FÉDÉRATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

Minutes of the meeting of the International Hang Gliding Committee (CIVL) held at the Governador Palace Hotel, Governador Valadares, Brasil. March 19,20,21 1990

These Minutes recorded by Noel Whittall, Secretary, and approved by Thomas B Bosshard, President.

Present:

For FAI Dr Cenek Kepak, Secretary General

Australia Paul Mollison, 8 Brown Street, Adamstown, NSW 2289, Tel: 61 49 570216, Fax 61 49 499395 (DELEGATE)

Austria Sepp Himberger, Pöllweg 7, A-6345 Kössen, Tel: 05375 6559, Fax 05375 2160 (DELEGATE)

Brasil Pepê Lopes, Rua Calheiros Gomes 517, Barra da Tijuca, Rio de Janeiro, Tel: 021 3997328/3994923, Fax 021 2461167 (DELEGATE)

Mario Carlos Campanella, Rua Desembargador Fernandes Dinheiro 123, Apt 102, Barra, CEP 22620, Rio de Janeiro, Tel: 021 3995588 (ALTERNATE

Renata Maria Small, Rua dos Oitis 17/201, Gavea, Rio de Janeiro, CEP 22451, Tel/Fax: 021 274 8159 (OBSERVER)

Denmark Torben Taustrup, Baldrianvej 22, 8240 Risskov, Tel: 45 86173467 (DELEGATE)

Finland Reini Valtonen, Haminant. 29F, 45100 Kouvola, Tel: 358 51 10763 (Home), (SP) 51 84581 (Office), Fax: 0 3741551 (DELEGATE)

France John Zalewski, 24 Rue de la Fontaine du Sault, 92160 Antony, Tel: (33)(1)4661 3442, Fax: 6447 5367 (DELEGATE)

Great Britain John Pendry, 41 Sillwood Road, Brighton, Sussex, Tel: 0273 733883 (Home), 0983 78611 (Office), Fax: 0983 78552 (ALTERNATE)

David Bedding, Hillview, New Road off Lodge Lane, Chalfont St Giles, Bucks, Tel: 0494 764571 (Home), 0923 664759 (Office) (OBSERVER)

Walter Neumark, 2 Churwell Avenue, Stockport, Cheshire, Tel: 061 432 7315, Fax: 061 431 0786 (OBSERVER, having responsibility for Class 3)

Ann Welch, 14 Upper Old Park Lane, Farnham, Surrey GU9 0AS, Tel: 0252 715991 (SECRETARY, Section 7))

Italy Carlo Marchetti, c/o Aero Club d'Italia, Vle Mllo Pilsudski 124, Rome, Fax: 06 8870993, Tel: 06 9403459 (Home), Fax: 06 9403256 (Home) (DELEGATE)

Italy Ornella Magnaguagio, Via Corvoleo 11, 36100 Vicenza, Tel: 0444 322584 (OBSERVER)

Japan Yoshiki Oka, 3-2-13,301 Nakameguro, Meguro-Ku, Tokyo 153, Tel: 03 711 5027 (Home), 03 988 7125 (Office), Fax: 03 988 7263 (DELEGATE)

Etsushi Matsuo, 2-20-36 Takanawa, Minato-Ku, Tokyo 108, UP International Tel: 03 473 5510, Fax: 03 473 5514:
or UP International 560-4 Birch St, Lake Elsinore, CA 92330, USA, Tel: 714 674 7005, Fax: 714 674 3071 (OBSERVER)

Norway Ole Erik Vognild, Kolsasen 11D, 7079 Flatasen, Tel: 47 7 531160 (Office), 47 7 984505 (Home), Fax: 47 7 530308 (DELEGATE)

Per Christian Dehlin, Konglevn.25, N-0875 Oslo 8, Tel: 02 232604, Fax: 02 69 5942 (ALTERNATE)

South Africa Paul Thomas, PO Box 322, Sunninghill 2157, Johannesburg, Tel: 803 8128 (Home), 978 5909 (Office) (DELEGATE)

Spain Pedro Chapa, Otamendi 4, 3° A, 28039 Madrid, Tel: 91 4506551 (DELEGATE)

José Luis Bahon, C/Canillas 74, 1° C, 28002 Madrid (Home) *or* Real Aero-Club de Espana, Carrera de S. Jeronimo 15, 28014 Madrid, Tel: 34 1 4298534, Fax: 34 1 4297121 (ALTERNATE)

Switzerland Thomas Bosshard, Grunaustr. 2, 8624 Grut,
Tel: 01 932 1036 (Home)
or c/o Swiss Aeroclub, Lidostrasse 5, CH-6006 Luzern
Tel: 41-312121, Fax: 41-311453 (PRESIDENT)

West Germany Klaus Tänzler, Wettlhamerstr. 2, 8157 Dietramszell, Tel: 08024 4811, Fax: 08024 8402 (ALTERNATE)

Zico Franke, Tannenweg 1, 8137 Berg 3, Tel: 089 3800 2801 (OBSERVER)

United States of America Richard Heckman, Am Domstein 9, 5330 Königswinter 1, West Germany, Tel: 0049 2223 1716 (Home), 0049 2203 601 x 3339 (Office) (DELEGATE)

United States of America Dennis Pagen, Rd 2, Box 355P, Bellefonte, PA 16823, Tel: 814 383 2569 (ALTERNATE)

U S S R Vadim Kakurin, Ul. Panfilova 20/5, 125080 Moscow, Tel: 258 4895, Fax: 9430059 (OBSERVER)

Secretary: Noel Whittall, Pine Tree, Layton Lane, Rawdon, Leeds LS19 6RQ, ENGLAND Tel: 0532 504683 (Home) 0532 557846 (Office) Fax: 0532 553971

1 Opening address

The President, Thomas Bosshard, opened the proceedings, welcomed the Delegates, and introduced the Officials of the Commission.

The FAI requirements concerning the appointment of delegates was explained.

The meeting was reminded that although it was necessary to be a Delegate to become an Official of the Commission, others may be appointed to Technical Sub-committees. All Alternate Delegates, Observers and Specialists were welcomed to the meeting.

Fifteen (15) votes were validated.

The French delegate declared proxies from Holland and Poland, but both of these failed to comply with the rules and were declared invalid.

