CIVL 2018 PLENARY – ANNEXE 23 D

BUREAU PROPOSAL – GAP PARAMETERS CHANGES

Background:
Some previous discussions and decisions on changes to the GAP scoring parameters never made it into the Sporting Code. This proposal groups two of them together for approval and implementation at the 2018 plenary.

Issue and Discussion:
The GAP nominal parameters of nominal task distance and nominal task time can be used to ensure that full validity task point values (i.e. 1000 points) are not given for tasks that are under some minimum values.
Discussions have revolved around the question of whether a three to five-hour task that required many, many decisions to be made and opportunities to be exploited is a better evaluation of pilot skill than a 30 to 45 minute task. The same discussion was had around task distance. Is a 60+ km task that by definition requires many opportunities to make the correct or incorrect decision while racing to goal a better evaluation of pilot skill than a 30 or less km task?

The counter-argument was best captured by the Japanese competition constraints where it is difficult to get long tasks either in time or distance due to the constraints of their competition sites.

Proposal:
Add to S7A 5.1 Competition Validity the following words:
In order to assure sufficient opportunity to determine the level of a competition pilot's flying and decision-making skills that warrant the award of the maximum task points (i.e. 1000 points), the minimum GAP parameters for nominal task time is 90 minutes and nominal task distance is 45 km.

Issue and Discussion:
S7 CIVL Gap Annexe 12.1 ESS but not goal currently reads:
'In a task where ESS and goal are not identical, a pilot may reach ESS, but not goal.
Reaching goal is seen as "validating" one's speed section performance. A pilot who does not reach goal after reaching ESS will lose his time points. He will only score distance points for the distance actually covered, and leading points. This is seen as a safety measure, since it encourages pilots to plan their final glide to ESS with enough altitude to safely reach goal. This discourages high-speed final glides low to the ground.'

Getting no time points for ESS but not goal makes sense for paragliders and is the current default parameter in the FS scoring system. It does not, however, make good sense for hang

gliders as a high-speed final glide close to the ground is not a significant safety issue for a hang glider. When ESS and goal are not the same in hang gliding competitions the reason is not to avoid high-speed low final glides, but rather other issues like we saw in Brasilia in 2017 where the last 2 km to goal had very marginal landing options. The current FS scoring system default value for hang gliding is set at 80% of speed points awarded for ESS but not goal. This is a better option for hang gliders and should be allowed to be set differently in the local regulations depending on the particulars of the competition goal sites.

Proposal:
Change S7 CIVL Gap Annexe 12.1 ESS but not goal to read:
In a task where ESS and goal are not identical, a pilot may reach ESS, but not goal. Reaching goal is seen as “validating” one’s speed section performance. A pilot who does not reach goal after reaching ESS will lose a portion of his time points, as defined by the scoring system penalty parameter for this situation. He will also score full distance points for the distance actually covered and his full leading points. The time point penalty for not reaching goal is seen as a safety measure, since it encourages pilots to plan their final glide to ESS with enough altitude to safely reach goal.
For paragliders the scoring system parameter is to be set at 0% (i.e. no time points awarded) as this discourages high-speed final glides low to the ground.
For hang gliders the default scoring system parameter of 80% is recommended, but can be changed by the local regulations to suit particular sites.