



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*

Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the **FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission**

**Held at the Movenpick Hotel
in Lausanne, Switzerland**
on 20 and 21 February 2010

*Avenue Mon-Repos 24
CH-1005 Lausanne
(Switzerland)
Tél.: +41(0) 21/345.10.70
Fax: +41(0) 21/345.10.77
E-mail: sec@fai.org
Web: www.fai.org*

CIVL Plenary Meeting, Lausanne, Switzerland
20th to 21st February, 2010

Minutes

1. Opening of the meeting

FK welcomed FAI president Pierre Portmann, FAI Secretary General Stéphane Desprez, delegates, alternate delegates, observers. Moment of silence in remembrance of pilots who have died in the past year.

2. Roll call, apologies and proxies: number of votes

27 voting members present plus 4 proxies, gives 31 votes. 21 are necessary for a 2/3 majority and 16 votes for a simple majority.

3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest, according to FAI Code of Ethics

CB/GBR, PG SC chair is involved with one of the championship bids being presented later

4. Approval of the Agenda

No comments. Agenda approved.

5. Approval of the minutes of the last Plenary meeting

No comments. No questions. Minutes approved unanimously.

6. Report of the CIVL President

Full details in Annex 1 : Communications could be better. Some Subcommittees are still not working as much as they need to during the year. I hope for a much more active S&T SC in 2010. Safety is still a major priority. Treasurer had to resign. It is thanks to volunteers that CIVL gets its work done so it is important that those who volunteer are sure they have the time to do the work required.

7. Report of the FAI Secretary General

FAI President's address – Mr Pierre Portmann: FAI is moving to new offices in Lausanne next year. Reinforcing FK's comment, PP emphasised that CIVL volunteers need both the will to work and the competence. Following the retirement of Max Bishop, PP introduced the new Secretary General, Stéphane Desprez. His appointment was overwhelmingly agreed by the FAI board.

FAI Secretary General – Mr Stéphane Desprez: He reported that the General Conference at Incheon was well organised by Korean organisation. 20 Asian nations were among those represented, many for the first time, bringing FAI closer to ASIANIA organisation. FAI to support East Asian countries to develop airports and airports will be part of the Asian Games in Incheon in 2014. Pleased to see that Chinese Taipei is bidding to host the next CIVL Plenary.

Aims for 2011. Looking to help commissions achieve some of their essential tasks. Encourage greater cross-fertilisation between commissions. Improve marketing and communications, which will also help all commissions. A number of new active and temporary members were announced. The 2011 GC will be in Serbia. FAI door is always open.

8. The Plenary is asked to ratify the following decisions taken by the Bureau in accordance with IRs 4.3 and 4.4:

- Approval of minor changes (name, personnel, dates) to the 2nd FAI Asian PG Championship, and to allow the entry fee to be increased by expressing it in local currency.

No objections. Ratified

- Introduction of a rule mandating that from 1 January 2010, pilots competing in Category 1 events wear a helmet approved to EN966.

Decision initially deferred pending recommendations from the SCs. Bureau suggested this decision holds, and a WG appointed to research this further. It was commented that a WG was voted in a year ago, with a deadline of last October, and nothing happened. It was agreed to vote to ratify Bureau decision, and then appoint the WG.

Vote to ratify Bureau decision: In favour 22, Against 4, Abstentions 5. Decision ratified.

It was agreed that as this is a safety issue, some necessary funding can be made available.

Volunteers for the WG: Riss Estes (USA), Thomas Brandlehner (AUT) and Stephane Malbos (FRA).

Proposed mission statement: "To establish the protocols for comparing the standards, and then to determine which standards are deemed to be equivalent or superior. Progress to be reported to the Bureau". Vote to set up the WG: In favour 24, Against 4, abstentions 3. Approved.

- To upload PG competition results with task dropping using the full number of tasks flown, until the PG SSC determines an alternative solution.

Discussed in SCs, decision ratified by Plenary. Unanimous.

- Approval of the Local Regulations: 2010 FAI European PG Championships Abtenau, Austria.

It was confirmed that new rules approved in this Plenary will be in place on 1 May 2010 and therefore applied to these LRs. Bureau Decision to approve these LRs was ratified. Unanimous.

- Approval of the Local Regulations: 2010 FAI Asian PG Championships, Nishiawa, Japan.

YO/JPN asked if it would be possible, if places still available as the deadline approaches, to drop the limit on number of pilots per nation (50) set in the LRs. It was commented that we should be encouraging Asian pilots to participate in Cat 1 competitions.

JA/GBR proposed ratifying the approval of the LRs with the removal of the 50/country restriction.

Seconded by SM/FRA. Vote: In favour 29, Against 2. No abstentions. Passed.

- Approval of the Local Regulations: 2010 FAI HG Women's Worlds, HG Classes 2&5, Tegelberg, Germany.

Decision ratified following approval of Germany Proposals (see 26). Local Regulations will be updated to reflect rule change. In favour 30, abstention 1.

- Approval of the Local Regulations: 2010 FAI European HG Championships, Ager, Spain.

No questions. No objections. Ratified

- Bureau decision in October 2009 to split the approval of Cat 1 Entry Requirements from the approval of Local Regulations in order to publish entry information as early as possible.

No questions. No objections. Ratified.

- Other Bureau decisions taken at the Bureau Meeting, October 2009.

No questions. No objections. Ratified.

9. Review of the 2009 Championships. Reports from:

– FAI World HG Championships, Laragne, France – John Aldridge (JP)

Extremely well run championship. Tricky weather made life difficult for MD. Sprog measuring, although not as originally planned worked well.

– FAI World PG Accuracy Championship, Croatia – Kamil Konecny (CZE competitor)

Despite the bad weather, the Croatian organisers maximised the number of rounds that could be flown. Well organised, no problems.

– FAI World Air Games, Avigliana, Italy – Dennis Pagen (Steward)

We had some communication problems initially. But there were positives. Speed gliding course was improved. We had the rounds we needed for both HG speed gliding and HG aerobatics. Some tow problems. PG Accuracy went well too, with all programmed rounds flown. PG Aerobatics also went well, thanks to the help of the Judges. It was a good spectacle for the public, and especially by the participants from the other airports. Raft on the water was particularly attractive.

10. Report and Proposals Safety & Training Subcommittee

Full details in Annex 2. No report provided by outgoing S&T Chairman. JA/GBR reported that members have agreed to restructure the SC. From now on, safety issues will be discussed by each discipline SC and matters will be coordinated by a S&T chair, who will either be a Bureau member or report into the Bureau. A new Terms of Reference will be created. JA recommended delegates to think carefully when voting on proposals. Safety must be at the forefront. Delegates have a responsibility to think about the safety of all their pilots.

FA/POR: Noted that the discussion in the meeting on training for accident investigation and reporting, as raised by GK/LUX, and FA's suggestion to train CIVL Jury and Stewards accordingly, had been inadvertently omitted. (This will be appended to the report when it is published). JA asks that new S&T chair takes this point on board.

Approval of the S&T Report. In favour 27, Against 0. Abstentions 4. Report approved.

11. Report and Proposals of HG Subcommittee (including Sprog Measurements WG)

Full details in Annex 3. Safety issues: sprog measurements are continuing at our major competitions, including Ager, Tegelberg. Hiring experts as appropriate. Agreed to contact manufacturers to get more information.

Helmets: DP/USA: We need this rule to stop the use of inferior helmets, but we should not exclude superior helmets. SC proposed a qualifying statement, but this was not pursued once it was agreed to form the WG. Setting up a safety team within the HG SC.

Approval of the HG report, excepting the proposals that are on this Agenda and the helmet issue. Vote: In favour 30, abstention 1. Approved.

12. Report and Proposals of PG Subcommittee

Full details in Annex 4 CB/GBR: Productive meeting, thanks to constructive contributions of members. Safety matters: Helmets: Agree with Bureau decision, other standards can be added later. Harnesses: Proposing to limit Cat 1s to certified models. Paragliders: Long discussion on limiting uncertified (open class) wings. Proposal to set up PG Open Class Technical WG to look at establishing test standards for open class gliders and consider possible design limitations. Details and timelines in place. Proposed change to S7B to tighten up qualifications for pilots in Cat 1s.

Clarifying definition of Paraglider (the rigid structure/carbon debate): Long discussion, with many views, some deadlock. No consensus that this was a safety issue. Outcome: no change at this time.

Swiss proposal withdrawn pending discussions during the year and new proposal next year. Team size/allocation: earlier discussion by email was continued. Proposal to change allocation procedure.

Women's world question (held over until after women's Cat2 this year).

Some disapproval on decision to set up a short term self-certification solution pending a full test standard for certification. Still some support for moving to Serial class (no un-certified gliders). Fear that another year will pass without moving towards an acceptable solution. Heavy load on the WG.

Vote to approve this report, excluding the helmet issue and proposals on the Plenary Agenda: In favour 29, against 2, abstentions 0. Report approved with more than 2/3 majority.

13. Report and Proposals of combined HG/PG Subcommittee meeting

Full details in Annex 5. Discussion on defining prototypes set the scene and there was cross-fertilisation of ideas. PG SC became aware at least, of the way that HG might move. Discussion split to separate meetings. Approval of report: Unanimous.

14. Report and Proposals PG Accuracy Subcommittee

Full details in Annex 6. JV/SLO: SC has been working by email through the year. Safety issues:

Helmets: Would rather see EN966 recommended rather than mandated. Harnesses: change to method of specifying non-certified harnesses.

Range of updates and minor amendments to S7C proposed. Judging Code: This has undergone major revision. It is 10 years old and required some restructuring, and some changes. Reducing size of team, chief & event judges to be appointed by CIVL, update of roles, added in training requirements and programme. Some restructuring of S7C and would like more time to prepare this, until end of April.

Local Regulations for upcoming European Paragliding Accuracy Championships, Turkey, revised and now in final draft, awaiting Plenary Approval (attached to report).

Future: Still waiting for Judging database. Looking at scoring system development.

Judging seminar report from last year, and request for budget of 1500€ for 2010 seminars.

Wording for amendment to rule 2.16.5, determined jointly between SC and FA, has been appended to the report in Annex 6.

Proposed & seconded to reword rule change on Stewards to: Add: "It is recommended that..."

Approval of the report, including all proposals, European PG Accuracy Championships, Turkey Local Regulations, (amended) rule changes & restructuring, budget request, but excluding the helmet issue.

Vote requires 2/3 majority as it concerns S7 changes. Vote: Passed unanimously

FK. Thanks to Jurij for his work this and previous years. He is passing on his chairmanship.

15. Report and Proposals Aerobatics Subcommittee

Full details in Annex 7. IV/AUT: The SC has done a lot of work this year at meetings and by email.

Complete overhaul of rules and update to Manoeuvre board, plus restructuring and language corrections. Reflects fast moving nature of discipline. Fewer competitions this year. Still too many countries do not allow aerobatics, but lots of young people wanting to participate.

Cancellation of World Aerobatics Championships, 2010, Omegna – there maybe a chance it can be resurrected. Deadline of 15 March has been set as final date for notification of agreement and OA to be signed as soon as possible afterwards..

Addressing development problems. Looking for support from FAI to help promote this discipline to contact NACs, how they can get insurance, get training etc. Also to educate NACs that (in competition) there have been no major accidents in the last five years.

Upcoming projects: Scoring system for aerobatics, will talk to SW WG about if it is possible to incorporate or have separate initiative.

Judging training budget request for US and Europe and for training video. Will help promote the sport, promote safety. Request for 6000€ will be 50% funded by ARISF.

Approval of report, including rule change proposals and restructuring but excluding helmets:

Vote: In favour 29, Against 0, Abstentions 2. Report approved

Vote on budget request: In favour 23, Against 0, Abstentions 8. Request approved.

16. Report and Proposals Records & Badges Subcommittee

There was no meeting and no report. Chairman, Richard Westgate was not present. Vote to accept that there is no report. Agreed

17. Report and Proposals Software Working Group (including Altitude Limits WG)

Full details in Annex 8. AG/ISL: Live tracking – this was a lively debate, resulting in agreement that use of these devices be encourage and that there should be no delay on displaying pilot tracks. It was reported there will be a trial of live tracking this year (PG Europeans, Abtenau). Not for scoring.

Proposal that tracking should be allowed in 2010 competitions and rules adjusted accordingly. Altitude limits WG, ongoing (see interim report published with Bureau Meeting minutes October 2009). GAP documentation will be available shortly, to explain the options more clearly. Discussion on stopped task rule has been continuing. France planning to modify the proposal for next year. WXC Online contest – encourage all delegates to ensure that online contests in your country are participating.

Online demonstrations of WXC Online Contest and FS project of wiki based documentation, open for updating by scorers. FS currently only handling XC, and the intention is to have additional modules for Accuracy and Aerobatics scoring. Plan for software budget (unused) for several years, to be used to further a number of outstanding scoring and database projects, including Jury & Steward and Judging databases.

Approval of report and proposals: In favour 30, Against 0, Abstentions 1, Report approved.

18. Report and Proposals Sporting Code Subcommittee

Full details in Annex 9. JA/GBR presented the rule changes proposed in his Agenda and brought to the meeting by the SC chairs. Vote to approve the report: In favour 29, 0 against, 2 abstentions, Report approved with 2/3 majority.

19. Report from Cat 1 Preparation & performance Measures Working Group

JA/GBR: Verbal report: This WG had minimum communication and did no work at all. Apologies but the task has not been achieved. FK declared this WG is disbanded. No objections.

20. Jury & Steward selection & coordination issues, including report from J&S Selection WG

FK: The WG did not report to the Bureau after 3 months as required. Bureau kept the WG informed of its procedures and timing of the selection and appointment of Jury & Stewards. Limited feedback from a couple of WG members was received. This WG is now disbanded. FK noted that this Plenary has ratified the Bureau's decision to appoint FK as the Jury & Steward coordinator. A TOR will be produced. The database will be constructed. The coordinator is a Bureau appointment.

21. Presentations of bids

European Paragliding Accuracy Championships to be held in FYR Macedonia. Event planned for 1st to 8th July, 2012. Bid presented by Goran Diminovski, delegate for FYR Macedonia.

PG Accuracy SC had reviewed the bid and reported that it is acceptable.

European HG Championship 2012, Turkey. Dates 19th August to 1st September. Presented by Hakan Cici, delegate for Turkey, with Adem Hasgul and Murat Baycora.

Some anomalies in the budget were noted (sanction fee not included, but a cost for medals was included, which they do not have to pay).

The HG SC reviewed the bid and reported that it is acceptable.

European PG Championships 2012, St André, France. Dates: 31st August to 15th September 2012.

Presented by Philippe Lami, Francois Gerin-Jean and Chris Burns.

The PG SC reviewed the bid and reported that it is acceptable

The bid from Brazil for the Pan-American PG Championships 2012 could not be presented as no confirmation of support was forthcoming from the Brazil NAC, CAB.

22. Award of the 2012 FAI Championships

FYR Macedonia - the bid for European PG Accuracy Championships 2012 was accepted by a majority vote

Turkey – the bid for European HG Championships 2012 was accepted by a majority vote

France – the bid for European PG Championships 2012 was accepted by a majority vote

We have received two notifications to bid for 2013 Championships:

World PG Championships in Estrela, Portugal

World HG Championships in Forbes, Australia

SM/FRA noted that the Australia bid coincides with the 50th anniversary of John Dickenson's first HG flight

23. Bureau Proposals: Changes and Amendments to Internal Regulations.

Proposed changes presented by JA/GBR. Proposed amendment to the change to point 7.2, to clarify 'elected annually by the Plenary'. Seconded. Vote to approve amended changes to IRs : Passed unanimously.

24. US Proposals:

a) Discussion: In light of the cancellation of the Aerobatics Worlds, Omegna, to explore CIVL policies to facilitate smaller Cat 1 Events & how to avoid cancellation in the future.

DP/USA: We should do all we can to encourage and support small meets, such as aerobatics, or maybe speed flying and other disciplines. One option is to opt for a representative jury, which would save costs for the organiser. But also, to look at the structure set up by FAI for 100 years. These were originally contests of aeroplanes, and things were very different. This should be looked at again, and to communicate with the FAI to see if any changes can be proposed. JA/GBR explained that proposals agreed by the Plenary can be taken up by the President and the CIVL CASI representative. Action on Aerobatics SC to explore ideas and report back.

b) Set up separate system of Cat2 and Cat 1 Open Distance competitions

Discussed in the HG SC. Action item on US. This proposal withdrawn at this time.