1 Apologies for absence

1.1
Apologies were received from Australia (Bill Moyes), Holland (Aad van Pelt), Hungary (Marton Ordody), India, Poland (Miroslav Rodzewicz), Switzerland (alternate) and Yugoslavia (Zlato Vanic), The Swiss proxy was vote was passed to Great Britain.

2 Minutes of last meeting

2.1
Oka (Japan) pointed out that in item 15.2 the date should read 1989 (not 1988), and in item 17.1 the initials should read FFVL, not FFVP.

2.2
The amended minutes were accepted as a true record and signed by the President.

3 Matters Arising

3.1
There were no matters arising which were not covered by the current agenda.

4 Report of the President

4.1
Thomas Bosshard offered his thanks to the Brasilian Aero Club and the Brasilian Hang Gliding Association for organising the meeting. He also thanked all helpers and the secretary for work throughout the year, and to all Delegates for making the journey to be present. He was concerned that many countries took advantage of the work of CIVL without contributing to it. He stressed the importance of attendance and requested all those present to encourage other countries to take part.

4.2
This is a period of great change throughout the world; in some ways the biggest change for two thousand years. This naturally means great changes in the aviation scene, particularly in Eastern Europe. CIVL has retained good contacts with most of the Eastern European countries, and wants to help. In some cases this was difficult because we could not always find out who was in charge. These communication difficulties are reducing and things should be better next year. This was a very interesting period, and in time the changes should be good for flying sport in general.

4.3
There had been two World Championships during the year, and several sub projects. Progress had been made on the CIVL questionnaire, thanks to Walter Neumark (UK), and on pilot certification systems, thanks to Dick Heckman and Per Christian Daehlin. There is still work to be done on these and other things.

4.4
The changes of 1989 were not only in the political arena: in FAI the new Statutes and Sporting codes had been accepted by Council. These reflect the more open and up-to-date style which is better adapted to the need of the sport. Now the Technical Commissions such as CIVL have more influence.

4.5
The paragliding movement (Class 3 hang gliders) had a great impact on CIVL. It is clear that more and more countries are treating the sport seriously and bringing it within the ambit of the FAI. Bosshard is convinced that all hang glider classes belong to the same family and should recieve the same treatment.

4.6
The President was sorry that he had been unable to represent personally the Commission at the General Congress, but that did not indicate a lack of activity in FAI matters. He had been to a meeting of CASI and other FAI bodies, as well as to meetings in Paris and Toulouse concerning the World Air Games.

4.7
New projects were planned for 1990, which would give CIVL a better image and improve public relations, particularly with pilots.

ø Information would be given more freely and press releases would be more frequent.

ø We would work hard to make championships more up-to-date so that they do not lag behind the needs of the sport.

ø We must get more competition pilots involved with CIVL! This is particularly important for Class 3, which is in a relatively early stage of evolution. The meeting was reminded to try to bring experienced competitors as observers or alternate delegates.

Thomas Bosshard concluded his report by inviting the Secretary General of the FAI, Dr Cenek Kepak, to address the meeting.

4a Address from the Secretary General

Dr Kepak opened by echoing Bosshard's words about the democratisation of FAI, and how this had given the technical commissions more power to look after their own matters, provided that the laws and statutes of the Federation are respected.

Problems concerning the participation of hang glider pilots from countries which are not FAI members can now be overcome; Kepak stressed that it is the duty of the Commissions to draw them in and encourage them to contribute to the work. This was now possible, because FAI licences are available to pilots from such countries in a way which overcomes the problems of the past. The new General Section explains how this can be done. The licences may be distributed by the national governing body of any particular branch of sporting aviation, rather than only by the National Aero Club, as in the past. It is still necessary for the NAC to agree to this.

At the last FAI Conference, where this work had been completed, CIVL had been congratulated on its presentation.

Dr Kepak concluded his address by stressing the additional responsibility which now fell upon CIVL and the other technical commissions as a result of the new freer rules. He then responded to questions.

4b Questions

Heckman: What is the position regarding the Olympic Committee?

Kepak: Parachuting has failed in its attempt to enter the Olympics as a demonstration sport at Barcelona. In spite of a huge effort and the expenditure of much money, they had been unsuccessful. However, hang gliding should not give up; although the Olympic Committee will need to change its policy if we are ever to succeed. We should try to be present at the Olympics in any capacity at all - even if not as a full demonstration sport. The Olympics which will almost certainly be held in Athens in 1996 may be our best chance. The parachutists are not giving up in their attempts, and CIVL should not either.

Bosshard: The second World Air Games are planned for Athens in 1995, and this may help with strengthening the Olympic connection.

Heckman: [referring to his activity as Project Leader concerning Olympic Development]: In response to a letter sent to all countries not represented on CIVL, we received 15 replies indicating interest in Olympic involvement. In spite of the negative response from the IOC, we recommend that hang glider interests establish relationships with their own National Olympic Committees, so that if there is ever the chance of joining, we will be prepared worldwide.

5 Current agenda

5.1
The President requested additional items for discussion and proposed changes to the running order. He suggested that the item concerning bids for future championships be moved to an earlier position to allow fuller discussion. He felt that more time should be allowed in the plenary meeting, before topics went to the Working Groups. These groups were also to be given more specific guidelines this year.

Bosshard, (as President) also recommended that we should give consideration to the by-laws concerning the presentation of bids and the conduct of CIVL in general. Accepted as item 10a.

5.2
Heckman (USA) requested Pilot Proficiency be included. Accepted as item 13a.

5.3
Zalewski (France) requested coverage of Section 7 of the Sporting Code. Accepted as item 13b.

5.4
Pendry (UK) requested the Superleague be included. Accepted as item 10a.

5.5
Bosshard (as President) requested expansion of item 10, the Hang Gliding Diploma.

5.6
Working group Chairmen were appointed as follows:

ø Past and future Championships, Classes 1 and 2: John Pendry
ø Past and future Championships, Class 3: Walter Neumark
ø Section 7 of Sporting Code and review of procedures for running CIVL meetings: Ann Welch
ø International licences: Dick Heckman and Per Christian Daehlin

6 Reports from Vice Presidents and Project Leaders

6.1 **Pilot Proficiency Programme**

Heckman reported good progress. Now a full agenda item (13a).

6.2 **Rules of the Air**

Neumark (UK) reported that the matter had been put before OSTIV and a comprehensive reply received. This and an associated questionnaire will be circulated with these minutes.

