



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*

Minutes

of the
Annual Meeting
of the
FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

Held in Varese, Italy
Friday 7th and Saturday 8th March 2014

Ver. 0.3/ 02 May. 2014

*Maison du Sport International
Av. de Rhodanie 54
CH-1007 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*

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

1. Opening

Representatives for the Varese Tourism Office and the meeting organiser Mrs Margherita Acquaderni welcomed the meeting participants to the Varese region, stating how important the sport of gliding is to the region.

Companions were invited to see the region during the meeting and all meeting participants and companions were invited to dine in the local gliding club on Saturday evening.

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

The President welcomed the Delegates to the 2014 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked the Italian hosts, especially Mrs Acquaderni for the invitation to come to Varese.

A special welcome was given to Ms. Susanne Schödel, newly appointed Secretary General of the FAI. Ms. Schödel is an active glider pilot, twice World Champion and well known to many IGC delegates.

1.1 Roll Calls

Mr Visa-Matti Leinikki, representing the FAI Head Office, called the roll. It was determined that 33 votes were present including 3 proxies (from Ireland to the UK, from Norway to Sweden and from Latvia to Lithuania), thus 17 votes would be required for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 22 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

Mr Leinikki again called the roll at the beginning of the second day, Saturday 2nd March. There were still 33 votes present.

1.2 Administrative Matters

Mr Tor Johannessen and Mr Wolfgang Weinreich were appointed to oversee the counting of ballots during the meeting. The FAI electronic voting system was used for secret ballots.

1.3 Conflict of Interest

The President asked the meeting participants to declare any conflicts of interest, which was done.

2. Minutes of previous meeting, Papendal 1st and 2nd March 2013

The Secretary presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Papendal 1st and 2nd March 2013.

One comment had been received in advance from Mr Rick Sheppe, noting that Mr Ax, Chairman of the Annex A Committee, spoke against the proposal of Agenda 9.2.5, Change of Observation Zone. This had not been correctly recorded.

With the above remark, the minutes were unanimously approved. A revised version of the Minutes of the 2013 IGC meeting has been uploaded to the FAI web.

3. IGC President's report

The IGC President referred to the report circulated before the meeting and had nothing to add.

The President's report was unanimously approved.

4. FAI Matters

The new FAI Secretary General Susanne Schödel first took the floor and thanked those present for the warm welcome

"I am aware that this is a job with many challenges but also opportunities, a job with a wide range of activities. I am a glider pilot, a Woman's World Record holder, with 16 years of experience working in non-profit organisations, managing a mix of voluntary people and paid staff.

I also know how it is to be in a political organisation. I have been member of the local City Council.

Air Sport is often about equipment and sporting rules, but FAI is also about promotion of the sports, environment and regulations. I think we can learn a lot from each other, between the air sports.

The Red Bull Air Race is entertainment and fascination with a lot of public interest, The Solar Impulse project is another type of activity with FAI involvement. Highly skilled people manage these activities in a very professional way. FAI and the NACs can learn a lot from working with these organisations

4.1 Update from FAI

Mr Visa-Matti Leinikki, the FAI IT Manager, reported that the 2013 FAI finances showed a surplus of about 13.000 CHF, whereas the 2014 budget had a 70.000 CHF deficit.

The income from Commercial activities was however increasing through new Sponsorship and Partnerships.

A new accounting system (ABACUS) was in place and together with a new Western Union payment system, tailored to international federations, trials to reduce banking transaction costs were undertaken.

A strategy for the partnership with Breitling was in place. The cooperation with Red Bull Air Races would restart in 2014 with FAI as a service provider to Red Bull on safety.

The FAI IT Service Centre is now able to host Air Sports Commission (ASC) websites at no cost. The full control of web sites remains with the ASC.

A new e-mail system, videoconferencing, E-voting, Online registration, forms, surveys and Online streaming of events are available for the ASC.

FAI Sporting License Management is already online on the FAI website under "About FAI". It is mandatory to use the system in 2014 and only Sporting Licenses entered into the new system are considered valid.

Make sure your NAC has uploaded their Sporting License data.

On the Anti-doping side, the 2013 experiences were good. No significant problems were encountered.

In 2014 CIA, CIACA, CIVL, IGC, IPC are part of the Out of Competition testing. Pilots have been selected and are already informed.

Anti-Doping Manager Mrs Ségolène Rouillon, (antidoping@fai.org) is available if there are any questions about anti-doping.

Mr Leinikki stressed the need for those competitors taking medication to get a Therapeutic Use Exemption (TUE) before the competition to avoid being caught for doping.

Mr Mozer thanked FAI for the update and wished Ms Schödel success in her new position, and added that he hoped she would continue as active gliding pilot.

5. Finance

The 2013 Financial statement and 2014 budget are available for download at the FAI web.

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2013 Financial Statement

The IGC Treasurer Mr Dick Bradley presented the 2013 Finance Report and the 2014 budget and apologised for the very late publication of the figures, caused by illness in the FAI office but also because the figures were based on FAI's new financing practices.

The 2013 report showed an income of 45.460€, 8.000€ higher than budget. The expenditure was slightly lower than budget so overall a very satisfactory result, even though the reserves were reduced with about 5.000€.