25. France Proposals:

i) Task Advisory Committee wording change – S7A

HG SC passed this to Sporting Code SC

ii) GAP parameters to be discussed & announced at 1st TL briefing – S7A

Vote on approving the recommendation noted in joint HG/PG SC meeting for both S7A and S7B, passed to Sporting Code SC.

iii) Change of max ballast to 20kg – S7A

Proposal withdrawn

iv) Change to stopped task scoring – S7A

Proposal withdrawn

26. Germany Proposals:

i) Women's HG class 1 – 2 pilots (instead of 3) to score for team

Discussed in HG SC and recommended it to be approved. Seconded SM/FRA

Vote: In favour 27. Against 0. Abstentions 4. Proposal passed

ii) Women's HG class 1 – stopped task scored after 1h

Discussed in HG SC and recommended it to be approved. Seconded by SM/FRA.

Vote: Proposal passed by necessary 2/3rds majority

iii) Women's HG class 1 – team size to be increased from 4 to 6

This is against the Bureau decision to approve the LRs for Women's Worlds which stated the team size should be 4 (plus individual entries). JA/GBR commented that the average number of competitors in these championships is 24, so that 75% of competitors could get medals. HM/AUS: We want to encourage women in the sport, so more medals will attract more women, and the media, to the sport. Seconded HM. Vote: In favour 26, Against 5, Abstentions 0. Proposal passed

27. Australia Proposals:

i) Establish new HG Safety WG

Proposal withdrawn as its intention has been superseded with the restructuring of the S&T SC and a safety team within the HG SC.

ii) Revise set up and operation of CIVL WGs

Proposal was agreed with the modification agreed in the HG SC (noted in Annex 3). Seconded IE/SLO. Vote: In favour 24, Against 3. Abstentions 4. Proposal passed.

iii) 2year transition for safe settings for small gliders

Proposal withdrawn following HG SC actions now planned in this area

iv) Review of FAI's change of representation rule

HM/AUS presented the case: That pilots who have lived in a country other than where their sporting licence was issued for 5 or more years may compete for that country without having to miss any major competitions as is now the case. A swap to compete in the team of another nation may occur once only. SM/FRA pointed out that this has the effect of extending the existing 2 calendar year rule, making it harder for some. Proposal to ask CIVL CASI representative to take up this point in the most appropriate way. Seconded RA/FIN. JA/GBR recommends that this proposal is also referred to the Australian NAC to take up with CASI. Vote: In favour 24 Abstentions 4. Against 0. Motion passed.

28. Netherlands Proposals:

i) Backdate implementation of reduced field for Sport Class validity

Proposal withdrawn

ii) Banning prototypes from HG Cat 1s

KdK/NED: Would only affect one competition a year (Cat 1s). HG has had safety issues, and this is improving. However, there are still pilots turning up at these comps with very new, untried prototypes, and gliders that are modified and called prototypes because they are uncertified. JA/GBR: Good step forward, ensures competition between pilots and not manufacturers. Further discussion in HG SC minutes, and another long discussion repeated many of them. It was clarified that the proposal applies to the new definitions agreed for prototypes, and that uncertified gliders will still be allowed. This is in line with the intentions of the PG SC also. KdK confirmed that many refinements can be included in the 'uncertified' category. It was pointed out that a few 'test' pilots would be forced to buy a production glider to fly in a Cat 1, as their prototype would be disallowed. Rule 12.1.2.3 would also need to be changed. Proposal seconded by HM/AUS.

Vote: In favour: 23. Abstentions 4. Against 4. Motion passed.

SM/FRA: Request to add a new proposal to the Agenda. Seconded by JA/GBR. Vote: unanimously agreed

Proposal: To delay implementation of the above proposal until 1 Sep 2010.

Vote: In favour 29, Against 1, Abstention 1. Proposal passed.

iii) Extending qualification criteria for HG comps

KdK/NED: summarised proposal as per HG SC meeting (proposal modified to 15 points). Wants to encourage greater media interest and participation in competitions by creating a need to 'qualify' each year for an upcoming Cat 1. Seen by some as a safety measure as pilots would be more current and experienced. But seen as not be good for Asian pilots who do not have so many points, and especially in HG, and may have to travel far to get more.

Vote: In favour 11. Against 11, Abstentions 9 Motion failed.

29. Switzerland Proposals:

i) Re-qualifying S7B definition of Class 3 paraglider

ii) Setting up WG for PG construction limitations or, establish homologation procedures for competition class gliders.

Both proposals withdrawn following acceptance of PG SC proposal to set up WG.

30. Slovakia Proposal: Change of definition of Class 1 Hang glider

Proposer not present. DP/USA: Has had an email discussion with the proposer who thought the original definition of HG did not take account of certain aspects in more modern designs. DP believes that the existing definition still serves adequately. Not seconded. Proposal not voted.

31. Spain Proposals:

i) Development of alternative types of task

Discussed in the joint HG/PG meeting. Action on Spain to further develop the idea. Proposal withdrawn at this time.

ii) FAI to monitor airspace issues

Proposal answered by Max Bishop (former) Secretary General, FAI. See Annex 11.

CV/ESP: Spanish federation raising some airspace issues with NAC. Concerned about European initiative, European Single Sky is putting at risk world class sites, such as Piedrahita. CV has been told he has to address EAS and is asking help from CIVL and FAI. KT/GER: Agreed, confirmed the ESS initiative is potentially very dangerous to free flight. EHPU also concerned. Spain should contact EHPU even though it is not a member, they will be heard. EHPU has an airspace officer and good connection with EAS. Meeting next weekend will surely deal with airspace matters. Working towards a concerted effort to lobby the right people, to make an impact. JA/GBR: 2 years ago, FAI set up a navigation and airspace commission (CANS), but this has a worldwide remit. CIVL is not active, but could send a delegate.

32. Continental Records – Update

JA/GBR: These have only recently been set up and it has been a slow process. There are some new world records that have yet to be claimed as Continental records recently, for example in USA and Italy. The information on the website should be up to date shortly. Continental records have been set up to motivate pilots and recognise their achievements. To hold a continental record, a pilot must hold a FAI Sporting Licence from a country in that continent. Delegates reminded that the purpose of establishing Continental Records is so they may be set independent of World Records rather than just have world record holders getting a second FAI Record Diploma for the same flight.

33. Bureau Proposal: Revisiting the CIVL Long Term Plan

JA/GBR: It is an old document from 1994, and there was an attempt to update it in 2001. This should be a useful tool for guiding CIVL direction. It is referenced in the TORs for all our SCs. Aims include: improving safety in free flying and competitions, liaison and cooperation with testing bodies, more continental championships promoting the sport to the media, expanding the format of events, developing scoring systems and WPRS, multi-discipline events (such as WAG), developing new disciplines, improve communications, encourage more professional events, reduce entry fees, limit entry to certified gliders. Most points are still relevant and under regular discussion, some aims are being furthered better than others. It was agreed the long term plan should be reviewed and appear on the plenary agenda every year. Fresh ideas needed.

34. CIVL Financial Report 2009

Due to the resignation of the treasurer, LJ/FRA presented the report and spreadsheet (prepared by LJ and WS/USA) showing 2009 income and expenditure, and sanction fee analysis. Vote to accept the report: unanimous

35. CIVL Budget 2010

Proposed 2010 budget also presented. The budget needs updating to include late items, such as Plenary reception, judging training budget requests and a provision for Safety & Training expenditure. (Updated in Annex 10) Proposal to mandate bureau to update the budget accordingly. Seconded. Passed unanimously.

36. Discharge of Bureau responsibility for decisions made since the last Plenary

Vote: unanimous

37. Awards - Pepe Lopes Medal and FAI Hang Gliding Diploma

No nominations.

38. Nominations and elections of the CIVL Bureau

MS/SUI: Request to put a new point on the agenda. Seconded. Majority agreement.

MS: Proposal to direct JA/GBR to determine if, in the future, we can allow Alternate Delegates to become vice presidents. Vote: In favour 30. Against 0. Abstention 1

Result of elections:

John Aldridge (GBR) – President

Agust Gudmundsson (ISL) Vice President

Igor Erzen (SLO) – Vice President

Fernando Amaral (POR) – Vice President

Scott Torkelsen (DEN) – Vice President

Louise Joselyn (FRA) - Secretary

Koos de Keijzer (NED) - Treasurer

39. Nominations and elections of the chairs of the SSCs

Safety & Training SC – Laszlo Szöllösi (HUN)

Sporting Code SC – Vacant (JA will continue until 1 May)

Paragliding SC – Robert Aarts (FIN)

Hang Gliding SC – Oyvind Ellefsen (NOR)

Paragliding Accuracy SC – Kamil Konecny (CZE)

Aerobatics SC – Dennis Pagen (USA) & Iris Vogt (AUT)

Records & Badges SC – Scott Torkelsen (DEN)

Software WG – Agust Gudmundsson (ISL)

Flip Koetsier elected President of Honour by acclamation

40. Bids for organising the next Plenary meeting

Presentation from Elsa Mai/TPE on hosting the next meeting in Chinese Taipei

Vote: 20 for Chinese Taipei and 11 for Lausanne. This vote required a 2/3 majority according to the FAI By-Laws (5.6.3) and the CIVL Internal Regulations (3.3). Proposal from Chinese Taipei failed by 1 vote.

41. Dates of the next Plenary meeting

26-27 February 2011 proposed. No objections. Subcommittee meetings will be scheduled for 24th and 25th February, 2011

42. President's closing remarks

We have had 4 very productive days, thanks to the cooperation of delegates and subcommittee members.

Annexes:

Annex 1 – President's Report

Annex 2 - Safety & Training SC Report

Annex 3 – Hang gliding SC Report

Annex 4 – Paragliding SC Report

Annex 5 – Joint HG/PG SC Report

Annex 6 - PG Accuracy SC Report

Annex 7 – Aerobatics SC Report

Annex 8 – Software WG Report

Annex 9 – Sporting Code SC Report

Annex 10 – CIVL 2010 Budget updated

Annex 11 – FAI response to Spain Proposal 2 on airspace



CIVL President's 2009 Report to the 2010 CIVL Plenary

Sporting Activity and Competition Review

It is a pleasure to be able to report again an increase in both Hang Gliding and Paragliding activities internationally. More than 250 Category 2 competitions were sanctioned worldwide. It is nice to see that in FAI sanctioned Paragliding Accuracy competitions, for example, in addition to European member countries and Japan, other Asian countries including China, Chinese Taipei, Malaysia and Indonesia are now represented. As a result, the number of PG Accuracy pilots now on our database has increased dramatically by 30% to 862. In the FAI World Paragliding Accuracy Championships held in Croatia, a record 17 countries were represented. Certainly the inclusion of Paragliding Accuracy in the World Air Games 2009 has contributed to increasing interest in this discipline worldwide.

In fact, the number of registered pilots and FAI sanctioned competitions in all CIVL disciplines has increased again in 2009. Our sport continues to be dominated by Paragliding XC, with some 6000 registered competition pilots - four times the number of hang gliding pilots. Furthermore, at the World PG Championships in Mexico, 44 FAI member nations participated, probably the highest number in any CIVL sanctioned competition to date.

In 2009 there were three CIVL-sanctioned Category 1 World Championships, plus the HG & PG elements of the World Air Games, and six practice events for Category 1 championships planned for 2010.

2009 Category 1 Championships were:

- World Paragliding Cross Country Championships at Valle de Bravo in Mexico
- World Hang Gliding Cross Country Championships at Laragne in France
- World Paragliding Accuracy Championships at Ivanec/Trakoscan in Croatia
- World Air Games, Torino, Italy

2009 Test events for 2010 Category 1 Championships were:

- (Pre-) European Hang Gliding Cross Country Championships at Ager in Spain
- (Pre-) European Paragliding Cross Country Championships at Abtenau in Austria
- (Pre-) European Paragliding Accuracy Championships at Inonu / Eskisehir in Turkey



- (Pre-) World Hang Gliding classes 2 & 5 and class 1 Championships for women at Tegelberg in Germany
- (Pre-) Asian Paragliding Cross Country Championships at Yoshinogawa in Japan
- (Pre-) World Hang Gliding and Paragliding Aerobatics Championships at Omega in Italy

It is thanks to the NACs that support these events, the event organisers and all the volunteers who invest their free time in assisting to organise the competitions, that we are able to run and enjoy these competitions in a safe way. In the past years we have already referred to the lack of enough qualified volunteer officials for our steward and jury database. Although we have trained some new stewards in the past year, this is a continuing concern that might risk the validity of future championships. We again are asking the NACs, the CIVL delegates and HG and PG federations to help encourage volunteers for these roles.

Future Championships

During the CIVL Plenary Meeting in February 2009 in Hall in Tirol in Austria the following Category 1 competitions for 2011 have been awarded:

- The World Hang Gliding Cross Country Championships to Sigillo in Italy
- The World Paragliding Cross Country Championships to Piedrahita in Spain
- The World Paragliding Accuracy Championships to Kuncice pod Ondrejnikem in the Czech Republic

We regret that because of financial difficulties, the 2nd World Championships HG & PG Aerobatics, 2010 at Omega in Italy has had to be cancelled. The cancellation of that event was a complete surprise for the bureau and the FAI.

Online competitions

CIVL began the trial season of its WXC (world XC online contest) in October 2008. There are already 70,000 registered flights from 5,000 pilots with flights in 76 countries. Total flown distance overall is 1,400,000 km.

Safety

Following the February Plenary, CIVL has instigated a number of new safety initiatives. The "HG Pitch Stability" Working Group, the HG Subcommittee and the CIVL Bureau are continuing to work on a permanent ruling that will contribute to HG safety. Hang Glider Sprog Angle Measurement was started during 2008, with a positive response from pilots. This year, a more strict measuring process was undertaken at the HG World Championship in Laragne. Pilots are considerably better informed about the possible dangers of incorrectly adjusted sprogs.



Sadly, there was a fatality during the World Paragliding Championships in Valle de Bravo in Mexico (Stefan Schmoker from Switzerland). In fact, there were some alarming figures from this competition: 2 badly injured competitors, 5 mid-air collisions and 13 reserve parachute deployments.

Some additional safety concerns:

- Some mid-air collisions are not taken seriously by pilots
- Cloud flying seems to be a regular and sometimes intentional occurrence.
- There are insufficient rules covering minimum standards for some flying equipment

As a result, a Paragliding Safety Working Group was established at the Plenary Meeting in February. This Working Group is tasked to look at further ways of improving safety in paragliding competitions and liaise with the CIVL Safety & Training Subcommittee. Issues include: setting standards for flying equipment including helmets and harnesses,

Despite the fact that we all realize and agree that safety has to be the CIVL's 1st priority, I have to admit that our Safety & Training Subcommittee has not been very active during the year. More work needs to be done to improve safety and the Safety & Training Subcommittee will have to do as much as possible to coordinate the efforts to improve the safety.

I still have the idea that a more frequent communication in the Subcommittees (SC mailing lists) and between the Subcommittees might contribute to improving safety and really hope that in the future the SCs will make more use of the digital highway, that makes communication very easy.

By contrast, the Pre-European PG Championship in Abtenau in Austria was a very safe competition, where no incidents or accidents happened.

Altitude Verification

All pilots use GPS devices for recording their flights. The downloaded tracklog is used for scoring purposes. It can also be used to check for infringements of altitude and airspace limits, and sometimes to provide evidence to prove (or disprove) cloud flying. However, some instruments have only GPS sensors, some barometric sensors and some have both. While the Altitude Verification Working Group continues to consider whether to regulate the type of measurement that should be used to ensure consistent and accurate altitude measurements, the Bureau has insisted the recommendation used at the HG Worlds, Laragne, is used for Cat 1 events in 2010.



The World Air Games

Hang Gliding and Paragliding were well represented in the World Air Games with 4 disciplines: HG & PG Aerobatics, PG Accuracy and HG Speed Gliding. We especially thank the "FAI WAG coordinator", Jean-Marc Badan and the HG and PG experts, Dennis Pagen and Louise Joselyn , for their contributions, work and energy to make this event a success.

Volunteers

Concluding this report I wish to thank all the volunteers, like the people in the worldwide HG & PG federations, the people working for the NACs, the people in the organisations of the many competitions worldwide, the members of the CIVL Subcommittees and Working Groups, the CIVL Bureau members and the enthusiastic staff at the FAI headquarters in Lausanne, who make it possible that the HG and PG pilots worldwide can enjoy our sports in a responsible and safe way.

Special thanks to the Secretary General of the FAI, Max Bishop, retired from the FAI at the end of January. I think that not many people know how much Max has done for Hang Gliding and Paragliding in addition to his work for the FAI and other air sports. I wish to thank Max for all his advice and guidance over the years, and wish him a healthy and happy "retirement". It has been a pleasure to work with him and I am sure that we will miss his enthusiastic devotion to our sports.