6.3 **CIVL questionnaire** Neumark reported good progress. Now a full agenda item (13)

6.4 **Eagle Badges**

Paraglider pilots have already made flights which would qualify for the Eagle Gold badge if correctly scrutinised. Neumark reminded the meeting that the British Paragliding Association had stocks of bronze, silver, gold and diamond Eagle badges available which could be provided to other associations at low cost. Details from: BAPC, 18 Talbot Lane, Leicester, LE1 4LR, England.

6.5 **Paragliding Working Group** Chairman - Neumark

As well as the specific items which appear under the appropriate agenda numbers, and the discussion of local regulations for forthcoming pre-world and World Championships, the Paragliding Working Group dealt with the following topics:

ø Attempting to establish a standard scoring system

ø Considering qualifications for entry into competitions

ø Encouraging the use of FAI licences in national competitions

ø Encouraging interest in Eagle badges

ø Recruiting more Observers

6.6 **World Air Games** Bosshard explained the background: in 1987 the FAI decided to support the establishment of a World Air Games, and France volunteered to promote the first Games. The bid as originally accepted was for the event to be held in the region of Grenoble. At this stage all the Technical Commissions, including CIVL agreed to give their support. Unfortunately, due to various reasons, the venue had to be moved, and the region of Midi-Pyrenée was selected; the headquarters now to be in Toulouse.

There were problems, and at one period it appeared that the event may not go ahead. There had been changes in the French Aero Club, which had declared itself unable to proceed. However, these problems are now resolved, and there is great support from the region. Bosshard had met all the French groups involved, including *Airbus Industrie*, *Aerospatiale*, hang glider pilots, department officials, etc. All now very enthusiastic. He had also seen all the proposed sites and was impressed.

The event is to be held in September 1991. Bosshard felt that CIVL can help with the basic concepts, but only if the French Federation can support it in detail; the President of FFVL has been the contact-man between CIVL and the WAG since 1987.

A problem is that the FAI World Paragliding Championships are scheduled to be held around Digne (France) at exactly the same time as the Air Games, and a clash was inevitable. Was there any possibility of moving the site of the Championships to bring it into Midi-Pyrenée, so that it would become part of the Air Games?

Zalewski: FFVL (the French Hang Gliding Association) will support Classes 1 and 2 but cannot move Class 3. Suggest having Class 3 as a demonstration sport. (See also 9a.4 *World Championships*)

Kepak: The object is to bring all aviation sportsmen together and to convince sponsors that we can be taken seriously. If we fail to do this we will be in trouble by the end of the century. Significant sponsorship is close, but our events must be more dramatic; instant results are needed to attract the public. The strength of the bid from Midi-Pyrenée is that they are prepared to finance this first event, so money won't be a big problem. Entry fees will be limited to the equivalent of between $US 140 and $280. The assistance and co-operation of the FFVL is essential.

7 Records and barographs

7.1
Zalewski: re electronic barographs; two instruments have been submitted for approval. One, the *Bräuninger Alto Print*, has been approved. The other, the *ENW Electronic Barograph*, will be submitted to final scrutiny by the committee during the current meeting. [see item at end of this section]. The main point is to approve the method of electronic sealing. Zalewski expressed the hope that more manufacturers would enter the market, as this would keep the prices down. He sees future development of flight recorders which will record x/y co-ordinates from radio or satellite sources. It is not unrealistic to expect that turnpoint photographs may eventually become obsolete.

The year had been rich in the production of records, and more than fifty percent of them were improved upon in the last twelve months. The Class 1 open distance record was now 462 k, and the class 3 record was 69 k, with a claim for 130 k awaiting homologation.

A revised list of established records is to be circulated shortly, and a manual on record-setting procedures is in course of preparation.

A brief question session followed Zalewski's presentation.

Himberger (Austria): The main problem is that it often takes too long in FAI to get homologation, although the delays are often the fault of the National Aero Clubs who first have to process the material. Can we find an easier method?

Zalewski: There are unfortunate delays, sometimes due to the sheer volume of work.

Himberger: It is sometimes a problem to find out who is an FAI Observer.

Bosshard: The CIVL questionnaire addresses the problem of shortage of Observers. The requirements for qualification are not difficult to meet, and all countries are encouraged to recruit more Observers. The problem of delays was very often due to the failure of NACs to send out confirmation of record claims.

Heckman: Reminded the meeting that the final responsibility for ensuring that a flight was correctly observed lies with the pilot.

7.2
Further report after sub-committee had met:

The ENW instrument is now approved. The committee was satisfied that the method of electronic sealing is secure. Attachment to the airframe during a record flight is no longer a requirement. Although there is no practical possibility of the pilot interfering with the recording, it was still felt sensible to advise that the instrument be carried in a position inaccessible to the pilot(s) during flight.

The multiple recordings of which the ENW is capable were considered acceptable.

8 Review of past Championships

8.1 **World Championships, Class 1**, Fiesch, Switzerland. July 1989

In his absence, the Secretary read Marton Ordody's (Chairman of Jury) report which expressed satisfaction with the quality of the organisation and the international goodwill engendered at this event. 34 countries participated, without a single protest. The organisers were congratulated on the event.

Bosshard: Weather problems had made task setting difficult. Weather reporting had played a big part in allowing the event to run at all in the circumstances. The tasks were highly demanding - on the limit some of the time - and as organiser he thanked the teams for the co-operation they had given.

Pendry: The second-last day was dangerous: this prompts the need for a system whereby a task can be cancelled for reasons of pilot safety once it is under way. We need to consider all the consequences; what happens if some pilots complete a task which is later cancelled?

Bosshard: Agrees, and asks the Working Group to make practical suggestions about this.

8.2 **World Paragliding Championships**, Kössen, Austria.

Welch (Chairman of Jury) reported that this was an interesting event which had unfortunately failed to meet the requirements which would allow it to qualify as an FAI Championship. The task setting had not been good, and the weather poor. The closed-circuit tasks which had been chosen were not suitable for the conditions. The launch window had repeatedly been closed too early. The Jury and the competitors gave repeated warnings, but these were not heeded by inflexible organisers.

There had been a number of protests, some of which were upheld. The Jury had worked well, and Mrs Welch felt that they had enjoyed the confidence of the competitors.