Mr Bradley noted that IGC officials were doing a tremendous amount of work at very low cost.

There were no questions to the Financial Report that was unanimously accepted by the meeting

5.2 2014 Budget

The Treasurer presented the budget for 2014.

The budget indicated a good financial position.

A new initiative from FAI is that from now on IGC can have access to its' own account. The IGC Bureau had decided to accept the offer, which will expedite payment and reduce workload at the FAI office and also give more visibility to IGC on the current financial situation.

6. Reports not requiring voting

(All received reports are available for download on the FAI web-site)

6.1 OSTIV report

The OSTIV President, Mr. Loek Boermans, presented his report.

In addition to the written report, Mr Boermans reported that the Active Members of OSTIV, present at this IGC meeting, were invited by letter for a brief Extraordinary OSTIV General Conference at a suitable time during the days of this meeting (approved by the Bureau) in order to vote on some changes of the OSTIV Constitution and on the increase of the annual subscription fees of two categories of members. However, due to a lack of the required quorum of 2/3 of the Active Members having paid their subscription fee, this conference had to be cancelled.

Mr Boermans took the opportunity to congratulate Prof. Dr. Zafer Aslan, chairman of the OSTIV Meteorological Panel, with the FAI Paul Tissandier Diploma for her enormous work and many contributions to the science of meteorology, often in relation to aeronautics and gliding.

Finally, Mr Boermans mentioned that he intended to step down in 2 years, after 19 years as president of OSTIV.

6.2 Standing Committees

6.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3D Report and 2014 version

Mr Ross Macintyre reported that the length of the written report did not correctly reflect the amount of work that had been undertaken. It had been the busiest year he could remember. With reference to the intended simplification of the Sporting Code, he admitted that there could have been more dramatic simplifications, but delegates tended to prefer the current approach.

6.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3C, Annex A

Mr Rick Sheppe had nothing to add, he thanked the members of the Working Group for their support

6.2.2.a Sporting Code Section 3C, Annex A Handicaps

Mr Christof Geissler had nothing to add. He also thanked the members of the Handicap Committee for their work.

6.2.3 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex D (Brian Spreckley)

Mr Brian Spreckley mentioned that there had been quite a lot of changes over the last year. These changes would be discussed later during the meeting. Paul Crabb is now managing the Ranking List. Mr Spreckley thanked Keith Nicholson for all the work he had been doing over the last 10 years.

The Ranking list has been moved to the FAI server, which had caused some problems and periods where access to the Ranking List was not possible.

6.2.4 Air Traffic, Navigation, Display Systems (ANDS) Report (B. Smith)

Mr Bernald Smith said that after 45 years in CIVV and IGC and being 87 years old, he wanted to step back as Chairman of the ANDS Committee – but he would not promise not to continue to take part in the debate. He asked IGC to find a new Chairman for the Committee.

Mr Smith received a standing ovation from the meeting.

6.2.5 GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Committee (GFAC) Report (Ian Strachan)

Mr Ian Strachan and Mr Angel Casado were re-elected for 3 years.

Mr Strachan reported that 45 Flight Recorders from 17 manufactures now were approved by IGC.

When the procedures for High Altitude Flight Recorders were adopted, a condition concerning SOLAR radiation was put in Sporting Code 3, para 4.5.3.d. This was put in as a precaution. We now know more, having consulted ICAO and FAA, and we will now propose to delete this paragraph, as we have no evidence of GPS radiation errors in IGC files.

The proposal was unanimously adopted by the meeting.

6.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report

Mr Dick Bradley reported that a new Stewards Group had been formed. The group will work with the Championship Management Group on aspects related to competition management. The first action was

to build up a database with useful information and documentation for stewards and Competition Managers.

Mr Tor Johannessen suggested having a similar forum for jury presidents.

6.3 Working Groups

6.3.1 Continental Records

Mr Hans Obermayer thanked the working group for its work, 30 record claims had been completed and the system was up and running. The Working Group had completed its tasks and it had been agreed with the IGC Bureau to discontinue the WG.

It was agreed that one task remained, to integrate the new records with the minimum requirements in order to have to consult only one list when looking for minimum requirements for a new record.

6.3.2 Country Development

Mr Alexander Georgas had nothing to add to the written report

6.3.3 History Committee

Mr Tor Johannessen apologised that no report had been published before the meeting and asked the meeting for volunteers to join the WG.

Mr Mozer responded that history is half of our life, and our heritage. We owe to the future the fascination of our sport and the Gliding Commission. There are many good ways to share and keep this material including stories and photos.

6.3.4 Scoring Software Testing

Mr Rick Sheppe apologised that no written report had been published. The WG had not been very active in 2013. Mr Sheppe thanked Peter Ryder for the work he had done reporting problems collected from scorers, stewards and jurors.

6.3.5 Safety

There was no written report. Mr René Vidal reported that The Safety Group had struggled to understand the aim of the group. The overall goal was of cause reduction of accidents, to increase safety, but the safety word is badly used. Improved behaviour is the most important goal, to create a safety culture.

The work will continue. The group had started collecting data through steward's reports, including incidents, in cooperation with OSTIV and EGU. Another task was to create tools and safety material, videos, documents.