CIVL Presidency

When I took over the presidency of the CIVL from Olivier Burghelle, I planned to stay in this function for approximately 7 or 8 years. This is my 5th President Report and that means that I have been CIVL President for only 5 years. In the 2010 plenary meeting I will not stand for re-election for reasons that have to do with my health. I have found out that the cliché that "health is the most important" is very true. Despite the fact that I like the CIVL President function very much, I need the time right now to focus on my health. I think that the nicest thing about being the CIVL President is the worldwide contacts with the people that represent the National Airsport Controls, the Hang Gliding & Paragliding federations and of course the pilots. I wish to thank all these people for the cooperation in the past years and wish you all happy landings.

Flip Koetsier
CIVL President

CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE
SAFETY & TRAINING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
Thursday 18 February, 2010

FK: Apologies from LG. Current SC chair, delayed due to road accident.

JA: The Safety & Training SC will not be following the set Agenda as no preparation on this has been done, and it has become obvious that a major restructuring is necessary. The S&T SC was originally set up when HG was the only discipline. It has not been working effectively as a cross-discipline SC for 10 years. Maybe Safety should be devolved to the separate discipline SCs? What we urgently need, is the people to make it happen. We need ideas, views and directions from delegates and others present.

The general consensus was that safety matters should be devolved to the separate discipline subcommittees, but with an overall chairman to oversee combined issues, and/or with a Bureau Member with a specific responsibility for safety issues.

An offer of help and participation came immediately from Martin Scheel for Paragliding.

The subcommittees were actioned to discuss the safety issues relevant to their disciplines, identify projects, actions, resources required and to encourage volunteers to step forward.

Some ongoing matters were raised:

Accident database:

Point was made that statistics are an important start point for addressing safety. Long discussion on collecting data, from competitions and from national federations. There is a view (DP) that CIVL could provide a valuable international resource by collecting and analysing accident report statistics from its member nations. This would require expertise, which may have to be paid for. **It was further noted (by GK) that anyone involved in accident investigation would require trained experts. (Additional point noted during Plenary).** Opposing (stronger) view that as CIVL has not been able to collect and analyse effective data for many competitions to date, it should start with a less ambitious aim. It was generally agreed that the start point should be Cat 1 and test events, where FAI official reports are generated. But that gathering data from other competitions should not be neglected. Robert Aarts (FIN) volunteered to take this data for PG and study it. BH reported that very basic information from Steward & Jury reports for the last five years or so, has already been collected into a spreadsheet.

Additional points included:

- cause of accidents at competitions likely to be different to those in the sport at large
- the reasons behind accidents at competitions is already reasonably well understood

Incident report form:

There is a view that the form created after the last Plenary for PG is too complex, and that something easier to complete would be better. Only one completed form has been submitted in the 6 months it has been available. First actions for the next safety committee is to review whether a simplified version of the incident report form is preferable and for the HG SC to produce a HG variant or to add fields to PG form.

It was commented that the original form design was taken from ETSC, so should be compatible with other European forms. Slovenia also reported it has a form that works.

The next issue is enforcing that these forms are completed and sent back. For Cat 1s it could be part of Team Leader packs and organiser would enforce that forms are returned. Possibility for Cat 2s to link the form to the results submission process, so results would not be entered for wprs until/unless the incident form was returned.

Another issue raised was the data collected at competitions on task safety. JA stated that this information is normally reviewed by the Steward and Safety Director, and is sometimes included in the Steward Report. It may be useful to mandate that this is the case.

JMB of FAI reported that the Parachuting commission has established a successful safety/incident

report database and system. He suggests we talk to them about how they do it.

Education & training material

KdK suggested that a repository of easily accessible safety information is created. Ideas include video tutorials on sprog setting and sprog measurements, (potentially existing post-Laragne). The work done by the Sprog Measurement WG in the last year is believed to have helped considerably in educating and informing pilots about safe settings. But in a few years, the knowledge will have gone, new people, new gliders etc.

JA reported that there are some higher discussions underway at FAI about creating a 'technical' intranet area of the FAI website for rules, reports and this type of information. If necessary some funding could be made available to develop effective content. But we need some ideas to be gathered and costs estimated.

Conclusion was that we still need a S&T SC chair, who does not need to be a delegate. SCs should report back with safety matters and development ideas from their discipline.

S & T Attendance List

HM	Heather	Mull	Australia
HS	Herbert	Siess	Austria
RK	Raimund	Kaiser	Austria
TB	Thomas	Brandlehner	Austria
IV	Iris	Vogt	Austria
ZH	Zhaofan	Han	China
YW	Yongli	Wang	China
ST	Scott	Torkelsen	Denmark
NA	Niels J.	Askirk	Denmark
RR	Rasmus	Rohlf	Denmark
RA	Robert	Aarts	Finland
LJ	Louise	Joselyn	France
BH	Brian	Harris	France
SM	Stéphane	Malbos	France
DM	Didier	Mathurin	France
RC	Raymond	Caux	France
KT	Klaus	Tanzler	Germany
HB	Harry	Buntz	Germany
MG	Manuel	Gutierrez	Guatemala
AT	Alejandro	Toralla	Guatemala
AG	Agust	Gudmundsson	Iceland
FT	Flavio	Tebaldi	Italy
YO	Yoshiki	Oka	Japan
GK	Greg	Knudson	Luxembourg
GD	Goran	Dimiskovski	MKD
FK	Flip	Koetsier	Netherlands
KdK	Koos	De Keijzer	Netherlands
RG	Robert	Groen	Netherlands
FA	Fernando	Amaral	Portugal
MS	Martin	Scheel	Switzerland
JA	John	Aldridge	UK
CB	Chris	Burns	UK
NM	Nicky	Moss	UK
DP	Dennis	Pagen	USA
RE	Riss	Estes	USA

**CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE
HANG GLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

PART 1 – SAFETY ISSUES

1. Pitch Stability/Sprog Measurements Working Groups (Report in Annex)

- Planning the next steps for measurement and education

Summary of report from WG presented in October 2009, by KdK. Comparing data from Greifenburg and Laragne (where limits were set in LRs), there is considerably less spread of values at Laragne. Demonstrates benefit of education and information.

Next steps:

Involve manufacturers: DP has drafted a letter to ask manufacturers how they recommend their gliders' sprogs should be measured. No comments on the letter.

MR: After a couple of years out of competition, MR pleased to see he no longer had to lower sprogs so much that it became a possible safety issue. He reported that some discussion points have been raised by Gerolf about measuring prototypes. A discussion ensued on measurement procedures, and how certain changes, like shorter wires, more VG, bending the keel, could get good sprog setting measurements. There is a possibility that a manufacturer can take a glider to be certified, then later tension/shorten the wires, to get another 2-3degree leeway, allowing sprogs to be lowered more, yet the 'twist' is unchanged, and still sprogs are within the 2degree rules. So, it is important to measure the 'twist' to give comparable numbers between gliders. Need to discuss how to determine a fair way of measuring sprogs.

DP: We can't control everything, and there will always be a way of cheating. Would rather run random checks on gliders at competition than 100% testing.

MR: An expert can tell by looking at a glider whether it is going to be out of spec.

RG: If this is the case, then should be able to take a photo from the correct angle and process them by computer.

JA: It has been valuable doing 100% testing. But it is an enormous effort in time and money. Need to be more selective.

DP: We have had accidents, including fatal accidents. Pilots are aware of the safety issues, and are being more cautious. He feels they are learning and taking notice.

Discussion on sprog measuring plans for Tegelberg (by DHV, overseen by Steward) and Ager. Tomas & co need to prioritise. Suggestions: Top ranking pilots, those who have not competed in Cat 1 before.

MR: Better to check fewer gliders more thoroughly, than more gliders faster and less accurately. Conversely, RG argued that even if it is not exactly correct, pilots will still be learning – the process will still be achieving its aims. Are we educating the pilots that need to learn, or trying to catch the expert cheats?

KT: Need more accurate measurement because 2 degrees below manufacturers recommended setting is dangerous. DP confirmed that we can now measure more accurately, so we can discuss whether to reduce the tolerances.

For Monte Cucco: It was discussed whether the two Stewards (HM and FD) would be able to demonstrate sprog settings.

Action: DP to send out letter to manufacturers.

Action: DP to write: Agreed to carry on with current sprog measurement wording, but emphasise that the only 'safe' setting is the certified setting.

Action: Rob int' Groen to research the photo analysis possibilities for determining actual wing twist and report back to DP and HG SC.

Action: DP to talk to Tomas. Have him measure every glider before the start of the event. Discuss if/how more detailed measurements can be made, and to evolve a plan of who and how to measure during the competition. Once decided, will need to send out information to pilots about what is going to happen, via competition website, for example.

2. **Australian Proposal 1** – See Annex 14

New HG Safety Working Group – to look at best ways of achieving safety
This proposal ties in with first S&T SC discussion, that safety matters be devolved to the subcommittee and that the S&T SC be restructured. This proposal has effectively been overtaken by events. HM agreed to withdraw the proposal as its intentions are accommodated by the proposed changes.

KdK agrees to be part of the HG Safety team. RK also. Scott Barrett has been asked if he wishes to be involved.

Action: KdK to collect safety info, films, etc. to include in database and web site.

JA: The Terms of Reference for the S&T SC will be reworked by the new chair and Bureau. Keep everything temporary for now.

3. **Australia Proposal 3** – See Annex 14

2year transition period for safe settings for small gliders

Discussion: What is a small glider? Maybe this needs to be clarified.

KT: suggested that on this issue, maybe DHV has taken a cautious approach, for safety. JA commented that it seems that certified bodies are no longer testing in exactly the same way, and with small gliders the difference is more clearly evident.. Although it was pointed out that handling characteristics at 'safe settings' must be part of the tests, there was a view that the issue of small gliders could be reviewed. JA reminded members that we should not be making rules about airworthiness. We have to leave that to the experts.

The wording of DP's letter to manufacturers was discussed to include emphasis on the small glider issue. HM asked if we can ask the certified bodies to review their procedures with regard to smaller gliders. DP stated that if the manufacturers do not provide the data, we can only rely on the certified body numbers (primarily DHV).

Action on DP to modify the letter and send it manufacturers. Modification done.

Motion: Table this proposal, and accept the letter to the manufacturers as modified. HM proposed, seconded by NA. Vote: 7 in favour. Abstentions 2.

4. **Helmets – Agree with decision:**

“Introduction of a rule mandating that from 1 January 2010, pilots competing in Category 1 events wear a helmet approved to EN966.”

Consider: Are there other equivalent EN standards that would be just as acceptable? Is this EN standard appropriate to mandate worldwide?

There was concern about how this rule, now in LRs, can be enforced? JA explained it does not need 100% check but is down to Meet Director's judgement. Other rules in place for years are not detailed on how they are controlled.

Vote on whether to accept this decision: 7 for, 1 against (agrees in principle but would like to see a qualifier

Qualifier statement proposed by HM, seconded by RC: Add sentence:

“Helmets that are certified to a standard assessed to be equivalent or better than EN966, may also be acceptable.”

Voted: 6 in favour. 2 against.

Safety revisited:

JA: Summarised results of earlier S&T SC meeting, to clarify how it was agreed that safety matters would be addressed in the future. It was agreed that safety matters would now be devolved to the various subcommittees. So we need to recognise a small group of volunteers, that will address the issues that need to be covered. These include reviewing LRs, reviewing bids, reviewing Steward & Jury reports, identifying safety-related rule changes, considering specific and technical issues, such as sprog measurements, task setting, amending incident report form, collecting and analysing accident data, creating repository of resources for training and information, as well as identifying other safety projects and any costs associated with them.

Already volunteered are KdK, RK and possibly Scott Barrett. HM volunteered to help with Guidelines for Organisers sections. Steward reports can be made available for tapping of information.

The S&T SC as was, will be replaced by an overall coordinator. The TOR will be reviewed and restructuring will take place. Plans will be evolved during the year.

PART 2 – Issues passed back from combined meeting:

1. Clarifying the definition of a prototype

See Sporting Code SC Agenda, Chapter 12 of S7A.

Consider **Netherlands Proposal 2** (See Annex 15)– banning prototypes in HG XC Cat 1 competitions. (NB Also speed gliding?)

Proposed and seconded. Discussion:

MR wants to know why there should be no prototypes in Cat1. Typically will be tried out at Cat 2s, then will not be able to fly it in the Cat1. Delay in allowing prototypes to fly in a Cat 1 could allow competitors to catch up. May stifle or slow down development.

JA reminded the meeting that the aim of the competition is to find the best pilot(s) not the best manufacturer.

CS asked whether there was an issue of radically advanced prototypes winning Cat 1s. No, so there should be no problem accepting the rule.

CS remarked that for pilots on limited budgets they cannot afford a prototype and another glider to fly only in a Cat 1.

KdK commented that a pilot can do a lot of tuning on a glider before it becomes defined as a prototype.

HM Many pilots get discouraged that they can never have access to gliders that factory pilots fly. Some fly fewer competitions, change their gliders less often, so manufacturers will suffer.

MR: It's a fact of life that the good pilots will get better, and they go up the ranking and get the benefits.

Vote: In favour 4, against 5, abstentions 0 Motion failed.

3. Use of Tracking Devices in FAI competitions

Consider whether use of these systems by teams/TLs constitutes an infringement of Section 7A 2.19 or Section 7B 2.20 (external aids). If so, does S7 require amending to avoid problems if protest is made? Benefits of these systems (scoring, altitude verification, safety, media/spectator interest) will be discussed in Software WG meeting. Consider implications of competitor's flight progress information being available to other competitors or teams (and the public).

Discussion: Is use of these devices welcomed in competitions? Show of hands demonstrated all members in favour with one abstention. RC concerned about general privacy and the number of devices that pilots have to be equipped with. JA remarked that PG SC is looking at trial use of tracking devices in Cat 2, with no time delay, to report pilot positions in real time.

Should HG SC discuss if/how/when these could be used in Cat 1 events? No comment.

Action: Refer to Sporting Code SC the need to qualify the wording of 'radio' in the current rules, to differentiate between 2m (voice) radios, and to avoid the possibility of tracking devices being considered as in conflict with the phrase 'external aid to competitors'.

8. Australia Proposal 2: See Annex 14

Revise set up and operation of CIVL Working Groups

Modifications suggested to this proposal:

- i) Working groups are to include competition pilots, technical experts and CIVL representatives where appropriate. Recommendations from these working groups will be made to the delegates and CIVL Bureau.

Motion to include new wording to go into IR proposal:

Vote: In favour 8, against 0, abstentions 1

- ii) It was explained that the results of WGs must be approved by the Plenary. This clause cannot be approved without conflicting with FAI bylaws. Modified to: "When technical recommendations are made by Working Groups, these should be given all due consideration."

- iii) Wording modified to: "That members of Working Groups should have the FAI Code of Ethics and its references to Conflicts of Interest brought to their attention and that CIVL should follow the actions in that document regarding any disclosures of conflicts of interest."

Motion to approve these modified proposals, seconded. Vote: unanimous.

PART 3 – HANG GLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Germany Proposals: See Annex 13

- i) Women's HG class 1 – 2 to score for team

CS. Should be looked at in conjunction with third proposal, to maximise team size without penalising smaller teams.

DP summarised that increasing team size favours countries with larger teams.

JA explained background, that the Bureau has approved the LRs for Monte Cucco, and decided team size should stay at 4, but that individuals can enter.

CS explained that the team size rule reduces the size of an already small field.

Possible impact on sponsorship and media opportunities.

JA pointed out that with a team size of 6, some 75% of competitors could receive medals. In one competition earlier, a pilot who came last received a gold medal.

RC we need to promote the sport and supporting women will achieve that for both men and women.

HM encouraging the women with medals is the best way of encouraging more women into the sport.

- ii) Women's HG class 1 – stopped task scored after 1h

- iii) Women's HG class 1 – team size to be increased to 6

Vote on point i) motion passed. Proposal recommended.

Vote on point ii) motion passed. Proposal recommended.

Vote on point iii) in favour 6, against 1, abstention 2. Proposal recommended

4. Netherlands Proposal 3: See Annex 15

Discussion Proposal to introduce an additional pilot requirement for entering a Category 1 event. A minimum number of WPRS points in the 6 months before the event. See Annex 16 for discussion document.

KdK presented the case. Discussion centred on possibility of small countries being disadvantaged by this rule. 6 countries would not have a qualifying pilot. Suggested reducing the 20 points to 15 points. KdK agrees to amendment.

Vote: In favour: 7. Against 4. No abstentions. Motion carried.

5. France Proposal 3: See Annex 12

Reduced weight limit for all equipment, excluding glider

France thought point referred to Class 1, but refers to Class 5. Will be asked to withdraw his proposal as it would require a completely new rule, not a modification of existing rule. RC agreed.