Himberger [for the organisation): Not much to add. The Meet Director was unfortunately too new, but I was reluctant to undermine the authority of the Meet Director. Also some problems with rules which were changed and with the original rules. There were also problems with the sporting licences of some competitors.

Himberger stated that although the event had not been a sporting success, it had been a public relations success, with television coverage in 17 countries. It had also been an economic success for the region, which was important to the sport. He had been pleased to receive two cups from H.E. J Samaranch of the International Olympic Committee. He was sorry about the problems with the sporting side of the organisation.

A short discussion of validity of sporting licences followed. Apparently some entrants in the Paragliding Championships had quite openly obtained licences from countries in which they were not domiciled. Bosshard underlined the responsibility of NACs to monitor the issue of licences. It is very difficult to exclude pilots simply because of suspicion that their licences have been improperly obtained. The discussion ended with the Secretary reading out the relevant paragraph from the General Section of the Sporting Code (item 3.7).

Bosshard summed up by thanking organisers everywhere; from his personal experience he knows that it is hard work, but interesting and satisfying.

9a Future Championships: consideration of local regulations

[Secretary's note: The decisions of the relevant Working Groups are included in this minute.]

9a.1 **European Championships**, Yugoslavia, 1990

The trial competition held at Kranska Gora, the proposed competition venue, in summer 1989, had been the subject of a critical report from the British team which competed there. Marton Ordody had since visited the site and contacted the organiser, Zlato Vanic, but his report still highlighted points which must be attended to if the event was to be satisfactory.

The Secretary read out excerpts from both reports.

CIVL had received extensive replies from Zlato Vanic, but it was felt that certain key guarantees were still missing. Bosshard stated that the guarantees given were not enough.

Himberger: If the situation in Yugoslavia is not satisfactory, we could adapt the forthcoming Tyrolean Masters Competition as the European Championship. This offer was recorded.

Bosshard: We should avoid changing if possible, but we must have the guarantees.

9a 1.2
After considerable discussion in the Working Group, it was decided to send an urgent fax to Vanic requesting attention to various points concerning the site development, chairlift operation, proposed tasks and structure of the organisation.

ø Written replies are required by 15 April 1990.

ø If the replies are satisfactory, 2 CIVL-nominated inspectors will visit the site and verify the responses by the first of May 1990.

Failure to receive satisfactory responses to the points above will result in FAI sanction being withdrawn from the competition.

[Secretary's note: the fax was sent on March 24. Satisfactory responses have been received.]

The meeting accepted the recommendation not to transfer the Championship at this late stage. Voting was unanimous.

9a.2 **Female World Championships**, Kossen 1991

Himberger announced that he planned to add Class 3 (paragliders) to the existing Class 1 competition. In view of a decision taken by the Working Group considering paragliding championships, this was rejected. He stated that the numbers which were likely to compete in Class 1 alone were not likely to be economically attractive, and that CIVL should seek ways of increasing the numbers or there would be difficulty in finding organisers for events.

The entry fee for the Championships would be in the region of 10,000 Schillings.

The Working Group chaired by Renata Maria Small (Brasil), gave basic approval to the local regulations. The next version is to be sent to CIVL Bureau 30 days after the pre-world contest in 1990, and the final version to be approved by December 1 1990.

9a.3
World Championships, Class 1 and 2, Brasil, 1991

The Working Group chaired by Pendry produced the following recommendations:

9a.3.1 Teams to consist of 4 pilots. The countries whose national teams have scored in the top 10 in either of the previous 2 World Championships are to be allowed to enter 6 pilots, but must nominate the 4 who are to score for the team before the first round of the competition. The object of this rule is to keep the number of competitors to manageable proportions.

9a.3.2 Pilots who fail to make the cut will have their score averaged at that point and added to the team score.

9a.3.3 There will be no guest teams.

9a.3.4 Contest dates to fall between Feb 25 and 18 March. To be finalised within 2 weeks.

9a.3.5 Entry fee not to exceed $US 500. This will include a second competition for pilots excluded by the cut.

9a.3.6 There will be 2 groups in the opening rounds of the competition; each to use the same site, but at different times.

9a.3.7 The cut will be made according to the rule used in Australia in 1988. This results in a cut after approximately half the flying days.

9a.3.8 Pilots will be seeded according to the opinion of the nations entering them. Seeding lists will be on display during practice, and will be liable to challenge.

9a.3.9 A slight change to the scoring system will mean that speed points will be modified x 3, not x 2 as in the Alternativa competition.

9a.3.10 Prize money will be paid down to 15th place.

9a.3.11 Bosshard requested that organisers of these and other future championships discontinue the use of nicknames alone on programmes and results lists. Also, the glider type should be specified whenever possible so that there was benefit to the manufacturers.

The final version of the local regulations is to be approved by the CIVL bureau.

These proposals were accepted by unanimous vote.

9a.4
Paragliding World Championships, 1-15 September 1991

9a.4.1 Zalewski reported that preparations were well under way. Big site improvements involving a spend of approximately Ffr 3,000,000 had been made. The local regulations were prepared and a pre-world competition was to be held in 1990.

Neumark had inspected the sites and gave a very positive report. Everything was satisfactory and prepared well in advance. Further road and parking improvements are promised Mt Coussons. The 1990 French Nationals are to become a pre-world trial event, with the participation of 60 French and 60 foreign contestants.

Bosshard raised the problem that FAI wished the Championship to be part of the World Air Games, but that would mean a change of sites.

Zalewski: It would now be very difficult to move because of commitments from local authorities. All sites had the opportunity to bid in good time. Midi Pyrenée did not apply at the right stage. Everything had been done to comply with the FAI requirements. To change now would be very hard and make it very difficult for future organisers.

It was agreed that the local regulations are to be approved in the same way and to the same time-scale as those for KÖssen (See 9a.2).

The meeting decided by unanimous vote to maintain their decision to hold the World Championships in the Digne region.

9a.5
During discussion the question of prize money arose. Some delegates were of the impression that the FAI did not permit the award of prize money in Championships. Kepak and Bosshard clarified the position:

Prize money is permitted. CIVL neither encourages nor discourages it at any particular event.

9b Bids for future championships

Secretary's note: see Annexe 1 for current CIVL Standing Procedures on the presentation of bids.

9b.1 Avoidance of clashes between Class 1/2 championships and Class 3 championships.