6.4 IGC Representatives

6.4.1 CASI Report (FAI Air Sport General Commission)

Mr Johannessen had nothing to add to the written report

6.4.2 EGU/EASA

Mr Patrick Pauwels referred to the detailed report. The 2014 annual meeting was held in Luxembourg.

6.4.3 Environmental Commission Report (Bernald Smith)

Mr Smith had nothing to add to the written report.

6.4.4 FAI Medical Commission

Dr Jürgen Knüppel gave a presentation on the work undertaken to revert the rules for use of oxygen.

EASA has copied the ICAO rules for use of oxygen, meaning that the Pilot in Command must carry and breathe oxygen from 10.000 ft.

EASA has accepted to reconsider the rule and the FAI Medical Commission is now providing the evidence to EASA that the rules for use of oxygen safely can be changed.

The aim is to reach a situation where, with the implementation of required guidance, education and self-control by the NAC, operation up to 15.000 ft without oxygen can be approved.

6.4.5 On-Line Contest Report

Mr Geissler had nothing to add to the written report.

6.5 IGC Specialists

6.5.1 Trophy Management

Mrs Marina Vigorito had nothing to add to the written report

6.5.2 IGC Journalists

No report

7. Championships (Dick Bradley)

7.1 Past & Future Championships

Mr Bradley thanked the organisers of last year's Championships. All steward reports had been received and analysed by the Steward's group and the Bureau.

7.1.1 7th FAI Womens's World Gliding Championships, Issoudun, 2013, France

Nothing to report

7.1.2 8th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2013, Leszno, Poland

Nothing to report

7.1.3 17th FAI European Gliding Championships, Vinon, France (Flapped Classes)

Nothing to report

7.1.4 17th FAI European Gliding Championships 2013, Ostrow, Poland (Un-flapped Classes)

Nothing to report

7.1.5 33rd FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Leszno, Poland (Flapped classes)

Mr Artur Rutkowski reported that preparations have progressed as planned. The staff problems encountered earlier had been resolved. Some of the staff from the 2013 competitions would also be present in 2014.

7.1.6 33rd FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Räyskälä, Finland (Club, Std., 20m)

Nothing to report

7.1.7 1st FAI 13.5 Meter Class World Gliding Championships, Pociunai, Lithuania

Mr Vytautas Sabeckis reported that the preparations were progressing well. Support from the government had been secured.

7.1.8 8th FAI Women's World Gliding Championships 2015, Arnborg, Denmark

Mr Øjvind Frank, Alternate delegate from Denmark gave an update on the preparations and mentioned that a pre-world competition was planned in August 2014.

A new Competition Director had been nominated, Mr Peter Eriksen

7.1.9 9th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2015, Narromine, Australia

Mr Terry Cubley, the Australian delegate mentioned that there were a number of training opportunities in the area. They were available from the contest web-site.

7.1.10 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Pociunai, Lithuania (Club, Std., 20m)

Nothing to report

7.1.11 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Benalla, Australia (15m. 18m. Open)

Mr Cubley reported that the Web site would go active during 2014.

7.2 Approval of Competition Officials (Dick Bradley)

7.2.1 Formation of the Stewards Group

See above under item 6.2.6.

7.2.2 Approval of Officials for 2014 Competitions

a. 33rd FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Leszno, Poland (Flapped classes)

Chief Steward: Robert Danewid

Steward: Jaroslav Vach

Jury President: Peter Ryder

Jury Members: Jiri Cihlar

b. 33rd FAI World Gliding Championships 2014, Räyskälä, Finland (Un-flapped Classes)

Chief Steward: Terry Cubley

Steward: Patrick Pauwels

Jury President: Marina Vigorito

Jury Members: Juha Silvennoinen, Janusz Szczupak

7.2.3 Approval of Chief Stewards for 2015 Competitions

a. 8th FAI Womens's World Gliding Championships, 2015, Arnborg, Denmark

Robert Danewid

b. 9th FAI Juniors World Gliding Championships 2015, Narromine, Australia

Brian Spreckley

c. 1st FAI 13.5 Meter World Gliding Championships 2015 , Pociunai, Lithuania

Roland Stuck

d. 18th FAI European Gliding Championships 2015, Rieti, Italy

Dick Bradley

e. 18th FAI European Gliding Championships 2015, Ocseny Hungary

Marina Vigorito

f. 1st FAI Pan-American Championships 2015, Chilhowee, USA

Renato Tsukamoto

7.3 Sailplane Grand Prix

Mr Spreckley reported that Mr Alexander Georgas now was involved in the work on the Sailplane Grand Prix web as well as in the Sailplane Grand Prix (SGP) management group.

"The goal is to adapt the way we organise the SGP to meet media requirements. For the next series of SGP we had 10 bids for the 8 events and the first events are already full with a waiting list. It finally has become a series of events, not single events. All events are promoted through the SGP web portal, and are not any longer scattered all over the internet. We are able to create the heroes and the pilot profiles we need with a one-minute introduction video. Then do interviews to build the personal story."

7.3.1 5th FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championship, Sisteron, France

Mr Spreckley reported: "The Sisteron Aero Expo will be organised around the SGP Final. The nearby commercial shopping centre will have a big screen with live tracking, and a free shuttle bus service will take people from the shopping centre to the airfield. Opening will be with Patrouille de France and air displays are planned for every day."