6. France Proposal 4: See Annex 12

Change to scoring stopped task rule

Need to check with SW WG that this is possible in scoring.

Factor 10 is good compromise number. Terrain factor – suggest ignoring it. Use goal field as an absolute irrespective of terrain. Suggested that this is trialled in Cat 2 competitions first. Suggested amendment to proposal: change goalfield height to “goal (GPS altitude). Pilots projected to arrive past goal will get time points but no speed points”. Proposer agreed. Action: RC to take (modified) proposal to SW WG.

7. Proposals from Sporting Code Subcommittee

See Annex 9 for full information. Key points listed below:

i) **S7A, new paragraph 4.3.3 Tasks** – All competitors shall be set the same tasks, from the same sites on the same days.

Reason: to regulate attempts to fudge minimum numbers and also stop applications to sanction XC league events where pilots do not even fly from the same sites.

Proposed and seconded. Vote passed to accept this change.

ii) **S7A, 4.3.1** - Add the minimum numbers for Sport Class to be not less than 6.
Reason: several organisers have run a Sport class competition this year yet none of them were validated as they did not have the minimum number of participants.

Consider **Netherlands Proposal 1** – to backdate implementation to 1 January 2009.

KdK presented the case and moved the motion to reduce the minimum number to 6. Seconded. All agreed. Second motion to make it effective from 1 Jan 2009.

Failed due to no second.

iii) **S7A, Chapter 9**

Annex B to Sample Local Regulations – Certified glider statement: remove existing document and append to Chapter 12 with revisions as agreed by HG SSC.

Reason: existing document is badly worded and cannot be signed in honesty by many pilots. It is also not necessary to publish it with LRs and Chapter 12 is a more appropriate place.

JA presented the new definitions of certified, uncertified and prototype gliders (to be approved) in Ch 12.

It was noted that the new prototype definition does not require information on what has been changed. Pilots that then declare their glider is uncertified, will have to provide the information as per that definition (for example, if prototypes are excluded).

Clarification of 'production' model for non-certified gliders was discussed.

Suggested to be modified to: “production model hang gliders which have been available for sale for a minimum of four months, and have.....”

Modify prototype statement to read: development gliders produced by all manufacturers ...

Both changes agreed by majority.

Certified glider statement – it was felt that this still cannot be honestly signed by many pilots, because HGs are designed to be tuned. Suggested wording: “... have not altered the configuration of the glider since purchase, in a manner that would take it out of certification, and as far as I know ...”

No further comments or questions.

8. Bid reviews

European HG championships for 2012 – Bid received from Turkey.

A 3 person team from the HG SC reviewed the bid and questioned the bidder on a number of items in the Annex A bid checklist. All seemed to be in good order and the team concluded that the bid is acceptable. The bid looks like good value for money for pilots, with free accommodation and free transport available. Tracking devices will be provided for all.

9. Discussion topics

i) Long time windows cause additional stress and contribute pilots getting tired sooner on a long task. The time window between launch opening and the first start gate should be minimised, and should be less than 2h. Ideas:

It can be calculated as a function of number of pilots, number of ramps and giving 1.5mins per pilot to launch.

And/or, if conditions are difficult, consider setting more start times, and not extending the time window.

If not all (or say, less than 20%) pilots have the opportunity to launch in the first start gate, then no leading (bonus) points should be awarded.

Discussion: HM. This can be a very difficult call to make. It can often be 1.25h.

But on a difficult day on a restricted launch, it can take 2h.

Juaki: Have to give all pilots the opportunity to take the first start gate. In reality, there will be 15 that race to launch and 15 that follow. Also, can lose an hour from briefing to launch open. Instead of an ordered launch and a start window way ahead, give pilots chance to choose start window (on launch), open launch earlier, as function of number of pilots wanting to launch for first start window.

DP: Probably would not work on all sites. Can work at Ager, day starts later. At Laragne, can be very tight timescale.

RK: Avoids having large gaggles waiting over launch for a long time.

MR: Setting multiple start gates is a safety issue. But I am a fan of first to goal is winner – all flying same start gate. Confusing, stressful to pilots not knowing if they get to goal and they don't know how well they have done. But stressful

waiting in right position to get a good start also. May have to start up the hill earlier. Careful task planning to first turnpoint can avoid large gaggles too.

ii) Altitude limits at goals – discussion/proposal from Juaki (Spain). See below.

Discussion: Idea arose from competition at Ager last year.

Has been discussed by SW WG to ensure there are no scoring issues. It will be trialled further in Cat 2s over the coming year.

Meeting closed: 16.30 Friday, 19 February 2010.

Attendance List

HM	Heather	Mull	Australia
HS	Herbert	Siess	Austria
RK	Raimund	Kaiser	Austria
MR	Manfred	Ruhmer	Austria
NA	Niels J.	Askirk	Denmark
LJ	Louise	Joselyn	France
RC	Raymond	Caux	France
CS	Corrinna	Schwiegerhausen	Germany
MG	Manuel	Gutierrez	Guatemala
AT	Alejandro	Toralla	Guatemala
FT	Flavio	Tebaldi	Italy
PB	Pietro	Bacchi	Italy
FK	Flip	Koetsier	Netherlands
KdK	Koos	De Keijzer	Netherlands
RG	Robert	Groen	Netherlands
Juaki	José Manuel	Sanchez	Spain
MB	Murat	Baycora	Turkey
AH	Adem	Hasgul	Turkey
JA	John	Aldridge	UK
DP	Dennis	Pagen	USA

Annex – Letter to HG Manufacturers

Sirs,

This letter is intended to ask for your assistance in the matter of sprog or washout strut measurement. As you know, the CIVL, under the urging of some member countries, has been measuring sprogs for a couple years to gather data in order to determine how pilots are altering sprog settings, and what the limits are to safety. Clearly, sprog settings are one of the easiest things to alter on a modern hang glider and they may have a noticeable effect on performance, so they are the item that most competition pilots alter.

The CIVL believes that the manufacturers are the best resource for information relating to sprogs, so we are asking two things: First, we wish to know the sprog settings on your different models and sizes of competition gliders that you declare to be within the limits of safety. In general, these are the settings that the CIVL will use as the standard to measure to, and should be those that satisfy one of the accepted certification organizations (DHV, HGMA, BHPA). We are specifically interested in smaller glider settings in this context.

Secondly, we wish to know the method you declare is your preferred method of measuring with an angle meter. For example, do you measure with the undersurface zipper open or closed? Many sprog struts are tapered in various places. Where on the sprog do you measure to either include this taper or avoid it? If the zipper is open, where does the sprog lie when you measure it? A detailed description of your measuring method would be greatly appreciated. In the past we have used our standard method which is essentially leveling the glider and measuring the sprog as near to the sprog support wire as we can with the zipper open. Let us know how you want it done so that we conform to your standards.

Thank You,

**CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE
PARAGLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

PART 1 – SAFETY ISSUES

1. Report from PG Safety Working Group

- i) Helmets – Agree with decision to: *“Introduce a rule mandating that from 1 January 2010, pilots competing in Category 1 events wear a helmet approved to EN966.”*

Consider: Are there other equivalent EN standards that would be just as acceptable?
Is this EN standard appropriate to mandate worldwide?

The meeting discussed whether EN1077 should be added to the rule. Some pilots already use these helmets and it was reported that they are allowed in German competitions. The meeting felt however that EN966 should be the starting point and that other standards could be added in the future provided sufficient justification was made and the suitability of the standard investigated.

Concern was raised that EN 966 helmets may not be available worldwide.

There was no additional recommendation made to the agenda point.

- ii) Harnesses – progress on specifying minimum standards?

Discuss PMA proposal of harnesses with protection to LTF standard.
(Information will be circulated on the PGssc email list)

The discussion centred on the apparent lack of suitable test standards for back protectors when used in conjunction with competition style harnesses due to the reclined position of the pilot.

The SC recommended that in order to move safety forward we should not allow highly modified or “non-certified” types of design and therefore produced the following recommendation to the Plenary

All harnesses and back protectors used in Cat 1 competitions must be certified to EN 1651 and LTF 09 standard or equivalent by 1st May 2011

Proposer Switzerland. Seconded France

Vote: 16 in favour, 0 against, 1 Abstention

- iii) Policing the safety equipment rules at Cat 1 events?

Discussion: Various suggestions were made on when to check that equipment was compliant with the rules. These ranged from checking at registration, checking at the start gate or checking at the goal field. It was generally felt that it was impractical to check all pilots every day but that observation at the start gate and random checking at the goal field should suffice. It was noted that it should be the organiser’s/meet director’s responsibility to check equipment and that the meet director has the power to ground a pilot found to have non compliant equipment until the equipment complies.

2. Improving Paraglider Safety in Category 1 Competitions

- i) Discuss options:
- A: Certified Gliders only (Serial Class)
 - B: Certified and Open class, no prototypes
 - C: Gliders tested to CEN D at trim.
 - D: Aspect ratio limited gliders.
 - E: Other types of limitation

ii) Swiss Proposal 2: See Annex 16:

Setting up Working Group to set restrictions on construction acceptable for gliders in competitions OR setting new homologation for competition class glider

The SC discussed improving the safety standards of paragliders in Cat 1 competitions and felt unanimously that there had to be a change to the current situation. The discussion covered a range of options including certified-only gliders (En D), homologated open class gliders, gliders homologated to a subset of specifications (aspect ratio and minimum line lengths, glider weight) and the idea of self certification by manufacturers. In addition ideas discussed included a separate serial class Cat 1 event or multi class Cat 1 events. But these were rejected by most members of the SC. The SC was generally in favour of not continuing to allow pilots to fly prototypes that had only load test documentation. The SC favoured the creation of a WG that would work with manufacturers to produce safer Open Class Paragliders

The following motions were made by the group;

That from 2012 Category 1 competitions should be restricted to paragliders certified to EN D or lower.

Proposed Finland Second USA Vote: 5 in favour, 12 against , 1 abstention Motion failed

The following statement and motion is recommended to the Plenary by the SC:

“CIVL is fully aware that the introduction of new materials and new technology into paraglider design does not necessarily constitute a compromise in safety. On the contrary, we have seen many instances in which such innovations have actually made our sport safer. With this in mind, it is not this Commission’s wish to limit the development of such innovation. At the same time, however, with reference to FAI Category 1 events, it is this Commission’s responsibility to ensure that all participating paragliders actually adhere to or exhibit a demonstrable level of safety. With this in mind we present the following proposal:

To address the issue of prototype and open class paragliders being eligible to fly in Cat 1 events.

1.a

In order for an otherwise non-certified paraglider to be allowed to take part in Category 1 events, as an initial interim solution, we propose introducing a form of ‘self-certification’ in which manufacturers will be required to publish documentation and a video of the paraglider wherein its various flight characteristics have been demonstrated as a result of a series of manoeuvres.

To this end, establish a working group that will determine what would have to be documented and displayed as well as the parameters under which it would be produced.

1.b

As a long term solution, we propose the eventual introduction of a new standard (eventually EN), wherein, only paragliders meeting the requirements delineated within this standard would be allowed to take part in Category 1 events. To this end,

establish a working group that would study this issue and determine the requirements such a paraglider would have to fulfill as well as the feasibility and means by which such a new standard could be introduced.

2.

The working group will also study the possibility of introduction of limitations such as aspect ratio, weight of the paragliders, minimum line length or other options.

Timeline requirements for the working group

1.a - Self-Certification

Goal: to be able to use it at the 2011 World Paragliding Championship

- info to manufacturers in three weeks
- 1st Meeting by 30th of May (during European Championship)
- August – final proposal
- have a report prepared for the CIVL half-year meeting in October
- have a proposal or recommendations ready by deadline in December
- February 2011 – final decision at plenary

1.b - New standard

Goal: to be able to use it as soon as possible

- have a report prepared for the CIVL half-year meeting in October.

2 - Introduction of limitations

Goal: to be able to use it at the 2012 European Paragliding Championship

- info to manufacturers in three weeks
- 1st Meeting by 30th of May (during European Championship)
- 2nd Meeting by 30th of September (during PWC super-final)
- December - Final proposal
- February 2011 – final decision at plenary

Work group proposed members

Martin Scheel SUI (chair)
Gregory Knudson LUX
Didier Mathurin FRA
Robert Aarts FIN
Harry Buntz GER
One Bureau member to be designated

Proposed Slovenia Seconded Luxemburg Vote: 19 in favour , against 0, abstention 0 Motion passed

3. **Numbers of competitors allowed at Category 1 events**

and level of qualifications required. Reference earlier email discussions covering how to specify gaggle-flying experience. (Ref also allocation discussion later)

Some SC members believe that the number of competitors should be reduced but in general it was felt that 150 pilots was OK, provided the site was suitable. The test event would identify if pilot numbers was a problem and would therefore be reduced in local regulations the following year.

No change recommended.

Some members felt that the level of pilot qualification should be raised by using higher WPRS ranking figures or increasing the qualifying flight distance, but the general feeling was that we had a mechanism which worked and could be adjusted in the local regulations for each competition. In order to ensure that there was reasonable gaggle flying experience the following change is recommended to be implemented in S7

Recommend to change S7B 3.4.2

Flown X number of flights over Y kilometres in FAI sanctioned paragliding competition with over Z number of pilots

Proposed Iceland, Seconded Finland

Vote: 15 in favour, against 0, abstentions 3. Motion carried.

Additional safety issues:

When asked why SC is not discussing task setting as a safety issue, CB stated that he believed task setting had improved over the past few years.

PART 3 – PARAGLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Paraglider Definition in S7 and General Section

Discuss: Does it need qualifying or changing? (It was designed to differentiate HG from PG) Why does it need qualifying or changing? (Safety, simplicity.....).

i) **Switzerland Proposal 1:** See Annex 16

Based on PMA recommendation for qualifying the term 'rigid primary structure'.

ii) Consider other definitions to achieve the reason for change.

iii) Consider other options (ie new class)

The SC felt almost unanimously that creating a new Class of paraglider at this time was not the route they would recommend and moved on to discuss the need for changing the definition. The meeting was divided on the need to qualify the definition. There was a lot of discussion as to why the definition needed qualifying, such as performance gap, safety, a line needed to be drawn so that future developments would not include more and more inflexible components. Some members of the SC felt it was important to give a clear direction to future development. The proposer indicated that he would also be happy with a modification to his proposal to a 10cm bending radius.

The discussion was suspended by a majority vote in order to discuss the **Improving Paraglider Safety in Category 1 Competitions**. On resumption of this topic the Swiss proposal was withdrawn by the proposer and the discussion closed.

2. Allocation of Gender specific team places at Cat 1 events.

Following the earlier email discussion: Given the pressure on places (more nations competing):

- Is a change needed for allocation system? Discussions included straight allocation by wprs (ie no free places to women); and 1+1 then by nation wprs order.
- Should qualification levels be increased? (Cross ref earlier discussion – Part 1.3)
- Is it time to consider a PG Women's Worlds?
- If not, is it fair to award Women's medals when allocation (may) only allow 1 female from each nation?
- What about split nation/individual championships?

Due to the number of countries that now have pilots available to compete in Cat 1 events it is no longer possible to use the 3 +1 allocation system. The SC discussed the idea of splitting the team and individual championships into 2 competitions but rejected the idea citing problems such as bidders/sponsors. They also discussed creating a Cat1 event for women but rejected the idea because top women pilots are not in favour and there may also be problems with bidders/sponsors. There was a brief discussion on the merits of competition open to all nations vs only high ranked pilots but it was felt that this discussion had been had many times and was not pursued.

Motion

Recommendation to the Plenary to change the allocation procedure so that we start with 1 +1(female pilot) for each nation and then allocate pilots 1 per allocation round in Nation WPRS order until the competition is full

Proposed Iceland Second France. Vote: 12 in favour, 4 against 2 abstentions

3. Task dropping:

- i) Discuss if task dropping should be covered in Ch4 (Cat 2) scoring chapters of S7B (it is specifically excluded from S7A) and if there should be restrictions: ie worst task can be dropped after x tasks flown. No more than x% of tasks in a competition can be dropped. (Not only the PWCs have been dropping tasks during 2009)
- ii) Consider impact on WPRS. Review Bureau decisions: *“To upload competition results with task dropping using the full number of tasks flown to determine the Ta factor. Also, if organisers choose to drop an entire task for all pilots, then this is effectively an invalid task, and should not be counted towards Ta in the WPRS formula.”*

SC agrees with Bureau decision. Vote in favour 16 against 0 abstentions 2

1. Proposals from Sporting Code Subcommittee

See Annex 9 for full information. A key point listed below:

- i) **S7B, new paragraph 4.3.2 Tasks** – All competitors shall be set the same tasks, from the same sites on the same days.