The paragliding working group put forward a recommendation that Class 3 World Championships should be held during alternate years to Class 1/2 events. After discussion, this was rejected, and a unanimous vote taken for the existing rythm to continue. However, strenuous efforts would be made by CIVL to try and avoid clashes so that pilots will have the opportunity in competing in both categories if they wish.

9b.2 European Championships, Class 1 and 2, 1992

9b.2.1
A provisional bid from Czechoslovakia was considered to have lapsed in the absence of any supporting material or representation.

9b.2.2
Bids from Hungary and Norway were received. The Hungarian bid was presented on their behalf by Whittall (UK), and proposed an aero-tow event. The Norwegian bid by Ole Erik Vognild was for a hill-launch competition based on the Vogo area.

The meeting selected Norway on a vote of 12:2 in favour. Hungary was thanked for offering their services, and interest was expressed in a future tow-launched Championships.

9b.3 World Championships Class 3, Paragliding, 1993

9b.3.1 Provisional bids had been received from Japan (Yoshiki Oka) and Brasil (Pepe Lopes). Both bids remain provisional and the meeting requested full written presentations to CIVL at the earliest possible opportunity. Both bidders were requested to continue.

9b.4 World Championships Class 1 and 2, 1993

9b.4.1 France had made a provisional bid for these Championships, but withdrew in favour of the USA bid.

9b.4.2 The meeting received a fully-documented bid presentation by Tom Kreyche on behalf of the USHGA, for a Championship to be held in the Owens Valley. With the honourable withdrawal from France, this was the only bid for the event. When accepting it, Bosshard stressed that only in the most extreme circumstances would a 2-year bid knock out an existing 3-year provisional acceptance.

10 The 1990 Hang Gliding Diploma

10.1 The proposals for the 1990 Diploma were preceded by a short discussion. It was brought to the attention of the delegates that CIVL was one of the few Commissions of the FAI which does not have its own special design of diploma. Everybody in hang gliding is invited to submit designs or suggestions. Bosshard: Should we have 2 diplomas - the second one being for paragliding?

Kepak: There should be more than one diploma, and they could carry names - Lilienthal or Rogallo for example.

Taustrup (Denmark): Are these to be awarded for performance or for general contribution to the sport?

Bosshard: Primarily for general contribution.

It was agreed that CIVL should invite designs for a Hang Gliding Diploma (Classes 1 and 2), and a Paragliding Diploma (Class 3). Delegates are requested to advertise the need for design suggestions and to send all the results to the President or Secretary before the end of 1990.

10.2 Proposal: The 1990 Diploma be awarded to John Carlsen of the Dansk Drageflyver Union. See citation appended to these minutes.

Carried unanimously.

10.3 A proposal had also been received from France, the nominee being André Milewski. Unfortunately this was just too late to be considered for this meeting, but is to go forward for 1991.

10a Amendments and additions to section 7 of the Sporting Code

10a.1 Report of the Working Group chaired by Ann Welch:

Amendments to Section 7:(Paragraph numbers refer to existing Section 7 document)

3.4.10 Change to: **Remote Take off and/or Landing Point**
A pilot may take off from a point remote from the Departure Point and/or land at a point remote from the Finish Point of the flight provided that the Departure and Finish Points are declared and he is properly controlled overflying these Points. Any distance flown prior to the Departure Point or subsequent to the Finish Point is not counted towards the record distance.

4.4.6 Delete 'taking together all the championship tasks in that class'.

4.8 **Stewards**. To now read 'The organisers shall appoint one or more Stewards according to the needs of the championship. They shall be of different nationalities excluding that of the organiser..... 'Stewards must be able to speak a common language - etc', to end of para.

4.32.2 Delete 'One day's high score' and replace with 'Approximately 1/2 the value of the number of rounds flown'.

5.1.2 **Landing witnesses**. Put second paragraph first with change to '2 witnesses'.

5.4 **Barographs**. Refer to *annex 2* (to be produced by John Zalewski). This should include that barographs may be used if approved by CIVL, and that Observers should familiarise themselves with the equipment.

5.2.1.2 **The Radius of the Earth**. Replace with R = 6371 km.

5.6. Add to first paragraph. The sector limit is 1 km from the quadrant apex.

5.8. **Start and Finish Lines**. Start and Finish Lines are gates of maximum 1 km in length either clearly marked on the ground or between two vertical features, with a maximum height of 1000 m. For championships any reduced dimensions shall be stated in the Local Regulations.

Note: The 1987 *Code for Parascending* now replaced by Section 7.

10a.2
Heckman suggested that all applicants for International Sporting Licences should be supplied with a copy of Section 7. It was felt that this was a good idea, but should be up to the individual NACs to arrange if they wished.

11 Aerobatics and dual-flying championships

11.1
Aerobatics were covered in discussion and the conclusion reached by consensus.

Welch: We must decide whether we want to deal with this in CIVL or if it should go to the Aerobatic Commission.

Oka: Does any manufacturer produce an aerobatic hang glider?

Pendry: There are no gliders which are certified for aerobatics; I do not think that manufacturers are interested in building or attempting to certify such gliders at present.

Zalewski: Aerobatics should always be performed over water.

Neumark: Aerobatics has led to sailplanes which are no good as gliders! [voices of dissent]

Heckman: We would require gliders to be certified for aerobatics.

Whittall: This Commission should consider if there is a demand from the pilots; if there is, we must address it. Kepak: When the Sailplane Commission people announced that they were interested in aerobatics, 18 manufacturers declared an interest in producing aircraft.

Lopes: Brasil would be interested in promoting an aerobatic championship.

Conclusion:

The CIVL Bureau, with the assistance of Zalewski, are to produce relevant papers at the next meeting, and solicit information meanwhile. The USA delegation were asked to send sample documents from the Telluride competition to either Zalewski or Whittall.

11.2 Dual flying

The following points were cleared in the course of open discussion:

Zalewski: Can we have dual flying championships? - Yes

Mollison (Australia): Can we have dual flying classes in championships? - Yes

Bosshard: It is now up to an organiser to bid.

12 South African Participation in World Hang Gliding Championships

Paul Thomas (South Africa) outlined the changes that were occurring in his country and expressed the hope that soon there would be no obstacles to full participation in international competitions. He appreciated the efforts that the organisers of the Championships in Fiesch had made to allow pilots from South africa to compete as guests.