7.3.2 2014-2015 Qualifying Sailplane Grand Prix

For the 2014-15 series 8 events are planned.

7.3.3 2015 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Final, Varese, Italy

Nothing to report.

7.3.4. IGC/FAME Grand Prix Company

Nothing to report

7.3.5 Proposal to change the class for the Sailplane Grand Prix final in Varese 2015

Mr Spreckley explained that the organisers of the FAI Sailplane Grand Prix Final in Varese had asked to have the competition with 18-meter Class gliders, and asked the meeting if that could be endorsed.

Mr Denis Guerin, Alternate delegate from France: "We do not think it is a good idea to move to the 18-meter Class. We don't know what will happen with the classes in the future."

Mr Mogens Hansen, Danish Delegate: "What will then happen after Varese?"

Mr Spreckley: "This time we did not specify the class in the invitation for bids, but we will do that in the future. In my view the class used in Varese will be the future class."

Mr Reno Filla, Swedish Delegate: "I do not see why we need to determine class for the future now, let us keep the discussion around Varese in 2015."

Mr Christof Geissler: "Will this decision affect the class used for the Qualifying SGPs?"

Mr Spreckley: "No, the class used for the Qualifying SGP is up to the organisers to decide."

Mrs Frouwke Kuipers, Dutch Delegate: "In the Netherlands we do not have 15-meter gliders any more."

Mr Vladimir Foltin, Delegate of the Slovak Republic: "I can support 18 meter in Varese, but I don't like a binding decision for the future. There could be venues where 15 meter is more appropriate. I suggest deciding on Varese only."

Mr Hermann Trimmel, Austrian Delegate: "The main question is still open, what happens if we move away from the 15-Meter Class. Will the class survive?"

Mr René Vidal, Argentinian Delegate: "We have always flown the SGP in the 15-meter Class. We think the 15-meter is best suited for the SGP."

Mr Spreckley: "Mr Foltin has a valid point. Maybe we should limit the decision to the SGP Final in Varese."

It was agreed to vote for the SGP Final in Varese only.

The proposal to fly the SGP Final in Varese in the 18-meter Class was adopted with 28 votes for, 4 votes against and 1 abstention.

7.4 Sailplane Racing web-site (Brian Spreckley)

Mr Spreckley gave an update on the ongoing work on the Sailplane Grand Prix web site.

"The aim is to create value for organisers by providing useful tools, increase quality of event presentation by establishing close working relations with event organisers, create a single broadcast channel for viewers to follow glider racing and do all this through a process that is owned and controlled by the IGC. The First events are the WJGC, WWGC and 13.5-meter WGC. Our focus is first of all to make it work, then to add all Category 1 events, integrate the ranking system and ease of use by event organisers. Next steps will be to add all sanctioned contests, the Ranking List presentation and include commercial partners and advertising. All events now have their own logo based on the SGP logo. We are trying to find a way to recruit people outside gliding to support the commercial development. FAME and other Sports Commissions are invited to take part in the development."

Mr Leinikki added to the presentation from Mr Spreckley that FAI was working on automatic result upload and to link the web site directly to the Sporting Licenses database.

Mr Vidal asked if there still was contact to Mr Mario Hytten.

Mr Spreckley: "I believe Mr Hytten still is trying to raise money. He has made a direct approach to glider pilots, but as far as we know, nothing has happened."

Mr Filla: "Mr Hytten has produced the video "Wings over Sweden". There was some reluctance to fund. A lot of people put money into the project. We have been promised two deliverables, the DVD from the SGP in Chile and a promotional 12-minute film. Right now he has gone underground, but appeared recently and said he had the money to go ahead, but would not continue because not enough people supported it. So basically we did not get anything for the money."

Mr Peter Ryder: "I like the idea of a centralised result service, but it is important that we recover the results from soaring spot or whoever is providing that service."

Mr Geissler: "What if the event organisers want their own website?"

Mr Spreckley: “The homepages are in English and German. The event website can have a local language site if they prefer so. This site may not be good for the local information you want to get out, in which case you may want to run a completely different site for the local public.”

7.5 Presentation of bids for future championships (max. 10 minutes each)

The following bids were presented

7.5.1 9th FAI Women’s World Gliding Championships 2017

- Waikerie, Australia
- Zbraslavice, Czech Republic
- Ferrara, Italy

7.5.2 10th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2017

- Vinon, France
- Pociunai, Lithuania

7.5.3 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017

- Czech Republic (Club, Standard and 20-meter 2-seater class)
- Poland (15m/18m/Open Class) Late bid
- UK (15m/18m/Open Class) Late bid

7.5.4 2nd FAI World 13.5 Meter Class Gliding Championships 2017

- Poland.

7.6 Question to all bid presenters

Mr Patrick Pauwels, Belgian Delegate: “Can France explain why Vinon is a good place for the Junior WGC?”

Mr Guerin: “The Southern Alps have very good weather and we do not have to fly into the high mountains.”

Mr Rick Sheppe, Delegate from USA: “When will we know the dates and how will that be decided?”

Mr Terry Cubley, Australian Delegate: “We are flexible with regard to the dates. The Plenary can decide that.”

8. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

8.1 Year-2 Proposals

8.1.1 Delete the Start Altitude option from Annex A (Annex A Comm.)

Mr Cubley explained the proposal to delete the Maximum Start Height from Annex A of the Sporting Code. Last year the Plenum voted to allow the Organisers to impose a maximum altitude before the start opens, with the provision that any altitude limitation be removed after the opening of the Start.

This Proposal affects Annex A para. 7.4.4 and 8.7

It was also explained that approval of this Year 2 proposal would cause the following changes to Annex A, with an effective date of October 1 2014.

The proposal was adopted with 30 votes for, 2 votes against and 1 abstention.

8.1.2 Delete requirement to communicate Start Times (Annex A Comm.)

The proposal was to delete the requirement to report Start Times to the Organisers.

This Proposal affects Annex A para. 7.4.5, 7.4.6, 8.7

Last year the Plenum voted to delete the requirement to report Start Times to the Organisers. Approval of this Year 2 proposal would cause the following changes to Annex A, with an effective date of October 1, 2014.

Mr Alexander Georgas, Greek Delegate: “This would have a negative effect on our ability to let people follow the race.”

Mr Hansen: “This is the only way the Competition Director can know if pilots have started, and when he can expect to have them home.”

Mr Bradley: “This is opposite to what we discussed yesterday, where we wanted to create more exposure for our sport.”

Mrs Kuipers: “We should reduce workload by allowing Team Captains to mail or SMS the Start times.”

Mr Filla: “One of the reasons for this proposal is that pilots can be penalised for things they have not done. Maybe we should have this requirement in the Local Procedures, but no penalty to the pilots.”

Mr Artur Rutkowski, Delegate for Poland: “I agree with Mr Bradley, this is not good for the visibility of our sport. We are against the proposal. We should consider how to deal with the penalty though.”

The vote was then carried out. The proposal was lost with 11 votes for and 22 votes against.

8.1.3 Change of Observation zone (France, Germany, UK)

It is proposed that Sporting Code Annex A, 7.5.1 is changed from:

A Turn Point is a waypoint between two legs of a flight. The Observation Zone of a Turn Point is the airspace in a vertical cylinder of 500 m radius centred on a Turn Point.

to:

A Turn Point is a waypoint between two legs of a flight. The observation zone of a turn point is the airspace in a vertical cylinder of 500m plus a 90 degree sector with a radius of 20 kilometres opposite the bisector of the inbound and outbound direct tracks both originating at the turn point.

All navigation equipment currently in use can accommodate this observation zone change.

Mr Filla: “Sweden has put forward a discussion paper, but there are two points I would like to stress. The proposal only covers competitions and we will mix the two task types we have. It will change the philosophy of the speed task from today.”

Mr Sheppe: “USA supports the Swedish position. This may or may not help with the problem with rainstorms around turn points and enhance pilot safety in situations where a thunderstorm or shower is covering the Turn Point. It can divide the race into two. It is the opposite of the aim of a speed task.”

Mr Guerin: “It is not correct that we turn the Speed Task into an Assigned Area Task, as you will not be credited the extra distance.”

Mr Spreckley, UK Delegate: “If someone chooses a longer route and wins it is OK. We have experience and know they go to the shortest distance.”

Mr Markku Kuusisto, Delegate from Finland: “If you have very long legs on a task this may be right, but we support Sweden.”

The proposal was lost with 15 votes for and 18 votes against.

8.1.4 Suppression of tie pilots in the IGC Ranking List (France)

This Proposal is a year two proposal for inclusion in Annex D rules for the Official IGC Pilot Rating Ranking list.

Following the adoption of the year one proposal on tiebreak procedures in the IGC Ranking List, it is proposed that rule 5.8 in Annex D be changed from:

Pilots are ranked upon decreasing Pilot Scores. The highest single pilot rating score breaks ties.

To:

Pilots are ranked upon decreasing Pilot Scores. Ties are initially broken by the highest single pilot rating score if a tie still exists the pilot with the highest ranking on the 31st of December of the preceding year will take precedence.

This Proposal affects Annex D Rule 5.8

The proposal was supported with 27 votes for, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions.

8.1.5 Emergency Procedures (Germany)

Following the acceptance of the Year 1 proposal, Germany proposed the following wording for Annex A:

1.4.2 The Organisers shall pay due regard to safety and fairness in all aspects of the championships. This shall include the distribution of an Emergency Plan to the Team Captains.

1.4.5.4 Task Sheet

The Task Sheets will be distributed at Briefing. The Task Sheet must include:

- a) The date and Competition Day number
- b) The Class (in Multiclass Championships)
- c) The Task specification (see 6.2)
- d) Operational Procedures in use
- e) Any changes to forbidden airspace or altitude limits
- f) Grid Time
- g) Anticipated time of first launch
- h) End of legal daylight
- i) Safety frequency
- j) Emergency telephone numbers
- k) Any other information relevant to the day's flying

The proposal was supported with 31 votes for and 2 abstentions

8.2 Year-1 proposals

8.2.1 Proposal to simplify the Sporting Code (Sporting Code Committee)

In order to structure the debate around the Year-1 proposal, the debate was structured along a number of principle issues

1. Place badges and records in separate sections/chapters of the code

This principle was adopted with 31 votes for, 1 vote against, 1 abstention

2. No stand-alone paragraphs (must be PR or FR)

This was adopted with 31 votes for, 0 votes against, 2 abstentions

3. Observation zone – remove FAI sector, only a cylinder with extended bisector

The Greek delegate, Mr Georgas did not see any benefit in replacing one sector with another sector.