Reason: to regulate attempts to fudge minimum numbers and also stop applications to sanction XC league events where pilots do not even fly from the same sites.

Review other proposed changes in Annex 9.

Vote: 15 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions. Agreed

2. Qualification & allocation dates:

In S7B 3.4.5 the qualification date is specified as no later than 60 days before the competition. In 3.2.1 the nation rankings to be used for allocating places is first day 3 months before. Any change required? Maybe use the same reference date?

Recommend that this be referred to the S7 SC, to update S7B where relevant so that the qualification date and the Nation rankings use the same reference date, and that it should be 2 months before the Championship.

Vote: 13 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions. Motion carried.

3. Discuss/review bids for:

12th FAI European Paragliding Championships: France

The bid was reviewed. Calvo (part of organising team) was able to satisfactorily answer several questions regarding altitude restrictions and potential task problems with northerly winds. The SC finds the bid acceptable.

3rd FAI PanAmerican Paragliding Championships: Brazil.

Bid not discussed as it is incomplete

PG SC Meeting Attendance List

TB	Thomas	Brandlehner	Austria
IV	Iris	Vogt	Austria
ZH	Zhaofan	Han	China
YW	Yongli	Wang	China
EM	Elsa	Mai	Chinese Taipei
KK	Kamil	Konecny	Czech R
ST	Scott	Torkelsen	Denmark
RR	Rasmus	Rohlf	Denmark
RA	Robert	Aarts	Finland
BH	Brian	Harris	France
SM	Stéphane	Malbos	France
DM	Didier	Mathurin	France
KT	Klaus	Tanzler	Germany
HB	Harry	Buntz	Germany
AG	Agust	Gudmundsson	Iceland
SK	Dr S P	Katyal	India
YO	Yoshiki	Oka	Japan
GK	Greg	Knudson	Luxembourg
GD	Goran	Dimiskovski	MKD
FA	Fernando	Amaral	Portugal
ZO	Zeljko	Ovuka	Serbia
IE	Igor	Erzen	Slovenia
CV	Cecilio	Valenzuela	Spain
MS	Martin	Scheel	Switzerland
CB	Chris	Burns	UK
NM	Nicky	Moss	UK
RE	Riss	Estes	USA

CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE
PARAGLIDING & HANG GLIDING JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

1. Clarifying the definition of a prototype

See Sporting Code SC Agenda, Chapter 12 of S7A.

Consider **Netherlands Proposal 2** (See Annex 15)– banning prototypes in HG XC Cat 1 competitions. (NB Also speed gliding?)

General discussion of how the subject was being approached from HG side: JA explained that three categories being proposed: Certified gliders, non-certified gliders that are 'in production' and Prototypes (factory specials). This links to the Dutch Proposal to ban prototypes from Cat 1 events. KdK explained that he feels it is important for fairness, that pilots have access to the same type of gliders. Nobody knows how the prototype may differ from production models. But the intention is not to stop development, so they should be allowed in Cat 2s.

Broad ranging discussion. Points included:

- banning prototypes would ensure championships were between pilots and not between manufacturers.
- Special factory prototypes only for special pilots is not fair. (several in agreement)
- But contrary view (from GD) that Pilots have been flying prototypes since day 1. Is it really about fairness, or about safety? Prototypes with 'permit to fly' certificate from manufacturer should be allowed.
- If it is unfair in Cat 1s, then would it not also be unfair in Cat 2s?
- MS commented that it would be difficult to check conformance, and it is also 'fair' that a good pilot goes up the performance ladder. Cat 1 has to be top level.
- Pilots don't want to have to fly different gliders at different competitions.
- Chair of Aerobatics SC, Iris commented that aerobatics pilots mainly fly prototypes.
- Female HG pilot, Corinne S: Flies prototype HGs, particularly small models. Mostly flies in comps to test gliders. Not enough time to test outside. Not enough money in HG to pay many test pilots.
- HM: Pilots don't find it 'satisfying' to fly in a competition against 'special' gliders that they don't have access to, nor know how they have been tweaked.

It was decided that the differences between HG and PG needs was sufficient that the subject should be taken back to the separate discipline SCs for further discussion.

2. Task setting at Cat 1 events

- i) Procedure for selecting task advisory members
France Proposal 1 (See Annex 12) – new wording proposed for S7A. Also for S7B?
Sporting Code SC to look at better choice of wording. No interest in change in PG SC
- ii) **Spain Proposal 1** (See Annex 18) – widening range of types of tasks that can be set – open distance with goal

DP: Pointed out that this and (next) US proposal are different.

Cecilio: Highlighted main points of proposal. Need variation, not just race to goal

Rob G: Gliding has different tasks – Assigned area tasks. CS: said that assigned area tasks had been tried in one HG competition. Some liked it, some did not. Tried it again in Laragne, but was protested against (by UK pilots) before it began. Need more feedback from pilots.

MS: Good idea in principle. But he warns against open task setting, especially in Cat 1s. It can lead to too much of a chance/luck factor. Need to try to make sure it is fair to all pilots. First option is ok.

AG: To test these ideas out in Cat 2s, we need better defined task types to see if it can be scored in the scoring programme.

GD: In La Palma, the scoring contained a 'tactical' element on decisions, to extend the distance while still being able to reach goal in a defined time. But scoring needs improving. Second type, not easy to organise in open area, only on a ridge. Not sure it would be useful task type.

It was emphasised that new types of competitions and different task formats are attracting new pilots to competition, pilots with a different attitude to the normal 'race to goal' community. Such tasks/events are complementary and a way to expand competitions. Different task styles can suit different sites and conditions. Can allow task setting on difficult days. Open + goal style is good for managing logistics in a larger competition. Generally thought good to support different task styles. Action item: Spain to create a document that details these types of tasks, which can then be reviewed for scoring purposes, and circulated to other organisers, for trial in Cat 2s in the coming year. Meanwhile, the proposal should be tabled.

iii) **US Proposal 2** Open distance contests – establishing the rules in S7 for Cat 1 & Cat 2 competitions

DP: Explained that in US there are more pilots competing in open distance contests than in race to goal, which has become highly structured. Need a more accessible entry to competitions (less reliance on instruments, racing and gaggle flying). Some pilots not comfortable flying in gaggles. Looking at a format that is more inclusive to pilots wanting to fly competitions. Requesting not a different type of task, but a separate world championships. Different scoring. Can be lower cost too.

There was a view that setting up a different competition structure could split what is already a small (HG) field? Not known if this would really attract new pilots to competition in Europe. It was pointed out that open distance Cat 2s already exist and are well attended. Not sure there was a need (in Europe) for a (separate) world championship. May just get the same pilots competing for the medals.

AG: We are already testing new types of championship, ie XC Online contest. Still need to discuss whether there will be a separate world champion in this class.

JA: There is not actually anything in the rules preventing US from putting in a bid for such a championship, which, if accepted would have its own medals and titles.

The comment that historically open distance tasks became unpopular for logistical and safety reasons, as pilots could be anywhere, was countered by the emergence of live tracking technology, which could now (largely) solve this problem. Also, there are ways (turnpoints) of keeping pilots in range.

GD: Pilots like to race against each other. Open distance and no goal, not good for media coverage, sponsorship etc. MS: Pure XC pilots still won't want to go to a 'competition' on a single site at the same time, they just do their own thing. Supports idea of XC online contest.

Conclusion: US will go back, setup a US championship.

Action item: US to communicate rules and progress to the wider international community.

DP emphasised his view that these events will (largely) involve different pilots and not split the field, as some fear.

3. **Use of Tracking Devices in FAI competitions**

Consider whether use of these systems by teams/TLs constitutes an infringement of Section 7A 2.19 or Section 7B 2.20 (external aids). If so, does S7 require amending to avoid problems if protest is made? Benefits of these systems (scoring, altitude verification, safety, media/spectator interest) will be discussed in Software WG meeting. Consider implications of competitor's flight progress information being available to other competitors or teams (and the public).

Deferred for discussion by software WG and later by individual disciplines.

4. **Sporting Code proposal** to give greater scoring flexibility

S7A & B, 5.2.2 Local Regulations – delete this paragraph entirely.

“The scoring system must be consistent with local regulations, which must specify in detail the way in which any variable within a formula is to be determined. It is also important that the design of the competition, especially the task and local factors complements the scoring

system.”

Reason: No longer required as approved scoring systems are listed in 5.2.1 & 5.2.3 and it is not considered appropriate to restrict the task setting flexibility of an MD by setting out in the LRs exactly how the scoring system and formula will be used; this should be decided in the light of the conditions prevailing on the day.

Proposed seconded agreed by all

5. **Sporting Code Subcommittee proposal:**

S7B, 5.7.2 Application of Penalties – add sentence detailing how progressive penalties are to be used when a pilot infringes the same rule on more than one occasion in a single flight e.g. in cases of cloud flying or altitude infringement. PG SSC to be consulted on this.

Reason: this has happened in recent championships and the rules are not clear about the application of progressive penalties.

Short discussion that this has been left to the discretion of MDs in the past.

JA: Suggested wording: “Where there is more than one infringement of a rule in a single flight, and where there are progressive penalties specified for that infringement, then the MD may impose more than one penalty.”

Motion proposed and seconded and passed by majority.

6. **France Proposal 2: setting GAP parameters** See Annex 12

GAP parameters to be discussed & announced at 1st TL briefing – S7A: Also relevant to S7B.

If parameters are set ahead, and TLs not happy, it's a problem. If TLs involved then they can't complain. Short discussion highlighted need for expert input to fully understand the ramifications of different GAP parameters. Tendency to have low GAP parameters as it shows a more successful event. AG reported that SW WG is formulating documentation for GAP which will help, with detailed descriptions of how GAP parameters work.

JA: Asked to remove reference to Race in the proposal.

Proposed as amended, seconded. Unanimously passed.

7. **Continental championships as Test Event for World Championships**

Discussion: The question has been asked whether a continental championship held in one year could also be the Test Event for a World championship to be held the following year (in the same place and organised by the same team). Rules do not specifically exclude this. In FAI terms, a Test Event is held to test the organisation, it is not normally considered to be a qualifier or test event for the pilots, although in practice this is often the case.

Long discussion revolved around two views. Not a problem as a test event is a test of organisation and site. Downside is that some pilots may not have the opportunity to fly a pre-worlds. Remarked that Not all the top pilots go to test events anyway. Han: If an Asian country wants to organise both, then there will be opportunities for European pilots to participate in the continental championship.

Comment that this situation would come up as part of the bid review process.

FA: said it is unlikely that the Plenary would award a bid to a country that already has a continental championship if there are other bidders. But if there are not enough bids, then maybe this should not be ruled out.

SM: Proposal: A continental championship cannot be considered a test event for a world championship, unless there are no other bids are received for that world championship.

Seconded by Japan.

Vote: 3 in favour, 14 against, 2 abstentions. Motion defeated. No action required.

Joint PG HG Attendance List

HM	Heather	Mull	Australia
HS	Herbert	Siess	Austria
RK	Raimund	Kaiser	Austria
TB	Thomas	Brandlehner	Austria
IV	Iris	Vogt	Austria
MR	Manfred	Ruhmer	Austria
ZH	Zhaofan	Han	China
YW	Yongli	Wang	China
KK	Kamil	Konecny	Czech R
ST	Scott	Torkelsen	Denmark
NA	Niels J.	Askirk	Denmark
RR	Rasmus	Rohlf	Denmark
RA	Robert	Aarts	Finland
LJ	Louise	Joselyn	France
BH	Brian	Harris	France
SM	Stéphane	Malbos	France
DM	Didier	Mathurin	France
RC	Raymond	Caux	France
KT	Klaus	Tanzler	Germany
CS	Corrinna	Schwiegerhausen	Germany
MG	Manuel	Gutierrez	Guatemala
AT	Alejandro	Toralla	Guatemala
AG	Agust	Gudmundsson	Iceland
SK	Dr S P	Katyal	India
FT	Flavio	Tebaldi	Italy
YO	Yoshiki	Oka	Japan
GK	Greg	Knudson	Luxembourg
GD	Goran	Dimiskovski	MKD
KdK	Koos	De Keijzer	Netherlands
FA	Fernando	Amaral	Portugal
IE	Igor	Erzen	Slovenia
CV	Cecilio	Valenzuela	Spain
Juaki	José Manuel	Sanchez	Spain
MS	Martin	Scheel	Switzerland
CK	Chrigel	Kuepfer	Switzerland
HC	Hakan	Cici	Turkey
MB	Murat	Baycora	Turkey
AH	Adem	Hasgul	Turkey
JA	John	Aldridge	UK
CB	Chris	Burns	UK
NM	Nicky	Moss	UK
DP	Dennis	Pagen	USA
RE	Riss	Estes	USA

CIVL Paragliding Accuracy Subcommittee, Proposals for Plenary 2010

O. REPORT ON 2009

Development:

30 comps per year, 32 nations, 700 pilots
6th World Championship in Croatia (14 nations)
2nd European Championship in Turkey in 2010
Newcomers: Ch. Taipei, China, Saudi Arabia, Peru, Austria...

Further issues

Judging structure - cont. (database, training programme)
Record structure
Scoring software

I. ISSUES REFERRED BY CIVL BUREAU

III. RULE CHANGE PROPOSALS FROM SPORTING CODE SUBCOMMITTEE

S7C, Chapter 5 – include performance standards of measuring equipment to be used.

Reason: request from steward's report after test event for European Championship.

(included in IV/1)

S7C, 2.8.2, Appointment of Stewards – amend 2nd sentence to read “If an entry of more than 100 is expected, two stewards may be required.”

Reason: From steward's report - Section 7C requires 2 stewards if more than 100 pilots are expected. This should be reconsidered, at this competition there were 86 pilots and 15 more pilots would not have made a difference. Two stewards should be a recommendation that is discussed when the bids are reviewed.

(included in rule change 2.8.2., agenda item IV/6.)

II. REVIEW OF LOCAL REGULATIONS

Local Regulations for European Paragliding Accuracy Championships, 2010, Turkey have been finalised. See attached Annex.

IV. RULE CHANGE PROPOSALS

1. BACK PROTECTION (2.16.5) stw

PROPOSAL: rewording of last sentence:

»...12 cm thickness back protection. A minimum level must extend across the whole area from 15 cm above and below a horizontal line passing through the centre of the curve of harness.«

Rule proposal modified in Plenary to:

2.16.5 Harness & other flying equipment

A pilot's flying equipment shall not be modified such that built in safety features

are adversely affected. Harnesses and back protectors shall be certified to EN 1651 and LTF09 standard or equivalent or harnesses must be fitted with a minimum level of 12cm thickness of suitable back protection where the suitability of back protection is to be assessed by the meet director. A minimum level must extend across the whole area from 15 cm above and below (measured on the inside of the curve) horizontal line passing through the centre of the curve of the harness.

2. HELMETS (2.16.2) stw

PROPOSAL: Rewording of first sentence:

»Helmet is compulsory and pilots at FAI Cat 1 competitions are recommended to wear a helmet certified to EN966.«

3. FLAG AND ITEM (15.2.1) stw

PROPOSAL: Add a line at 15.2.1: - Flags and anthems: organiser shall take care that (equal size) flags and items of all representing nations are presented and available at competition ceremonies.

4. E-MAIL NAC CONFORMATION (3.2.1) stw

PROPOSAL: Add a sentence to 3.2.2:

"Responsible person of NAC shall confirm to the organiser in writing, the selection of national team members and team leader (paper letter, fax, email are acceptable)"

5. RADIO RULES (2.18.1) stw

PROPOSAL: Rewording of the whole para 2.18.1:

»Voice radio transmitters are allowed for reasons of safety and communication between the team leader and pilots. Radios are not to be used during competition flight for the purpose of providing advantageous competitive information or coaching a pilot. Permitted safety frequencies shall be specified in the Local Regulations.«

6. NUMBER OF STEWARDS (2.8.2) stw

PROPOSAL:

Re wording a sentence: »If an entry of more than 100 entries is expected, at least two stewards may be required.«

AND

Re wording of one before last sentence: »**It is recommended that** they should have experience of interational FAI paragliding accuracy competitions.«

7. TAKE OFF INTERVAL (2.20.1) stw

PROPOSAL:

2.20.1: re wording of last sentence and 9.4 -> 7.3: »The recommended launch interval should be 1,5 min, adjusted by the Launch Marshal. A Pilot can choose 90 second interval.«

8. GLIDER IDENTIFICATION (2.11) pgawg

PROPOSAL: Re wording of para 2.11:

» The organiser shall allocate a contest number to each pilot. The method of affixing and displaying these numbers will be specified in Local Regulations.