13 CIVL Questionnaire, Newmark commented that he appreciated that many respondents may have been irritated by the length of this document, but it was all necessary. The main object was to counter the possible effects of 'harmonisation' of flying rules throughout the European Community. This harmonisation could be implemented as early as 1992, and if the bureaucrats chose the easy way of simply applying the most restrictive rules of the member countries, the result will be a very serious overall restriction in our freedom to pursue our sport.

When the proposals were first announced, it was thought that they aplied only to commercial flying operations, but it is now clear that they apply to all flying.

The analysis of the responses will be used to influence the Council of Europe and the European Parliament. Eight replies had been received at the time of the meeting, with others promised shortly. The results of the survey will be published via FAI.

Kepak: It is the duty of the FAI to help everybody with hang gliders and paragliders; CIVL should consider preparing a paper which would help any country to develop these sports as well as possible.

13a Pilot Proficiency

13a.1
Safe Pro/Para Pro training programmes

The Working Group chaired jointly by Heckman and Daehlin considered the new versions of the Safe Pro and Para Pro produced by the Hang Gliding section of the Norwegian Aero Club. Both documents were thought to be most satisfactory, and only a few insignificant changes were proposed. The Group particularly appreciated the input from the Spanish Delegate and Alternate, and congratulated the Norwegians on their excellent production.

Following the recommendation of the working group, Para Pro and the new version of Safe Pro were unanimously adopted by CIVL.

13a.2
International Pilot Proficiency Identification

Heckman produced sample designs in a number of sizes. After discussion, the Group recommended a card which will be folded once to be the size of a credit card. It will almost certainly be in full colour on one side at least, and designed to a high standard.

The gradings will be based on the 'Pro' ratings, and the issuing countries will mark the card accordingly. In cases where the stages of a country's rating system do not correspond exactly with the Pro system, the card should be marked with the nearest lower Pro stage. The same card will be capable of carrying both Safe Pro and Para Pro ratings.

Tow ratings are not to be indicated separately because there are so many different tow systems worldwide that a checkout before flight is almost always essential.

The group were grateful for the offer of sponsorship of the card from a prominent magazine, but the Meeting voted in favour of a card which would bear no commercial advertising at all. (3:2 against, 9 abstentions)

Vognild expressed a preparedness to assist with the production of the card, and indicated that there was a possibility that start-up finance would be available.

Whittall is investigating the possibility of discounts being available to cardholders on cable-cars, ski-lifts and flight parks. Initial results are very encouraging. The Working Group, led by Vognild, is to become a sub-committee to produce the card. Basic design to be finalised later in 1990, for final approval by the Bureau.

13b Superleague

Pendry introduced the concept of the Superleague, which is to be a series of competitions for top pilots. He stressed that the object was not to undermine FAI championships. The Superleague had been started in response to requests from many world-class pilots, and had been set up quite quickly. Three events were planned for 1990, and possibly four or five in subsequent years.

President is Brian Milton (UK), and the Director of the overall series is Matthew Whittall (UK).

Pendry's request that Superleague rounds be recognised as FAI First or Second Category events, assuming that all FAI requirements are met, was approved by the Meeting with a unanimous vote.

14 Recognition of eligibility of records and badge flights made by powered foot-launched hang gliders of all classes

Although a request for discussion had been received, no paper had been presented to the meeting, so the subject was deferred until 1991. Before the meeting moved on to next business, Zalewski expressed the opinion that if power was used only as a way of gaining height initially and glide performance then became the only consideration, we may be able to find a way of accommodating such claims.

The Records sub-committee will produce a paper in time for the 1991 CIVL meeting.

15 Elections

Following elections conducted according to FAI rules, the following officers of the commission were elected:

President: Thomas Bosshard (Switzerland)

Vice Presidents: Richard Heckman (USA), Ole Erik Vognild (Norway), Marton Ordody (Hungary)

Secretary: Noel Whittall (UK)

Assistant Secretary: Renata Maria Small (Brasil)

Secretary, Section 7: Ann Welch (UK)

Chairman of Working sub-committees:

Hang gliding, Class 3 (Paragliding): Walter Neumark (UK)

Hang Gliding Class 1: Marton Ordody (Hungary)

Hang Gliding Class 2: Denis Pagen (USA)

Records and Barographs: John Zalewski (France)

Pilot Proficiency Card: Ole Erik Vognild (Norway)

16 Other business

16.1 Transponders

Bedding (UK) expressed concern at a letter from André Dumas, former FAI President and delegate to ICAO, which appeared in FAI Bulletin number 127, page 6. This apparently supports the widespread use of transponders. A very brief discussion established that CIVL does not support the use of transponders to control airspace.

16.2
Bosshard stressed the need for more paraglider representatives in CIVL, and stressed willingness of CIVL to do all it can to promote this class of the sport with as much vigour as possible.

17 Date and venue of next meeting

The next meeting is to be in Switzerland, in early April 1991. It will take place over a Friday, Saturday and Sunday, the exact dates to be advised in due course.

NW 2.04.1990

Annex 1

CIVL STANDING PROCEDURES

1 Championship Bids

Timescale for World and Continental Championships

3 years in advance. Preliminary Notice of Bid should be in writing with personal presentation and supported by a letter of confirmation of bid from the NAC. It should include information on arrangements for pre-worlds or rehearsal competition. This 3 year notice is advisable but not mandatory. If not made the bid must comply directly with the 2 year bid requirements below.

2 years in advance. Fully detailed bid presented personally, at the CIVL meeting, plus a letter of support from the local authority of the area in which the event is to be held. Presented in writing should be as much information as possible as listed in 4.7.1., and the draft local regulations.

The Meet Director should be present and, for Worlds, if possible a senior representative of the Local Authority. For Continentals the representative need only attend when the event is in the continent of the NAC making the bid.

The bid must be accompanied by a site report from a nominated CIVL inspector if the site or organiser is new. As with all other expenses related to the bid, the cost of the site report is the responsibility of the organiser.

It is only on a fully detailed bid that CIVL will make a firm decision.

1 year in advance. Presentation of the Local Regulations, Entry forms, financial and media arrangements and names of key officials.

Note that 'Years in Advance' means the normal annual CIVL meeting in that year. All written bid information must be received by FAI headquarters for inclusion in the agenda 2 months prior to the meeting. A copy of the documents must be sent to the President.

Note 2 Future organisers should take advantage of existing events to put up a display about their forthcoming championship, and if possible, bring their local authority representative and sponsor to visit.