The Swedish delegate, Mr Filla shared the view of Greece.

The proposal was lost with 0 votes for, 28 votes against, 5 abstentions

4. Definition of start/finish point options

Mr Georgas saw some confusion in the proposal. For certain types of performance the release point can be used as start, but that has to be declared. It is not clear how to do that.

An amendment for the proposal to read “For a release point option, no pre-declaration is required”. The amendment was not supported.

Mr Spreckley was did not like the idea of losing the options we have at the moment.

Mr McIntyre explained that the whole idea was to reduce the number of options.

The proposal was lost with 16 votes for, 10 votes against, 7 abstentions

5. Start line shall be 3000M long (currently 1000M)

The proposal was adopted with 31 votes for, 0 votes against, 2 abstentions

6. Loss of Height adjustment

- 50X rather than 100X

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: “100x factor was introduced when we had worse gliders and why should we reduce it now when numerous glider types have L/D over 50.

Mr Guerin, France: "I don't see where the simplifications are."

The proposal was lost with 3 votes for, 25 votes against, 5 abstentions

7. Silver C distance – must fly at least 50km distance from a declared start point.

Mr Georgas: "What is the change compared to today?"

Mr Macintyre: "To assure the pilots make a 50 km cross country flight away from the airfield, to get a real cross country flight. It makes very little difference from the rules as they stand now."

Mr Hansen, Denmark: "We agree with this proposal, we want the real 50 km distance flight."

Mr Filla, Sweden: The intent is good, but the wording is not achieving that. It's probably OK as Year-1 proposal, but we need to work on the wording."

Mr Rutkowski: "Why do we not keep this as a free distance?"

Mr Macintyre: "The intention is that you cannot stay within gliding range of your airfield."

The proposal was adopted with 27 votes for, 4 votes against, 2 abstentions

8. Declaration requirements

Mr Hansen: "What is the purpose of photography with time stamp?"

Mr Cubley: "To make sure there is a paper declaration made before the flight. We have some problems with that so we need some sort of proof done before the flight."

Mr Pauwels, Belgium: We only use Flight Recorders now."

Mr Cubley: "Some countries use Position recorders, these can't take electronic declarations."

Mr Filla: "Photographic evidence can be digital, the time stamp can easily be manipulated."

Mr Leinikki: "I understand the Official Observer could be remote. According to the Sporting Code, the Official Observer shall be present at launch or landing."

The proposal was adopted with 29 votes for, 0 votes against, 4 abstentions

9. Change of name to pilot option task

The proposal was won with 18 votes for, 7 votes against, 8 abstentions

10. Record declaration – way points may be changed after launch, but pre-start

Mr Georgas: "We empowered the Sporting Code Commission to simplify the Sporting Code. How did this proposal come up?"

Mr Macintyre: "This proposal came from the gliding movement."

The proposal was lost with 14 votes for, 16 votes against, 3 abstentions

Mr Mozer: "Mr Macintyre and his Committee will now focus on the proposal that passed and will present a new version next year."

Mr Georgas: "Will there also be a revision and simplification of the entire document?"

Mr Macintyre: "Our mandate is to go ahead with the entire document, but we will have to come back with these new proposals. We could end up with a totally new document next year."

8.2.2 Speed Records, Loss of Height, Part 1 (Sporting Code Committee)

As well as simplifying the Sporting Code, the committee has a mandate to rationalize it in light of current technology and practice ("why do we still have this rule?").

The current Code invalidates a speed record flight having a LOSS OF HEIGHT (LoH) in excess of 1000m, while a distance record allows the claimed distance to be adjusted. The history of this disparity in the rules is not clear. However, given the availability of today's GPS flight data, there is no reason why this difference should continue.

This proposal removes invalidation from the possible outcomes of a speed record attempt, and provides for an adjustment to the claimed speed for any excess LoH.

Proposal:

For speed tasks, a number of seconds equal to (excess Loss of Height divided by 2.5) shall be added to the time on course for the calculation of the claimed speed.

Discussion:

For distance flights, excess LoH is “penalized” by reducing the credited distance. For speed flights, excess LoH would now be “penalized” in terms of speed, a penalty which is implemented by adjusting the elapsed time. The proposed adjustment to the time on course is intended to approximate the time (2.5 m/sec) it would take to climb the excess LoH. (This adjustment value is more valid than the 100 multiplier factor currently used in distance records.)

This is Part 1 of a two-part proposal, and it stands on its own. Part 2 is an extension of Part 1, which redefines “excess”.

Mr Spreckley, UK: “It does make sense to make a predefined variable, but this complicates the rules”

Mr Macintyre “The figures are not suggested by the committee, but is a way to help for a pilot who loses 5 meters too much.”

The proposal was lost with 1 vote for, 31 votes against and 1 abstention.

8.2.3 Speed Records, Loss of Height, Part 2 (Sporting Code Committee)

Mr Filla, Sweden: “This gift of 1000 meter has been there from the start of our sport. There is no problem to fix and all old performances are based on this rule.”