Glider identification can be made by recording glider manufacturer, type, and colour combination or by sticker at registration. The method will be specified in Local Regulations«

9. REALLOCATION (3.2.4) pgawg

PROPOSAL: Delete paragraph 3.2.4.

10. SCORIG STANDARD (4.8) pgawg

PROPOSAL: Delete paragraph 4.8

11. LR sample (9.4 – >10.1) pgawg

PROPOSAL: Re wording of a first sentence: »The Chief Judge and Event Judge will be qualified persons in accordance with the Judging code and appointed by CIVL in accordance with organiser at least three months before the competition.«

12. PROVIDING A JUDGE (13.2.2) stw

PROPOSAL: No change on this matter.

13. SECTION 7 SEPARATION () Kamil

PROPOSAL: S7C to be reorganised generally in two chapters, which covers organisational rules and competition rules. Provisions will not be changed. A task for PGA SC to prepare final wording of S7C before end of April 2010.

14. 2/3 cm DC MEASURING DEVICE (5.5.3)

PROPOSAL: Add a sentence at the end of para. 5.5.3.: »The same diameter of dead centre must be used throughout the whole competition.«

15. Restricted area provision () Violeta

PROPOSAL: No change to current rules.

16. Scores publication (5.2.6 , 2.4.10 and 9.4/13) Andy W.

PROPOSAL: Add a sentence at the end of para 5.2.6: » If provisional scores are posted more than 2 hours after sunset and before 6.00 am next day, then the deadline for a complaint is 8.00 am. «

17. JUDGING CODE (13.0) //

13. JUDGING CODE

13.1. General

This is a judging code for judging at FAI 1st and 2nd category paragliding accuracy competition.

The main task of judges and judging team is to provide fair judging decisions of pilots' performance by measuring and recording.

Judges have to take their decisions alone, based on their observation of pilot performance.

All nominated judges will be given a copy of this Judging Code, to which they must adhere.

13.2. Judging team

A Judge is an official, who is qualified to observe, mark and measure the performance of a competitor. Judges must have a character of high integrity and must be capable of making fair and

13.2.2. Nomination Judging team is nominated by:

Judge	FAI 1 Nomination	FAI 2 Nomination
Chief Judge	CIVL	Organiser
Event Judge	CIVL in accordance with Chief judge and organiser	Organiser in accordance with Chief judge
Fichet Judges	Chief judge in accordance with event judge and organiser	Organiser in accordance with Chief judge

13.2.3. Judging team Selection: Judging team members have to be selected, as far as possible, from those with appropriate levels of experience who are registered on the CIVL international Judging database.

13.2.4. Levels of needed experience for judges:

FAI 1 competitions

Judge/ experience	Needed experience
Fichet Judge	- attended a judging training in last 12 month or

		- attended a judging training and perform as fichet judge twice (at least at FAI 2) in last 2 years
Event Judge		- attended judging training and - act 4 x as fichet judge in last 3 years or - act as Event Judge in last 3 years
Chief Judge		- attended judging training and - 2 x Event judge in last 4 years (at least once at FAI 1) or - act as Chief Judge at FAI 1 in last 4 years.

FAI 2 competitions

Judge/ experience	Needed experience
Fichet Judge	- attended a judging training in last 24 month or - attended a judging training and act as fichet judge once in last 3 years
Event Judge	- attended judging training and - act 2 x as fichet judge in last 3 years or - Perform as Event Judge in last 3 years
Chief Judge	- Attended judging training and - Act 1 x as Event judge in last 3 years or - Perform as Chief Judge in last 3 years.

13.2.5 Language skills

FAI 1: Official judging language is English. Fichet judges must be able to communicate their observations and decisions in English. Event judge and Chief judge must be able to deliver briefings, instructions and reports in English.

FAI 2: At international events, composition of judging team, official language is English. EJ and CJ must be able to deliver briefings, instructions and reports in English.

13.2.6. Revoking an appointment

Judges may have their appointment revoked by the Chief judge if they fail to maintain the standards of this code, or are guilty of misdemeanours during the competition.

13.3. Responsibilities

13.3.1. Fichet Judges

The Fichet Judge team will consist of three members, positioned at 120 degrees to each other with one judge up wind and approximately on the wind line, within the measuring field.

- The Fichet judges will observe all contacts noting the first point of ground contact of the Competitor.
- If an automatic measuring device is found to be defective and the first point of ground contact has been on it, judges are to measure the score manually.
- If the first point of ground contact is off the automatic measuring device, but within measuring field, the fichet judges will mark and measure the perceived point of ground contact of the pilot.
- In the event that the judges consider that there was more than one simultaneous point of first contact, the farthest point of first contact will be measured.
- Once measured, one member only of the team, who has been nominated as caller, will call the score to the recorder. The score will be repeated back by the recorder.

13.3.2. Event Judge

The Event Judge (EJ) is the team leader of the judging team and is responsible for the following:

- checking landing area setting,
- the smooth running of the target area,
- to produce a roster of change of duties for short periods to one of the judges,
- may also take over any of the duties within the target area,
- for observing competitors' separation in the air and during final approach
- for observing pilots route from take off to target.

If the Event Judge considers that conditions are becoming dangerous, EJ has the authority to temporarily stop the competition after he has conferred with the Chief Judge and the Competition Director.

Event judge must hold a preparatory meeting for the judging team and supporting roles before the *training round* of the competition.

13.3.3. Chief Judge

The Chief Judge is responsible for the following:

- Ensuring that correct judging standards are maintained by all members of the judging team.
- Assembling and briefing all judges prior to the commencement of the Competition.
- Ensuring that all required equipment is available and in working order.
- Attending all briefings of competitors and if necessary giving his own briefing to competitors.
- Ensuring that at any time at least two required nations mix is represented in the judging team at the target.
- Keeping a record of the judges and their duties during the competition and providing these information to CIVL.
- Conferring with the Competition Director as soon as a request has been made to temporarily stop the competition.

The Chief Judge will not interfere with the running of the target area unless it is considered that the Event Judge is not in full or proper control. In certain circumstances, i.e. lack of a full judging team, the Chief Judge may stand in to take over the duties of the Event Judge as a temporary measure.

Chief judge can decide on video evidence review according to 2.6.8.

13.5 Judging equipment

13.5.1. Clothing

Fichet judges shall wear clothes (vests) of very visible colours (red, yellow...)

13.5.2. Metering:

Fichet judges shall be equipped with pointers which can be used for marking a pilot's first point of landing, but which does not disturb other pilot's landings. The tape measure shall be the same length as the measuring field radius.

13.5.3. Signalling

Signalling equipment consists of red flag or pad and two stripes of bright colours to indicate the target is closed.

13.5.6. Communication

Organiser must provide communication equipment to facilitate communication between Meet director, Chief Judge, Event judge and Launch marshal.

13.5.7. Shelter

Organiser must provide a shelter and refreshment for judges and supporting duties officers.

13.6 Supporting services

Organisers must provide the following supporting services / duties:

13.6.1. Recorder

The Recorder will repeat and record on an official log sheet a competitor's score, which is called by the fichet judge. The score shall be signed by the competitor. The Recorder will record the start, finish and stand down times of the rounds on the log sheets.

13.6.2. Wind speed monitor

The Wind speed monitor is a person observing the wind speed at wind speed measuring device in the period of 30 seconds before a landing by a competitor. If the wind exceeds the maximum value, he will record that on the official log sheet provided and notice an event judge.

Wind speed signalling and recording can be done with automatic devices.

At FAI 2 competitions wind speed monitor service can be simplified by using mechanical instruments, and in case of high winds organiser must provide a person for observing and continuously reporting wind speed to the Event judge.

13.6.3 Launch Marshal

Launch marshal is responsible for smooth running of take off operations. His duties are:

- To Open and close take off
- To call pilots to prepare
- To allow every pilots take off according to the flying order
- To allow take off out of flying order in special cases (relaunch,...)
- To record all pilot take offs on each round according to the flying order list
- To communicate with CJ and MD regarding flying conditions and competition running
- To communicate with pilots on take off regarding safety and competition logistics.

Launch marshal must have knowledge and experience of local weather and flying conditions.

13.7. Judges training

Judges training is organised and founded by organiser of competition or by NAC. Lecturers are senior judges appointed by CIVL. Depending on availability of funds, CIVL may cover travel expenses for lecturer.

13.7.1. Programme

Judges training consists of following programme:

- Introduction to FAI, CIVL, FAI 1 and FAI 2 competitions
- Overview of S7C and relevant chapters of GS.
- Importance of judging role for quality competition
- Setting target area
- Judging code
- Judging situations and decisions
- Practical exercises

It is advisable that practical part is performed on real site with pilots landing.

13.8. Judges database

Judging database is set and maintained within CIVL information system. All judges attending seminars and roles acting at competitions are recorded in judging database. Organisers and Chief Judges are responsible for collecting and submitting data on acting judges to CIVL.

13.8.4. Judging Logbooks and data check

All judges have to maintain Judging logbooks and check their entry on the CIVL Judging database is up to date. Chief of Event Judge have to sign off Judging Log books at the end of competition.

(End of Judging code)

To improve consistency in S7C two new proposals are prepared for S7C on video evidence policy and possible time out for relaunch decision.

2.6.8 Video evidence

PROPOSAL: Last sentence of paragraph is changed:

»The video recording can be used as an additional source of evidence only if:

- jury decides to review it when dealing with a protest or
- Chief Judge decides to review it on receipt of a Complaint or by request of the Event Judge«

2.21.6 Re-launches

PROPOSAL: Add a new sentence at the end of second sentence in first paragraph:

»The Event Judge may postpone a decision on a relaunch request for up to 15 minutes to be able to consult judging team and (if Chief Judge decides so) video evidence.«

VI. PLENARY PROPOSALS

VII. COMPETITION BIDS

1. FYR MACEDONIA for European Championship 2012

The SC reviewed the bid from FYR Macedonia and concluded that the venue, organising team and proposed organisation is acceptable. We believe that the organiser has the appropriate skills and experience to prepare a very well organised competition. We trust that he will fulfill his promises made in the bid regarding take off preparation.

PG Accuracy SC propose to Plenary to accept bid for 3rd European Championship 2012 from FYR of Macedonia.

VIII. OTHER ISSUES

1. JUDGES DATABASE

PROPOSAL: waiting for database to be done operational

2. SCORING SYSTEM (5.2.7 – new) stw

In conjunction with SW SWG: We shall evaluate and find a possibility to prepare a software for :

- calculation / scoring (access or other standard application)**
- with interface to CIVL database of competitors**
- with interface to web for media coverage.**

PROPOSAL: pending

3. JUDGING SEMINARS IN 2009 – report & developement (lecturers, Louise, JV)

CIVL – Paragliding Accuracy – Subcommittee - Judging Working Group JUDGING SEMINARS & TRAINING: SUMMARY REPORT FOR 2009

Judging Training & Seminars

Three Judging Seminars were held during 2009: in Caraz, Peru, Vrsac, Serbia (Romanian border) and Adha, Saudi Arabia. In total, 49 Judges received initial training, mostly at the starting level, but several, with experience from parachuting accuracy, were brought up to speed very rapidly, receiving more in-depth coaching.

Caraz, Peru:

Seminar run by Matjaz Feraric (SVN) during their first Cat 2 sanctioned Accuracy competition. 22 Judges attended the seminar, held in two parts: classroom based to deliver the theory, history, explanation of roles and rules, background to the discipline within FAI, plus practical sessions, before and during the competition on the target, with de-briefing sessions after. Trainee Judges were rotated in various roles. Standard training material, in English, included powerpoint presentation, supporting documentation and the FAI Sporting Code, Section 7C. The trainer reported that the organisers were very helpful. He took an official scoring pad with him, which helped clarify many of the rules & scoring issues, demonstrating minimum standards for an FAI-sanctioned competition. The high number of participants demonstrates the enthusiasm to learn how to judge at an international level. Publicity of this event throughout South America would show how easy it is to participate in this discipline.

This was an excellent opportunity to bring this discipline to South America. Although the competition itself was not validated by FAI (too few licence holders participating), it clearly demonstrated to pilots their potential to compete on the world stage, even from Peru. Hopefully, the FAI licence issue will be resolved before the next competition, and further events will attract pilots from neighbouring countries.

Vrsac, Serbia:

Seminar run by Uga Jondzic (SRB) alongside the Serbian National championships, a Cat 2 competition, but very close to the Romanian border. Held in two parts, classroom based plus practical sessions, the participants included 7 from Romania, 2 from Hungary and 3 from Serbia. Several well qualified Judges were on hand for fast learning at highest level. Opportunities for all participants to get involved. Trainees will be able to share their combined knowledge and experience on return to their home country, hopefully extending the discipline to another country. Romania has previously only run one non-sanctioned Accuracy event. The seminar will hopefully ensure consistent standards for Judging, and more trained and qualified Judges available, as well as encouraging more pilots to compete at an international level.

Running it alongside a real competition works very well, as Judges experience first hand the competition environment and interaction with pilots in a potentially stressful competitive situation. Enforces the necessity for assertive confidence in Judges who know the rules and have broad experience. Support from the NAC in this case was very welcome, but is not always possible. Good idea to inform NAC or Federation that a seminar is/has taken place in such cases.

Adha, Saudi Arabia:

Seminar run by Uga Jondzic (SRB) was organised alongside a high profile competition, which attracted pilots from several neighbouring countries, many of which are not regularly involved in FAI-CIVL sanctioned events. Some are not even FAI members. The seminar attracted judges/participants not only from Saudi Arabia, but also from Yemen, Qatar, Egypt and Syria. All expressed interest in the FAI-CIVL structure and enthusiasm to take this discipline back to their own countries. FAI-sanctioned Accuracy competitions are not yet a regular feature in any of these countries.

The trainer was particularly impressed with the extremely high judging standards demonstrated by the senior participants. Some are ready even now to judge at Category 1 events, he said.

Results: Judges from several nations brought up to speed in a new discipline very effectively.

High profile event, enhanced by CIVL presence and assurance of professional-level judging standards. Excellent support from organisers.

This seminar was wholly funded by the competition organisers in Saudi Arabia. However, details are included in this review to illustrate a spin-off benefit of the CIVL/ARISF programme of Judging Seminars. It would not have happened had this programme not been in place, the trainers ready to help and the material prepared. The availability of some funding is important to continue this activity, but it is sometimes possible to extend the activity without incurring additional costs. The ability to establish this programme has improved the reputation and credibility of the FAI-trained judges, such that some nations are prepared to underwrite all of the costs to gain this perceived value

2009 Objectives:

- To ensure Paragliding Accuracy Judging Teams operate consistently and to high standards across different nations.
- To provide a Judging training programme for countries new to the sport
- To encourage more Judges to train to international standards
- To promote the sport of Paragliding Accuracy to other countries

Direct Results:

- Some 49 people from at least 9 countries attended various Seminar theory and practical training sessions. Most were completely new to Paragliding Accuracy Judging.
- Valuable judging experience provided by the seminar training contributed to the success of a Paragliding Accuracy competition in Saudi Arabia.
- The trainers report that the organisers in Peru, Romania, Saudi Arabia and neighbouring countries are keen to hold further competitions next year.
- Some of these new trainees will be able to share their knowledge and experience at competitions organised in their home countries.
- These organisers and newly trained Judges are now far more confident about holding Cat 2 events at an international level.

Indirect/follow on results:

- Judges are beginning to be better recognised for their expertise and professionalism.
- Pilots new to Accuracy, as well as trainee judges attracted to competitions running seminars.
- Pilots, Judges and organisers appreciating the benefits and kudos of being part of the FAI scene in paragliding Accuracy.

Expenditure for CIVL/ARISF Paragliding Accuracy Judging Training in 2009

Budget Allocated	2,700 € Travel & Subsistence	Amount in €	Totals
Seminar 1 - Vrsac, Serbia October 2009			
Travel & subsistence, Uga Jondzic	€289	€289	€289
Seminar 2 – Caraz, Peru August 2009			
Air Fare (Matjaz Feraric)	€1145	€1145	€1145
Seminar 3 – Adha, Saudi Arabia July 2009			
All costs paid by organiser	€0		
Total		1434 €	1434 €

Future development:

- Broaden the geographic scope of the Seminars to North America & China, Asia
- Consolidate and expand in Europe, particularly aiming at countries where interest for accuracy competition is shown: France, Austria...
- Establish high level, international discussions among Senior Judges,
- Ensure that International Judging Log Books are used at all Cat 1 & 2 events and data on Judges participating is collected,
- Ensure judging teams are selected from those on the International Judging Register / database.