2 Arrangements for CIVL Meetings

All items requiring discussion or decision to be received by FAI/CIVL for inclusion in the agenda two months prior to the date of the meeting. Items not so received will not be accepted for discussion except in an emergency or by a vote of Commission delegates. A copy of the documents must be sent to the President. Reports from Sub-committees detailing progress during the past year may be submitted in advance of the meeting, or circulated at the meeting; in either case, written reports are required.

The Bureau appreciates the willingness of many countries to host CIVL meetings. The following points are intended to ensure that the meetings run smoothly:

If the meeting is to be held outside Paris (FAI Headquarters), the organisers shall:

ø cover the expenses of a representative from FAI HQ

ø arrange hotel availability for delegates

ø arrange meeting rooms and any required equipment. All rooms and accommodation should be reached easily by public transport. The expense of the meeting rooms is the responsibility of the organisers.

ø if possible arrange a reception or social event whereby delegates have the opportunity to meet local authorities and/or local clubs or fliers.

ø Organisers are expected to assist as far as possible with local travel arrangements between airport/station etc, and the venue of the meeting.

ø General information concerning the venue etc, for circulation to members, must be sent to the Secretary of CIVL at least 3 months before the meeting.

The rules of the proceedings of CIVL meetings are explained in Chapter 5 of the 1990 By-laws to the FAI Statutes.

PROPOSITION FOR A PARAGLIDING OR HANG GLIDING COMPETITION IN THE FORM OF A "RALLY"

Concept

A large number of competitors attempt to fly defined tasks at any time during the competition period. The tasks are graded to include easy, intermediate and difficult challenges.

According to the number of different tasks completed, the pilot is awarded a gold, silver or bronze medal, or at the lowest level, a certificate.

There is no individual or team winner.

Multiple launch sites may be used. The pilot can choose to fly any task on any day.

All task recording is photographic. Each take-off point has an identification board (changed before the start of flying each day), which is photographed before the pilot launches. Turnpoints etc are then photographed in the normal way to establish the task flown, and a sign-off board, bearing the name or number of the task claimed is photographed after the pilot has landed, but on the same day.

The tasks are designed so that any competent entrant could expect to win a bronze medal, but gold winners would have to be top-grade advanced pilots.

As the rally is visualised, in a 10-day event probably 7 completed tasks would qualify for gold, 5 for silver and 3 for bronze. If desired, certificates could be given to all who complete a single task.

Advantages

This format can handle a very big entry quite easily. Entry is not restricted to elite pilots. The flying skills of the competitors will be extended by participating. The sheer size of the entry should attract media attention.

It is simple to control the numbers on the sites by setting the more difficult tasks at the smaller sites etc. An entry of several hundred may be anticipated if there is good pre-publicity. This will generate a large sum in entry fees, and will be popular with hoteliers etc.

Because this style of event should perfectly fulfil the aim of bringing large numbers of sporting aviators together, it would be ideal to use as the paragliding component of the World Air Games.

Extras

If desired, some tasks could be laid out as FAI triangles, so that competitors, if they wished, could attempt records. Naturally this requires the provision of timing facility: with this, simple duration tasks can be included, such as 1-hour or 5-hour duration.

An added attraction of this event is that it should improve the skill of the participants, and because there are no 'winners', the competitors will tend to help each other more than in an orthodox competition.

Noel Whittall

26.3.1990

NOEL WHITTALL
PINE TREE
LAYTON LANE
RAWDON, Nr. LEEDS
W. YORKSHIRE LS19 6RQ
0532-504683

Organisation Scientifique at Technique International du Vol à Voile

Training and Safety Panel

RIGHT-OF-WAY RULES - HILL SOARING

Introduction

In 1988 the International Hang Gliding Committee (IHGC - previously Commission Internationale de Vol Libre - CIVL) wrote to the President of OSTIV requesting a review of the hill soaring rules. This was considered at the OSTIV Board meeting at Wiener Neustadt and the Training and Safety Panel were requested to consider the subject. The harmonisation of the different European and UK/USA rules as a principle would have to be considered by the governing bodies (Aero Clubs/Gliding Federations) in the respective countries. This would probably be on the basis of any recommendation from OSTIV to CIVV (IGC) and if CIVV accepted it.

Considerations

There are two aspects to be considered:

1. The lack of International standardisation of the basic Rules.
2. The problems which occur when there is mixed traffic, for example, gliders, hang gliders and paragliders.

In the IHGC letter it was suggested that in reviewing the rules ". . . .the wide difference in performance (speed, sink rate, manoeuvrability, field of view, etc) should be taken into account."

General Collision-avoidance Rules

The accepted rules for converging, overtaking and approaching head-on are international. However, the additional rules for ridge soaring are not included in the Rules of the Air (UK Rules of the Air and ATC Regulations) except (in the UK) to allow a glider to overtake another glider on the left or right.

The Ridge-soaring Rules

1. In the UK these are:

   a) that all turns are made away from the ridge and

   b) that the overtaking glider should pass between the other glider and the ridge.

It is understood that these same rules also apply in the USA.

2. In Europe the rules are different:

   a) "never turn towards the hill;

b) always overtake on the valley-side (never between the slower aircraft and the slope);

c) where there are several sailplanes slope-soaring and two meet head-on, the pilot who has the hill on the right has priority because he cannot give way to the right). Pilots who have the hill on their left must therefore allow plenty of space for oncoming traffic to pass between them and the hillside.

(From Flying Sailplanes - A Practical Training Manual by Helmut Reichmann)

The fundamental difference are:

(i) the respective overtaking rules which could cause conflicts for pilots trained to use UK rules when flying in Europe (and vice versa) and

(ii) the European rule [2(c)] which applies in practice in the UK but is not a 'written rule'.

Why the Differences?

It is thought that the fundamental difference between the rules for overtaking stem from mountain soaring, that is with the gliders being below the top of the ridge. Also, to stay in the lift the glider may have to be flown very close to the mountain side. Clearly in such circumstances the overtaking glider must comply with 2(b) above.

Similarly, when gliders are approaching head-on, it is impossible for the glider with the hill/mountain on its right to alter course to the right. This gives the basis for 2(c).