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: “We support Sweden.”

The proposal was lost with 33 votes against

8.2.4 13.5 Meter Records (Sporting Code Committee)

It is proposed to institute Records for the 13.5 M Class.

Now that the 13.5m class has been created, the opportunity has arisen to institute a record category for this class. The definition of the class is already in the Sporting Code, 6.5.6 No change is envisioned to the definition.

Minimum performance for records may be set by IGC for initial claims. The creation of the 13.5m class has subsumed the existing World Class for competition, so it is logical that the current World Class records at 30th September 2015 be the minimums for the new record class. (see Proposal 2 below).

It is noted that 13.5m World Championships will start in 2015, if approved at this IGC meeting, creation of the record class will be able to commence on 1st October 2015, subject to approval of a year 2 proposal in March 2015.

The proposal was adopted with 27 votes for, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions.

Proposal 2

a). Create a sub class within the 13.5m record Class.

The World Class is a one-design class created by IGC with the only type of glider in the class being the PW5. While the creation of the 13.5 class has subsumed the World Class for International Competitions, there has been no move to remove the World Class records. This proposal would create a sub class within the 13.5m record class applying only to present World Class gliders and accepting the current World Class records (as at 30th September 2015) as the starting minimums for the sub class.

The suggestion for a sub-class within the 13.5m class records recognises that the IGC World Class, which was created by the IGC, should have a longer life than a sudden removal from the record lists but extended for a few more years. Many available Continental Records in this class have yet to be claimed.

b) It would not be reasonable to have this as a totally open-ended record class, as it would appear that no more PW5s will be manufactured, it is suggested that this sub class should remain “live” until 30th September 2020.

The proposal was lost with 4 votes for, 21 votes against and 8 abstentions.

8.2.5 Integration of Handicap Procedures in Sporting Code Annex A. (Annex A Committee)

It is proposed:

1. To create a new document entitled “IGC Procedures for Handicapped Classes”;

2. To keep the handicap lists and procedures to be used for handicapped classes in this document;
3. To give responsibility for maintaining the document to the Handicaps Subcommittee, subject to the approval of the Annex A Committee and the Plenum;
4. To refer to this document in Annex A, and to consider the document to be part of the rules for World and Continental Championships; and
5. To delete Appendix 1, "IGC Handicap Lists," from Annex A.

This is a proposal to move the handicap lists and all the procedures specific to handicapped competitions into a separate document. At present, Annex A contains an incomplete set of rules and procedures for handicapped competitions in Appendix 1, and the handicap lists themselves are published separately. In order to improve the logistics of a handicapped competition, and to reduce misunderstandings, there is a need to document certain procedures and rules:

- Rules for the placement of ballast, in the wings and the fuselage,
- Rules regarding the carrying of personal equipment, including oxygen, food and drinking water,
- Procedures for weighing gliders during scrutineering,
- Procedures for daily weighing and random checks,
- Required documentation, including Type Certificate Data Sheets,
- Criteria for penalties and appeals.

And there is a need to keep the handicap lists current, independent of the publication schedule of Annex A.

This is too much for an appendix to Annex A, and a separate document should be created.

Mr Sheppe, Annex A Committee Chairman: "Handicap rules are scattered everywhere. We should put all handicap rules in a separate document."

The proposal passed with 32 votes for and 1 abstention.

8.2.6 Prohibiting functionality without removing or disabling instruments (Annex A Committee)

It is proposed to allow the carrying of instruments that are capable of performing prohibited functions (e.g. cloud flying), provided that the function is recorded as "disabled" in the Flight Log.

Discussion: Such instruments exist. If proof can be provided that the prohibited functions are unavailable to the pilot, we should not require the instrument to be removed or disabled

The proposal passed with 31 votes for, 0 votes against and 2 abstentions.

8.2.7 Carriage of multiple Flight Recorders (Annex A Committee)

This proposal affects para 5.4

It is proposed to remove the distinction between primary and backup Flight Recorders.

Discussion: At present, the flight log from the primary FR must be submitted. This procedure is not followed in current practice (if the pilot notices that the primary FR failed, then it is normal for him to submit a log from the backup FR, without being asked). Also, there are reasons, not limited to failures that a competitor will want to re-designate his or her "primary and backup" FRs, causing unnecessary work for the Organisers. Pilots should be allowed to submit a log from any pre-registered FR, without regard for "primary" vs. "backup."

The proposal passed unanimously.

8.2.8 Motorglider relaunch procedures (Annex A Committee)

This proposal affects Annex A para 7.3.2

It is proposed to allow motorgliders to perform an inflight "re-launch" provided they return to the contest site before starting the MoP.

Discussion: At present, the re-launch procedures depend on the number of motorgliders registered in the class. This is a brute-force solution to a problem that could be addressed in a more enlightened way. Motorgliders should be allowed to glide back to the contest site, start the MoP, climb to release height,

shutdown the MoP, wait for a few minutes, and then make a Start. This procedure does not put the non-motorized glider at a disadvantage.

Mr Sheppe: “The current rule says that inflight relaunches may be allowed only if all gliders registered in the class are equipped with MoP. We suggest that we improve the situation to allow for motorgliders to glide back and start the engine – climb back, wait 20 minutes and then be allowed to start.”