In terms of budget for 2010, the Subcommittee would like to run a seminar in regions where interest for development of paragliding accuracy is shown (North America, China, Ch. Taipei, Austria (Stubai)...) It is very important for developing the discipline to be able to support travelling and accommodation costs for lecturer where those can not be covered by NAC or organiser of particular event.

For 2010:

Budget Request for Paragliding Accuracy Judging Training: €1500

(50% funded by CIVL/ARISF)

Seminar in Asia (China or Ch Taipei): €1000

Seminar in N. America: dependent on funds available

Seminar(s) in Europe: €500

PG Accuracy SC Meeting Attendance List

KK	Kamil	Konecny	Czech R
LJ	Louise	Joselyn	France
YO	Yoshiki	Oka	Japan
UJ	Uga	Jondzic	Serbia
JV	Jurij	Vertacnik	Slovenia
JA	John	Aldridge	UK

CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE

Report from the Aerobatics Subcommittee Meeting

Part 1 – PG Aerobatics Section 7B

1. Rules Changes (see separate attached file):
 - Change of the whole structure because the content is not clear and in a logic progression
 - Proposal to the plenary that we can change the language problems (at the moment about 5 languages are used in doc) in conjunction with Sporting Code chair, later
 - „Real rule“ changes we want to make are in separate attached file

2. World Air Games 2009 – Money problems
 - we got the information from Jean-Marc who is still in charge in Italy for this topic

3. Cancellation of the World Championship in Italy 2010
 - There is a small possibility that the Championship can happen. The deadline that was fixed with Flip is the 15th of March 2010 for a final go or no go.
 - For financial support the organiser can find a bit more
 - Organiser has to sign the contract!

4. Promoting/developing FAI-sanctioned aerobatic meets and solving organisational problems
 - The Subcommittee Chairman collects data about accidents in the last 5 year during competition and will inform the FAI.
 - The Subcommittee Chairman will make a letter for the FAI/CIVL that Aerobatics is given some priority attention. The FAI will then address the NACs.
 - Aerobatics SC will organise better Web presence on the FAI site for important information. (Liaison with web content coordinator currently Louise?) → The FAI wants to help to promote aerobatics
 - We learned that we have the possibility to make competitions more economically viable and therefore attractive.

- a. Reducing costs/increasing income for organisers: Paying judges, increasing entry fees, reducing FAI officials costs etc
 - b. Increasing number of pilot entries – scoring system changes?
 - c. Creating a webpage (& the hosting) with all info around Acro competitions for pilots, sponsors, organisers etc. On CIVL website or separate? How to fund it (4.000 €)?
5. Building a software & scoring system to display results immediately (like iceskating): Within CIVL Software WG or separately? How to fund it?
- A software solution for Aerobatics Paragliding is foreseen.
 - The Chairwomen will ask for an offer and will deliver a description what is needed.
6. Legalisation of Flying Acro:
- o There are many countries where Acro is not legal
 - → no official competitions are possible
 - → no support from the government (money)
 - no national league – no national team
 - o What can the FAI do?
- this goes with the point of promoting Aerobatic Paragliding. The collection of accident data is needed. A general description of Acro will be made.
 - The FAI will address the NACs.
7. Budget request for 2010 from CIVL:
- o Budget for training judges (50/50% funded by CIVL/ARISF)
- please see attached file

Part 2 – HG Aerobatics

1. Structural strength requirements for HGs in aerobatics. Report from Raymond Caux who has been in contact with manufacturers.

AEROBATIC FUNDING REQUEST

The CIVL aerobatic subcommittee requests the following funds for the development of the sports of paragliding and hang gliding aerobatics.

JUDGE TRAINING

The primary need and focus of this request is to train judges, especially in areas where none are available, but potential competition activity exists. In all the Americas there is great interest in aerobatics and a number of pilots performing aerobatics, but no CIVL sanctioned competitions and no qualified judges, except for possibly one in Brazil, and one in Argentina. Clearly it is not possible to get the minimum of three judges together for a normal competition of 20 pilots or less.

We propose that the 2 trainee judges for the US come to Europe to attend one of the scheduled competitions and receive training from a senior judge. For this purpose, the request is for 3000 Euros with the breakdown being a total of 2500 airfare (for two) and public transportation, and 500 room and food (for two).

We also request for the remaining trainee judges in Europe 500 € for travelling and 500 € for food and lodging.

The training can be held at the competitions that are running through the season. And the trainees can train their skills there. To become a qualified judge a trainee has to attend minimum 3 competitions and learn there from the judges. After that the senior judges have to qualify the trainee.

So we request 4.000 € for the training in Europe.

In addition we request 2.000€ for training in the US:

For a senior judge to spend more time, it is desirable that he travel to the US to train judges to attend the pilot training and competition that will occur in early June near Salt Lake City, Utah. At this event will be experienced aerobatic pilots, and pilots just learning to fly aerobatics, both in hang gliders and paragliders. The method of launch will be by towing over a lake. The plan is to hold judge training at the same time with evening review of films of the routines. However, teaching potential judges without an experienced judge's input is nearly impossible. Therefore, we request a total of 2000 Euros to send a senior judge to from Europe to the USA to oversee training. The breakdown of the funds is as follows:

With this in mind, we propose that we send a senior judge to the US

Airfare—1,000 Euros.

Food and Lodging, five days—500 Euros.

Payment for services—500 Euros.

Total 2000 Euros

Finally, we request a total of 500 Euros for making a judge training video. This would consist of filmed flights of actual competition runs, with a commentary noting the judging details of each maneuver. The video would explain the method of scoring and how the judging criteria apply. This video could be sold to competition pilots in order

to learn how they will be judged and what the fine points of each maneuver are. Also, I used to set the judging standards in CIVL sanctioned meets. The 500 Euros is intended to pay for a senior judge or judges to collect the current judging film, edit it and perform the commentary in a professional manner. This fee considers it a job requiring from 25 to 50 hours. We believe such a video could sell for between 5 and 10 Euros, which should offset the cost with 50 to 100 sales.

Aerobatics Subcommittee Meeting Attendance List

IV	Iris	Vogt	Austria
ZH	Zhaofan	Han	China
YW	Yongli	Wang	China
RR	Rasmus	Rohlff	Denmark
RC	Raymond	Caux	France
FK	Flip	Koetsier	Netherlands
RG	Robert	Groen	Netherlands
CC	Claudio	Cattaneo	Switzerland
GB	Gilles	Berruex	Switzerland
DP	Dennis	Pagen	USA



CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE Software Working Group Report

1. Software WG

2. Live tracking in competitions

- Live tracking systems in competitions (SPOT, Leonardo...)
- Media and spectator friendly competitions
- Tracklog ready for scoring at HQ when pilot lands
- Cooperation with Gliding and Microlights for joint direction in live tracking

AG introduced the types of devices, and said the technology is emerging quickly.

Devices must be capable of storing enough track data at 1/s update rate. Main advantage of Live tracking is for media/spectators/sponsors. Also, HQ can take the tracks for scoring remotely, speeding up scoring and safety is enhanced as they know where the pilot is. Pilots will still need backup devices.

Other general discussion points included whether or not there should be a delay, and tactical advantages to teams. In general it was felt there should be no delay.

Currently S7 2.19 forbids external aids.

There are plans to use Tracking devices in the 2010 PG Europeans and the 2010 HG Pre-Worlds.

The SC WG recommends that the Plenary grant an exemption to S7 2.19 External Aids ruling to allow Tracking to be used with no data delay for competitions in 2010. Proposed Austria Secoded Finland. Vote; 17 in Favour , against 1, abstention 1

3. Altitude limits WG

- Review of the WG report
- Results or direction of CIVL

It was reported that there were still no definitive agreement in the WG on the altitude measurement question. And that the latest tracking type technology needs to be evaluated as this may provide a future solution. It was noted the procedure used at the 2009 HG Worlds has been added to the local regulations for 2010 Cat 1 events

4. WPRS formula

- No proposal to change the WPRS formula 2010.
- Discussions on future improvements

Generally felt that the WPRS formula only now requires minor tweaking and will be reviewed in the coming year.

5. Scoring formulas

- GAP detailed description document
- Scoring parameters in Cat1 competitions
- What options are accepted in Cat1 competition?
- Are they in LR's or first Teamleader briefings ?

AG stated that the published GAP documents did not completely reflect the coding used in the RACE software. And that undocumented options have been used for a long while in RACE.



An updated and revised GAP scoring formula document is currently being produced along with a document covering the options available in the FS scoring software. This will be published shortly.

AG stated that all the options available to be used should be discussed at the first team leaders briefing and that it may be advisable to document this with a template.

6. The French altitude proposal on stopped task was shown and AG confirmed that it could be implemented in scoring software but would be dependent on an altitude measurement solution.

7. FS competition software

Now becoming widely used.

8. WPRS system / web

- No real updates*

9. CIVL database

- Steward, jury and judge database*
- Jury and steward database work ongoing – demo by AG*

10. WXC online contest

- Trial period has been successful*
- More contests to join*
- Winners of WXC contest, Prizes, recognition*
- Demo of the web pages*
- AG said he hoped that there would be a proposal in 2011 to reward winner of the online contest.*
- A question was asked if WPRS points would be awarded to the online contest. AG replied there are no current plans to do so.*

11. Other issues (for discussion only)

WPRS formula P_n is currently calculated on the total number of all pilots in a competition. No one saw this as a problem.

Agust Gudmundsson
Chairman, Software WG, January 2010



Software WG Meeting Attendance List

HM	Heather	Mull	Australia
RK	Raimund	Kaiser	Austria
TB	Thomas	Brandlehner	Austria
ZH	Zhaofan	Han	China
YW	Yongli	Wang	China
ST	Scott	Torkelsen	Denmark
NA	Niels J.	Askirk	Denmark
RR	Rasmus	Rohlf	Denmark
RA	Robert	Aarts	Finland
BH	Brian	Harris	France
SM	Stéphane	Malbos	France
DM	Didier	Mathurin	France
HB	Harry	Buntz	Germany
AG	Agust	Gudmundsson	Iceland
SK	Dr S P	Katyal	India
FT	Flavio	Tebaldi	Italy
YO	Yoshiki	Oka	Japan
KdK	Koos	De Keijzer	Netherlands
FA	Fernando	Amaral	Portugal
IE	Igor	Erzen	Slovenia
CV	Cecilio	Valenzuela	Spain
Juaki	José Manuel	Sanchez	Spain
MS	Martin	Scheel	Switzerland
CB	Chris	Burns	UK

SPORTING CODE SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT TO 2010 PLENARY

For convenience the proposals for changes to the various sections of our sporting code are shown separately in:

- Annex A - Proposals for Section 7A Hang Gliding
- Annex B - Proposals for Section 7B Paragliding
- Annex C - Proposals for Section 7C Paragliding Accuracy
- Annex D - Proposals for Section 7D Records & Badges

Proposals distributed with the other plenary documents which have been modified as the result of further discussion here in Lausanne have those modification displayed in red.

February 2010

John Aldridge
Subcommittee Chairman

Attendance List for Sporting Code Subcommittee Meeting

HM	Heather	Mull	Australia
IV	Iris	Vogt	Austria
LJ	Louise	Joselyn	France
AG	Agust	Gudmundsson	Iceland
FK	Flip	Koetsier	Netherlands
JV	Jurij	Vertacnik	Slovenia
JA	John	Aldridge	UK
CB	Chris	Burns	UK
DP	Dennis	Pagen	USA

Hang Gliding Classes 1.2 & 5

S7A throughout – delete “PR Co-ordinator” wherever it appears and replace with “Competition Co-ordinator”.

Reason: To update title of official.

S7A, 2.4.2 Event Period – amend second sentence to read “Competitors are subject to all rules relating to championship flying” etc.

Reason: to correct typo – word missing in last edition.

S7A 2.6.3 Task Advisory Committee

Write the 1st sentence the same way as § 2.6.4:

“A Task Advisory Committee must be formed and shall include a minimum of two pilots elected by the team leaders and a FAI Steward.”

Reason: harmonization between 2.6.3 and 2.6.4 Transparency of the process. (French proposal)

S7A, 2.17.12 Suspension, cancellation or stopping a task – new sub-para 2.17.12.4.

When a task has been cancelled or stopped it is the responsibility of the organiser to announce this on competition and safety frequencies. In addition this should be notified to participants via team leaders. Where possible the announcement should also be repeated on team frequencies.

Reason: This is common sense and current good practice but there is no rule making it mandatory.

2.19.2 – Radios – add wording at end of paragraph

When radio transmitters are permitted in the local regulations one transmitter is permitted in each competing glider, one for the use of the team leader and one in each of a maximum of two retrieve vehicles. These radios are for communication between competitors and between them and the organisers. They may not be used to contact ATC other than for obtaining permission from an airfield to land on it, unless the organisers specifically require this. Permitted frequencies will be specified in the local regulations. The above does not apply to emergency location transmitters (ELTs), which are incapable of voice transmission or to cell phones or live tracking devices.

S7A, 2.24.6 Take-off “push” system – at end of first paragraph add “When an ordered launch is used a pilot who decides not to take off in his turn may not subsequently “push” in that task.

Reason: to avoid tactical ploy of declining position in launch order, moving to back of queue and immediately instigating a “push”.

S7A, 3.4.8.1 Responsibilities of all – delete this subparagraph entirely.

Reason: It refers to a list on the CIVL website which is not available.

S7A, 3.4.8.2 Competition Organiser’s Responsibility – delete 2nd sentence.

Reason: It refers to a list on the CIVL website which is not available.

S7A, 4.3.3 Minimum Number of Tasks – change heading to “Tasks” and add further sentence at the end “All competitors shall be set the same tasks, from the same sites on the same days”

Reason: to regulate attempts to fudge minimum numbers and also stop applications to sanction XC league events where pilots do not even fly from the same sites.

S7A, 4.3.1

Add the minimum numbers for Sport Class to be not less than 6.

Reason: several organisers have run a Sport class competition this year yet none of them were validated as they did not have the minimum number of participants.

S7A, 5.2.1 Approved Systems – amend the third sentence to read “Soaring competition is to be scored using the FS scoring programme with GAP 2000, OzGap, GAP2002 or GAP2008 formulas.

Reason: Race can no longer be used as the calculation it uses for task distance does not comply with 1.6.6.3. GAP2008 has been added as it has been well tested and is basically GAP2002 with additional options

S7A, 5.2.2 Local Regulations – delete this paragraph entirely.

Reason: No longer required as approved scoring systems are listed in 5.2.1 and it is no longer considered appropriate to restrict the task setting flexibility of an MD by setting out in the LRs exactly how the scoring system and formula will be used; this should be decided in the light of the conditions prevailing on the day.

S7A, 5.5.8 Scoring of Stopped Tasks – amend first sentence to read “A task which is stopped shall be scored if a minimum of one and a half hours have elapsed since the time the first valid start was taken by a competing pilot or at least one pilot who has taken a valid start has achieved goal. In the Women’s world championships the minimum period for a task to be scored is one hour.”

Reason: to clarify the point in time that the one and a half hours will be measured from and to ensure that no pilot who has not taken a valid start can claim to have triggered the scoring of a task that has been stopped. The words “but not cancelled” have also been dropped as it is not possible under other rules to cancel a task after pilots have launched, only to stop it and confusion has arisen over this point at a recent championship. Removing the words from this sentence should prevent confusion without any loss of meaning in the rule.

S7A, 5.6.2 As a Result of Complaint or Protest – delete “not” in second line and replace with “no”.

Reason: To correct typo.

S7A, 5.9.2 Application of Penalties – add sentence “Where there is more than one infringement of a rule in a single flight, and where progressive penalties are specified for that infringement, then the MD may impose more than one penalty.”

Reason: this has happened in recent championships and the rules are not clear about the application of progressive penalties.

S7A, Chapter 9 Sample Local Regulations 1.5 – remove second line re. late entry payments.

Reason: rarely used and implies the entry deadline is not really a deadline.

S7A, 9.4 / Local rule sample 10.1 - Replace first sentence of this paragraph by the following:

“Scoring will be done according to the scoring programme, version using the scoring formula. (5.2.1). GAP parameters will be discussed and decided at the first team leader briefing.”

Reason: Worried about bad weather, organisers tend to set very low parameters and sometimes define them beforehand in the local rules. This proposal ensures the GAP formula is agreed upon by all, understood and used the proper way. The aim is to avoid short tasks with nobody at goal being scored 1000 pts, which might make a competition unfair. If the parameters are set high enough (according to the expected weather, gliders performances and pilots levels), such tasks would then be devalued reasonably.

S7A, Chapter 9

Annex B to Sample Local Regulations – remove existing document and append to Chapter 12 with revisions as agreed by HG SSC.

