up of IPETA is as valid today as it was then, the decision to close IPETA has been respected and, thanks to Gail Bradley's work, the company no longer exists. The need for a company alongside International Federation is, in certain circumstances, obvious and exists elsewhere. FAME, the company set up by FAI still exists although dormant for the moment and could serve that purpose if and when necessary.

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

FAI AND IPC

The fact that I know the staff in Lausanne so well has made the relationship very easy and due to the Olympic project and also a workshop that was organised by the FAI, I visited Lausanne three times this summer. I would like to thank all the Head Office staff for their cooperation and assistance throughout the year.

In addition to the work on the Olympic Games and the World Air Games, I had the opportunity to represent IPC at a workshop organised by FAI called "One FAI". This was kicked off during the joint mid-year meeting bringing together ASCs and NACs and was followed up by a two-day workshop run by a facilitator who has worked with FAI in the past. A number of people were interviewed prior to the workshop to capture what concerns and feelings people had about the FAI. The key points retained were addressed in four sub-groups:

1. Purpose of FAI,
2. Decision Making and Governance,
3. The role of NACS, and
4. FAI Sporting Licences.

Surprisingly, the definition of the purpose was an easy task with rapid agreement by all and the resulting definition will probably be adapted for inclusion into the FAI statutes. The role of NACS has led to a proposal to edit a guidebook to help some NACs understand their role and obligations and what FAI can bring them. The Sporting Licence issue (that has not impacted IPC much because we do not have many SCEs) is on-going. Decision Making and Governance is the subject that still requires a lot of work and where IPC is most involved. This subject is now being addressed in a Working Group and has led the ASC Presidents to set up their own Forum and a group of us are working very closely together to encourage changes that will enable ASCs to contribute more to the overall governance of the FAI (CIVL, CIVA, CIA, GAC and CIAM). I will give an update during the Open Meeting.

FINANCE

Gail Bradley, our Finance Secretary will update you on the financial situation of IPC but I wanted to remind you that our only source of finance is the Sanction Fee paid by competitors. The financial contribution paid by our NACs to FAI serves to cover head office costs which include the work carried out for IPC by the Head Office. It does not serve in any way to enable IPC to function. We have had a reserve for many years from which we have taken small amounts for special projects and we have been whittling it down slowly by having a negative budget some years.

At the start of our tenure, we realised that only a very small budget had been planned for Bureau activities and travel. Although that should not be abused, there has to be the possibility to allow IPC representation not only at our own Competitions but at other events too. The past President very generously financed a lot of things himself but his predecessor had an approved budget to allow him to represent IPC at most competitions. According to our Internal Regulations, representation is a key role of the IPC President so it is important to be able to fulfil it correctly. The FAI workshop, two trips to Turkey, the visit to CISM, the travel to Lausanne for the Olympic project were necessary as was Bureau representation at our competitions. We also need to establish a budget for the record process and the Olympic Project. We need to finance our IPC officials, whether it be for travel or accommodation and we still need to be able to run special projects.

The sanction fee is currently 90€, to increase it would certainly be an unpopular move but we do need to think carefully about our priorities so that we make the best use of this money. Some of the proposals on the Agenda this year will definitely increase expense either for IPC or for Organisers but we have to remember that whether it

69th FAI/IPC PLENARY MEETING, LILLE, FRANCE, 26 - 27 JANUARY 2019

<i>Subject:</i>	2018 IPC President's Report	Annex No. -	4.1
<i>Author:</i>	Gillian Rayner, IPC President	Agenda ref. -	4.1
<i>Date:</i>	15 December 2018	Total Pages	8

be via the sanction fee or via the competition registration fee, it is the competitor that finances our activities. If we choose to adopt all the proposals, we might be forced to increase the sanction fee.

My thanks to my Bureau, First Vice President Elisabet Mikaelsson, Vice President, Doris Merz, Finance Secretary Gail Bradley and our Recording Secretary Susan Dixon. Our Internal Regulations allow for an additional Vice President. Nominations will be called for. We hope that you will vote for someone that will be complementary to the team that we form. Don't hesitate to discuss this question with any one of us.

Thank you for your attention and taking the time to read this rather long report.

GILLIAN RAYNER – IPC President
December 2018