The Rationale - Overtaking

The extent to which the mountain soaring rules are appropriate to hill soaring (where the gliders are above the hill) is open to question. In this situation it may be preferable to overtake between the other glider and the hill, 1(b) to avoid a potential conflict if the glider being overtaken turns (away from the hill - 1(a) and 2(a). It would obviously not be sensible to have one rule for below the hill-top and one for above it. Therefore, the only question is - "is the European overtaking rule regarded as satisfactory?" - to which the answer is probably "Yes!" unless any review of it has been considered. This leads to one possible solution in the interest of harmonisation which is:

- to get acceptance of the European Overtaking Rule by the BGA (UK), SSA (USA) (and any other countries).

This seems unlikely if the national associations do not think there is anything wrong with their existing rules.

The Rationale - Approaching Head-On

There should not be a problem with a general acceptance of European Rule 2(c) internationally. This might be simplified to:

- the glider with the hill on its right has right of way or
- the glider with the hill on its left must give way.

In practice a ridge soaring pattern often tends to be set up on this basis which on a westerly-facing ridge gives priority to traffic heading North.

Other Problems

Other problems arise with a mix of traffic, especially with modern high-performance gliders and hang gliders or paragliders. The most difficult situation to resolve is when the slower moving aircraft is 'hovering', that is stationary over the ground. In this situation the faster aircraft has to give way to the slower aircraft each time it passes. The difficulties may be critical when the area of lift is limited and the height separation is minimal. The worst case is when the glider can no longer stay airborne because of flying out of the lift too often. There are other aspects in this potential conflict.

1. The pilot's field of view is restricted to some extent:

   - for the hang-glider pilot upwards, backward and, too a lesser extent upwards and to the side.
   - for the glider pilot the worst blind spot is forwards and downwards.

   In the hill-soaring case each type is often in the others' blind spots, especially when the glider is slightly higher than the hang-glider.

2. Because of the different speeds of glider and hang gliders/para-gliders the glider is perceived to fly too close when overtaking. In other words the acceptable avoiding distance depends on speed.

   There is no solution to this problem since the pilot of the slower 'aircraft' feels at risk when being overtaken, especially if the view is restricted. The only possible way is to limit the number of aircraft in any given situation.

Possible Solutions

If it is impossible/unlikely that control of the number of gliders and hang-gliders or para-gliders in any given ridge soaring situation can be achieved then the only solution is a change in the existing rules.

Where conflicts exist adequate separation between different types of traffic should be based on 'good airmanship' which would qualify the existing rules as follows:

- Never fly sufficently close to another aircraft so as to cause its pilot concern for his safety;
- Never fly in the 'blind spots' of another aircraft;
- Always make allowance for the performance of the slower 'glider', its lack of acceleration, ability to make use of small areas of lift and the smaller radius of turn (due to its low speed).
- Avoid conflict with the ridge pattern by not 'S'-turning or circling unless well clear of other traffic.

Such basic points of airmanship assume some understanding of different aircraft types' performance but to make them into Rules would be very difficult. The only conceivable way to reduce the conflict (if, indeed, it exists) would be to revise the right of way rules. For example:

- Gliders give way to hang-gliders and para-gliders;
- Hang-gliders give way to para-gliders.

Since a glider is defined as 'a non-power driven, heavier than air aircraft' all three categories (glider, hang-gliders and para-gliders) can must be classified as 'gliders'.

Before considering any possible changes it is necessary to find out to the extent of the problem and if any solutions have been tried which work. The following questionnaire is to find out the nature and extent of any problems.

W.G. Scull,
Chairman, OSTIV-TSP
19.2.90.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HILL SOARING - RIGHT-OF-WAY RULES

Country: . . . . . Name: . . . . . .

Which hill-soaring rules apply in your country?: UK/European*

Is there any conflict between glider, hang-gliders or para-gliders?: YES/NO*

If 'YES' give details: . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

What attempts have been made to resolve the conflicts?: . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Why did the conflict occur?:

Over-crowding by one category of aircraft: YES/NO*

Incompatability due to speed differences: YES/NO*

Incompatability due to different patterns' flown: YES/NO*

Any other reasons (give details): . . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

. . . . . .

Is there any liaison between the Associations representing the different interests (gliding, hang-gliding, para-gliding)?:

At national level?: YES/NO*

At local (club) level?: YES/NO*

Notes

1. For example, 'S' turns, circling or hovering.

* Delete as applicable.

Please return to W.G. Scull, 6 Will Hall Close, Alton, Hants. SU34 1QP, U.K.

wgs/20.2.90

ANNEX 1

Dansk Drageflyver Union

Formand:
Torben Taustrup
Baldrianvej 22,
8240 Risskov
Tlf.: 86 17 34 67

C.I.V.L. SECRETARY
NOEL WHITTALL
PINE TREE, LAYTON LANE
RAWDON
LEEDS LS6 3QH
GREAT BRITAIN

RISSKOV 16-12-89

ITEM: FAI HANG GLIDING DIPLOMA 1990

DANISH HANGGLIDERS UNION (DDU) HEREBY NOMINATE JOHN CARLSEN FOR THE FAI HANG GLIDING DIPLOMA 1990.
JOHN CARLSEN HAS FOR THE PAST 10 YEARS BEEN AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE DHU LEADERSHIP, AND IN THIS FUNCTION HE HAS ACCOMPLISHED QUITE A LOT.
DURING THE YEARS JOHN HAS BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOLING OF NEW PILOTS AT TWO ANNUAL CAMPS. ALSO AS SECRETARY JOHN HAS BEEN THE "INGINE" IN MANY MATTERS, BOTH IN CONNECTION WITH THE DANISH SPORTS FEDERATION (DIF), AND THE DANISH AERO CLUB (KDA). IN BOTH CASES JOHN HAS IMPROVED THE UNIONS POSITION IN A POSITIVE WAY.
FOR ONE YEAR (1988-1989) JOHN WAS CHAIRMAN IN DDU AND WAS SALUTED BY STANDING OVATION THE DAY HE RESIGNED.
JOHN IS 50 YEARS OLD, AND IS STILL AN ACTIVE PILOT.
WE REGARD JOHN AS ONE OF THE PIONEERS IN DANISH HANG GLIDING, AND AS SUCH, WE THINK THAT HE DESERVES THE FAI DIPLOMA, WHICH IN THIS CASE WILL BE THE FIRST GIVEN IN DENMARK.

Torben Taustrup

TORBEN TAUSTRUP
DELEGATE DENMARK