Reason: existing document is badly worded and cannot be signed in honesty by many pilots. It is also not necessary to publish it with LRs and Chapter 12 is a more appropriate place.

10.1 Delete “Race” and insert “FS”.

Reason: updating in line with Chapter 5

10.2 Delete entirely.

Reason: Existing wording misleading and not required as full rule is in S7A.

10.4 Delete “by Race” in the second line.

Reason: Race no longer used for 1st Category events.

10.5 Delete entirely.

Reason: Existing wording out of date and paragraph not required as rule is in S7A.

S7A, Chapter 12 Hang Glider Safety Standards – revised by HG SSC to produce the version attached. This is shown as a “clean” document with all changes completely incorporated to make it clear what will be published in place of the current Chapter 12. There is also a version with all the editorial mark up still in place to identify the detail of the changes.

Reason: many elements of the existing chapter are out of date, badly worded or unclear, particularly where prototype gliders are concerned.

S7A, 15.5.4 Scoring a Stopped Task – delete all up to “a single start time.The” in the 4th line and replace with “The rule giving the circumstances in which a stopped task will be scored is at 5.5.8. When this occurs”.

Reason: to remove repetition of a rule which is found at 5.5.8.

Glossary – add

| Sprog A strut outboard of the wing which supports an area of the sail on a flexwing hanglider. Sometimes referred to as “wash-out rods” and “anti dive sticks or struts” in the past.

Reason: this is a term in common use which is likely to be referred to in Local Regulations for Class 1 championships.

Paragliding (Class 3)

S7B throughout – delete “PR Co-ordinator” wherever it appears and replace with “Competition Co-ordinator”.

Reason: To update title of official.

S7B, 2.6.1 The Local Regulations – delete word “aeronautical” from the first bullet point and insert “map or”.

Reason: An aeronautical chart is rarely provided and unnecessary if the remainder of the map or chart specification is met.

S7A, 2.18.9.4 Scoring of Stopped Task – delete the words “but not cancelled” in the first line.

Reason: Recommended in PanAm steward’s report. The words “but not cancelled” have been dropped as it is not possible under the rules to cancel a task after pilots have launched, only to stop it and confusion has arisen over this point at a recent championship. Removing the words from this sentence should prevent confusion without any loss of meaning in the rule.

S7B, 2.24.1 Launch Window Open Times – delete second sentence.

Reason: this is unnecessary in view of 2.24.2.

S7B, 2.18.9 Suspension, cancellation or stopping a task – new sub-para 2.18.9.5.

When a task has been stopped it is the responsibility of the organiser to announce this on competition and safety frequencies. In addition this should be notified to participants via team leaders. Where possible the announcement should also be repeated on team frequencies.

Reason: This is common sense and current good practice but there is no rule making it mandatory.

S7B, 3.4.3 Qualification After Gaining an Exemption - delete paragraph entirely.

Reason: This refers to S7A entry criteria and is not relevant to S7B.

S7B, 3.4.6.1 Responsibilities of all – delete this subparagraph entirely.

Reason: It refers to a list on the CIVL website which is not available.

S7B, 3.4.6.2 Competition Organiser’s Responsibility – delete 2nd bullet point.

Reason: It refers to a list on the CIVL website which is not available.

S7B, 4.3.1 Maximum Numbers – move last paragraph about complaints and protests into 4.2.

Reason: this paragraph does not relate to validation of an event.

S7B, new paragraph 4.3.2 Tasks – All competitors shall be set the same tasks, from the same sites on the same days.

Reason: to regulate attempts to fudge minimum numbers and also stop applications to sanction XC league events where pilots do not even fly from the same sites.

S7B, 5.2.2 Local Regulations – delete this paragraph entirely.

Reason: No longer required as approved scoring systems are listed in 5.2.3 and it is not considered appropriate to restrict the task setting flexibility of an MD by setting out in the LRs exactly how the scoring system and formula will be used; this should be decided in the light of the conditions prevailing on the day.

S7B, 5.7.2 Application of Penalties – add sentence “Where there is more than one infringement of a rule in a single flight, and where progressive penalties are specified for that infringement, then the MD may impose more than one penalty.”

Reason: this has happened in recent championships and the rules are not clear about the application of progressive penalties.

S7A, 9.4 Local Regulations – Insert new 10.6:

“Scoring will be done according to the scoring programme, version using the scoring formula. (5.2.3). GAP parameters will be discussed and decided at the first team leader briefing.”

Reason : Worried about bad weather, organisers tend to set very low parameters and sometimes define them beforehand in the local rules. This proposal ensures the GAP formula is agreed upon by all, understood and used the proper way. The aim is to avoid short tasks with nobody at goal being scored 1000 pts, which might make a competition unfair. If the parameters are set high enough (according to the expected weather, gliders performances and pilots levels), such tasks would then be devalued reasonably.

S7B Glossary

Remove reference to WHGS

Reason: this subcommittee no longer exists.

For Paragliding Accuracy

S7C throughout – delete “PR Co-ordinator” wherever it appears and replace with “Competition Co-ordinator”.

Reason: To update title of official.

S7C, Chapter 5 – include performance standards of measuring equipment to be used.

Reason: request from steward's report after test event for European Championship.

S7C, 2.8.2, Appointment of Stewards – amend 2nd sentence to read “If an entry of more than 100 is expected, two stewards may be required.”

Reason: From steward's report - Section 7C requires 2 stewards if more than 100 pilots are expected. This should be reconsidered, at this competition there were 86 pilots and 15 more pilots would not have made a difference. Two stewards should be a recommendation that is discussed when the bids are reviewed.

For Record & Badges

S7D, 7 TASK DECLARATION FORM – under “Glider” delete “Type and number” and insert “Class, make, model and serial number”

S7D, 8.4 Control – add sentence “The observer must also confirm that he has identified the pilot as the individual claiming the record and that he is flying a glider of the appropriate class.

Reason: There is currently no requirement to identify the pilots claiming a record and no requirement to check that aircraft flown meets the class definition requirements.

12 EQUIPMENT AIRWORTHINESS & SAFETY STANDARDS

12.1 General

12.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of these standards is to ensure a certain minimum level of structural integrity and pilot safety in hang gliders of classes 1, 2, 4 and 5 and associated equipment.

12.1.2 Change in glider configuration or construction

A glider shall fly throughout the championships as a single structural entity using the same standard of components used on the first day. Concessions to this rule are made to cover the case of essential repairs (see 2.16.4. Damage to a glider).

12.2 Airworthiness Standards

All gliders and associated equipment shall be of sufficient performance and standard of airworthiness to meet the demands of international championships.

12.2.1 Classification of Hang Gliders

Hang gliders permitted to fly in FAI sanctioned competitions must fall into one of the following categories. For 1st Category events the Local Regulations shall state which categories of glider are permitted:

- Certified Gliders – hang gliders of a make and model for which there is airworthiness approval issued by either the BHPA, DHV or HGMA and which have not been altered in any way since manufacture that would affect this certification. Sprogs must be set within the certified range.
- Uncertified Gliders – production model hang gliders **which have been available for sale for a minimum of 4 months and** which have not yet obtained airworthiness approval or certified models which have been altered from the certified configuration.
- Prototypes – all other gliders

12.1.2.1 A pilot flying a certified glider will be required to sign a statement that his or her glider is in certified compliance and hasn't been altered in any way to take it out of certification. The certificate to be used is appended to this chapter.

12.1.2.2 Uncertified gliders will be allowed to fly in Cat. 1 competitions only if the pilot or manufacturer can produce pitch test results for the individual glider and/or a description of the changes made to a certified glider is presented with confirmation from the manufacturer that the changes do not detract from the airworthiness of the glider. Pitch test results must specify the sprog settings used during testing.

12.1.2.3 Prototype gliders are only allowed with the manufacturer's statement that the pilot is approved to fly this glider. Furthermore, a statement from the manufacturer must be produced confirming that the glider is airworthy and specifying the sprog settings at which this confirmation is valid.

12.2.2 Strength

Hang gliders **must** comply with the load test certification standards of, the HGMA, BHPA or DHV, or similar testing body.

Where dimensional limits are applied to structures, these have been chosen such that adequate strength is achievable with materials currently in use.

The standards in 12.3 below override the certified configuration of a glider.

12.3 Structural limits

12.3.1 Structural Cables

Minimum diameter of any structural external wire cables is 1.9 mm or 5/64 inches.

12.3.2 Wire Attachment Points

Where an external compression strut is braced with rigging wires they must attach within 10cm of the point where the compression load is applied.

Side-wires shall attach to A-frames at no more than 10cm above the plane of the control tube, measured when the glider is resting on a horizontal surface.

Explanatory Notes: References to compression struts and rigging wires refer to the loads placed on parts of a glider by flight stresses. Gliders with cantilevered wings do not apply compression loads to the uprights, while in general, Class 1 gliders do have uprights which are under compression in flight.

Control cables are not deemed to be structural.

Any external part of the glider which has compression loads placed upon it during flight is an "external compression strut", and therefore bracing wires attached to it shall conform to these rules.

Where the terminology or definitions which are used in these rules are in question with any particular glider, the relevant protest committee will provide a ruling.

12.3.3 Control Bars (base tubes)

If a control bar is load bearing and made of materials other than metal, it must have an internal steel rigging cable that serves as a structural backup. If a non-metallic base tube (control bar) does not show clear evidence of an internal rigging cable (end pins or vibration when tapped) the pilot must supply a manufacturer's affidavit verifying the presence of a cable in the base tube.

12.3.4 Pilot Suspension Systems

The pilot suspension must include a non-metallic load bearing material of minimum 50 mm² cross-section area (normal material Nylon woven webbing with 1000kg breaking strain). The attachment loop must have a backup, which bypasses any mechanical devices and either the main, or backup must be non-metallic. If an integral (one piece) harness suspension/hook-in system is employed, the backup may have a mechanical link which allows it to loop around the keel and attach to itself independently of the primary system.

12.3.5 Rescue Parachutes

A rescue parachute must be capable of deployment by both the right and left hand of the pilot in a normal flying attitude.

12.4 Competing gliders

12.4.1 Glider identification

Each competing glider must have a serial number for identification.

12.4.2 Acceptance check.

All hang gliders must be made available to the organisers during the period of registration, for an acceptance check, in the configuration in which they will be flown. After the opening of the launch window on the first scheduled competition day no changes of hang glider may be made (see 2.16.4.).

12.4.3 Airworthiness checks.

At any time during the championships the organisers and FAI officials have the right to inspect any competing glider and, if necessary, ground it for safety reasons. They may also apply any other penalties listed in these rules and the Local Regulations for non-compliance with class or airworthiness standards.

12.5 Pitch Stability

CIVL officials at Category 1 events can measure and record sprog settings on competing hang gliders or perform other inspections. All competing pilots should co-operate with the officials in order to collect safety data. This data will be used to provide an understanding of the current safety situation in hang gliding competitions.

12.6 Ballast

12.6.1 Limits

A competing glider may carry jettisonable ballast only in the form of fine sand or water. A pilot must avoid dropping ballast at any time or in a manner likely to affect other competing gliders or third parties.

The weight limit in Class 5 for all equipment (without glider), clothes and ballast is to be 25 Kg. Any pilot equipped with a second parachute can exceed this limitation by the value of the weight of his second parachute and its deployment system. The weight limit with an additional parachute is 3kg above the 25 kg limit. Weight can be measured at take-off or landing (bare foot with T shirt and trousers, then equipped) by the organisers at the request of the stewards or of the organisers.

In all cases, pilots must also comply with the weight limitations set by the manufacturer and the authority who provided the certificate of airworthiness;

Pilots not complying with those rules will be removed from the meet.

12.6.2 Penalties

The normal penalty for non-compliance is a 20 % reduction in score for the last round flown, except where specified differently elsewhere in these regulations. If during a subsequent round the glider is again found to be non-compliant a 0 score will result for that round. At the discretion of the Meet Director a lesser penalty may be applied in rare cases due to extenuating circumstances.

Appendix to Section 7, Chapter 12

CERTIFIED GLIDER STATEMENT

I, the undersigned, declare that the Class ____ glider _____ (make) _____ (model) I will fly in the _____ (Name of event) _____ Championship, from _____ to _____ (dates) is a model certified by one or more of the internationally recognized certifying bodies (namely the DHV, HGMA or the BHPA). Furthermore I declare that I have not altered the configuration of the glider since purchase, **in a manner that would take it out of certification**, and as far as I am aware it is in certified configuration and I undertake not to alter this configuration during the championship. I understand that I am the sole individual responsible for the integrity of my glider and to the best of my knowledge it is damage free and airworthy.

Signed on this date: _____

Signature of Participant

Printed name of Participant

Address of Participant: _____

Signature of Witness

Printed name of Witness

Address of Witness: _____

If your glider is not a certified model or is not in certified configuration

DO NOT SIGN THIS STATEMENT

but instead comply with Section 7A 12.1.2.2 or 3

CIVL		2007 ACTUAL	2008 ACTUAL	2009 ACTUAL	2010 BUDGET	2010 Budget Feb 2010
Opening Balance		115'778	119'772	141'876		
INCOME :						
1.	TOTAL INCOME	53'050	95'415	53'869	56'500	56'500
1.1	Championships income	46'990	85'313	44'296	46'500	46'500
	Sanction fees - World Championships	9'933	2'528	6'061	2'200	2'200
	Sanction fees - Continental Championships	0	7'611	0	14'800	14'800
	Sanction fees - Other categories, ranking lists	20'065	23'023	28'359	29'500	29'500
	Protest fees	122	0	50	0	
	Bid fees	3'200	5'105	1'920	0	
	Deposits - Team entries	13'671	47'045	7'907	0	
1.2	Sales	4'865	10'192	9'572	10'000	10'000
	Sales of Badges, pins, IPPI cards, books, etc	4'865	10'192	9'572	10000	10000
	Sales of Championships Medals					
	Other					
1.3	Miscellaneous incomes	1'195	-90	0	0	0
	Donations and Sponsorship, Misc	1'195	-90	0	0	
	Media rights fees				0	
EXPENDITURE :						
2	TOTAL EXPENSES	49'056	73'311	49'573	57'805	65'717
2.1	Travel and Administration	21'937	15'913	22'492	21'450	23'050
	President's travel expenses and admin.	4'879	3'739	2'500	3'000	3000
	Other official expenses and admin.	15'173	10'073	17'809	14'000	14000
	ARISF Training		1'709	729	2150	3750
	Other costs (Steward/Jury Training)	1'884	391	1'454	2300	2300
2.2	Meetings	0	2'203	1'629	4'000	5'200
	Plenary/Bureau Meetings		1'794	1'629	4000	5200
	FAI meetings		377	0		0
	Miscellaneous		31	0		0
2.3	Stock Purchases	4'594	7'482	2'425	5'405	7'517
	Diplomas, pins, IPPI cards, books, etc	1'107	2'593	0	0	
	Medals (championships and others)	2'633	4'889	2'425	5405	7517
	Miscellaneous Stock Purchases	0	0	0		
	Computer material	853	0	0		
2.4	Championships expenses	21'549	40'336	19'697	6'650	6'650
	Stewards Fees			2'850	4150	4150
	Sprog Measure team expenses			2'188	2500	2500
	Deposit refunds	21'549	40'336	14'659	0	0
2.5	Miscellaneous expenses	976	7'377	3'330	20'300	23'300
	Donations					0
	Litigation					0
	Consultancy					0
	Other	976	7'377	381	20300	
	software & scoring					19000
	officials' wear					1300
	safety matters					1500
	WAG officials expenses			2'949	0	1500
	TOTAL INCOME	53'050	95'415	53'869	56'500	56'500
	LESS TOTAL EXPENDITURE	49'056	73'311	49'573	57'805	65'717
Income - expenditure for the year		3'994	22'104	4'296	-1'305	-9'217

Annex 11 CIVL 2010 Plenary Minutes

FAI statement in response to Spain Proposal

1. The FAI General Conference adopted a resolution a couple of years ago concerning access to airspace. This resolution was passed to all NACs with the suggestion that they use it to apply pressure on their respective National Aviation Authorities. We are not aware of how this resolution was used in Spain, if at all.
2. At present, Hang Gliding and Paragliding are EXCLUDED from the jurisdiction of ICAO and EASA. Therefore, responsibility for regulation of access to airspace by these types of aircraft remains a national matter. International organisations are not best placed to intervene at national level, although they can of course, always give full and active support to national initiatives if these are reported to FAI.
3. In Europe responsibility for regulatory matters is delegated by FAI to Europe Airports (EAS). It is not clear whether the drafter of the Spanish proposal discussed it with the Spanish delegate to EAS. Presumably he is not implying that FAI should take back from EAS the delegated powers.

Max Bishop
Secretary General
FAI
December 2009