Mr Guerin, France: “We believe this is unfair for non-motorgliders, these can be launched only after the class under launch has been completed.”

Mr Filla, Sweden: “Mr Guerin is right. We could maybe find a fair waiting time, I support the proposal, but we need to look at the details.”

Mr Kuusisto, Finland: “I think this will be unfair.”

Mr Guerin: “I just wanted to say that in France, it is the Competition Director that will decide.”

Mrs Kuipers, The Netherlands: “If there are only a few without motor I can see the point, but if half of the gliders have no motor, it is a disadvantage.”

Mr Foltin, Slovakia: “I have seen cases where motor glider landing was required to make it fair, and other cases where it was not fair. Knowing this, we should accept this proposal to see the detailed wording. If we reject, we cannot discuss the details.

The proposal was passed with 19 votes for, 10 votes against and 4 abstentions

8.2.9 Multiple starts (Annex A Committee)

It was proposed that the pilot will be credited with the Start that yields the best Score.

Discussion: Currently, the pilot must be scored using the latest Start. This makes no sense if the Flight Log shows that he or she made a previous Start that results in a better Score. Also, adoption of this proposal would remove a problem caused by the deletion of Start Time reporting.

Mr Hansen, Denmark: “The start time you report is your start time.”

Mr Guerin: “If you cross the start line you start, if there is penalty you should have the penalty for that.”

The proposal was adopted with 27 votes for 3 votes against and 3 abstentions.

8.2.10 Minimum distance in the 13,5 Meter Class (including a proposal to make this effective from spring 2014)(Annex A Committee)

It is proposed to change the minimum distance from 100 km to 60 km in the 13.5 Metre Class. This proposal affects Annex A 8.2.1, 8.3.1

Discussion: The reason to support the change is that we have lost too many days to this rule in the World Class championships. These are days that have been completely lost, not merely devalued.

While it is true that the performance of the gliders in the 13.5 Metre Class can be expected to be higher than that of the PW-5, the small size and relatively low wingloading of the 13.5 metre gliders makes it unfair to require them to go as far as the heavier gliders on a difficult soaring day. It is unreasonable to claim that “100 kilometres” means the same thing to the pilot of a 13.5 metre glider as it does to the pilot of a glider with twice that wingspan.

The Plenary is further being asked to make this change effective in time for the 2015 World Gliding Championship in the 13.5 Meter Class.

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: “I don’t see the big difference between the Club Class and the 13.5 meter class. We will have 40:1 glide ratio, so there I no need to change this. I would like to see the outcome of the first WGC.”

Mr Guerin, France: “We had the rule in France before, but it created strong side effects, as the difference of points is too big for such small distances.”

Mrs Kuipers, The Netherlands: “Why not do the same for the other classes, Open Class and Club Class has the same differences today.”

Mr Sheppe: “I would like to see changes for all classes. This is only the first small change.”

Mrs Vigorito, Italy: “We should maybe look at the philosophy for this new class.”

The proposal was supported with 27 votes for, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions.

The second part of the proposal, to apply this change for the 2015 13,5 Meter WGC passed with 30 votes for, 1 vote against and 2 abstentions.

8.2.11 Tie-scores in final results (Annex A Committee)

The Plenum is being asked to choose one of three options to handle tie scores in the final results of World and Continental Championships. This affects Annex A 10.2.2

The three options are:

Option 1: make no change to the current rule.

Option 2: disallow tied placings in the final results.

Option 3: allow tied placings in the final results.

Discussion

Option 1: make no change to the current rule.

Argument for: Ties are allowed in national championships and should also be allowed in World and Continental Championships, but there should be an exception if a tie for first place occurs. There can be only one World or Continental Champion.

Argument against: It is not consistent to disallow a tie for first place and allow ties for other places. Management of the podium and the awarding of medals and diplomas is complicated and controversial. The total number of FAI medals and diplomas cannot be known in advance of the competition.

Option 2: disallow tied placings in the final results.

Argument for: This is the most definitive option. It is straightforward to manage the podium, medals and diplomas.

Argument against: This is different from most (perhaps all) national championships. It may not be fair.

Option 3: allow tied placings in the final results.

Argument for: This is consistent with national championships.

Argument against: The podium can become crowded, and the total number of FAI medals and diplomas cannot be known in advance of the competition. The elite nature of the title of Champion may be lost.

Amended to change the proposal to read “Extend the tie-breaking procedure currently used for the Champion to be used for the first three places.”

The Amendment was passed.

The proposal was passed with 32 votes for, 1 vote against.

8.2.12 Handicap adjustment for lightweight pilots (Annex A Committee)

It is proposed to reduce the handicap factor of Club Class gliders by 0,004 for each 10 kg that the glider's mass is less than: “reference mass minus 10 kg.”

Discussion: In the Club Class, lightweight pilots are currently motivated to add ballast to bring the glider up to the reference weight. Sometimes this is not possible to do within the CofA. This proposal allows the pilot of a glider with unusually low take off mass (less than 10 kg below the IGC reference mass) to take a decreased handicap rather than the risk of adding a large amount of fixed ballast.

Mr Geissler, Handicap Committee Chairman: “For clarification, we talk about the light take off mass.”

Mr Hansen, Denmark: “This proposal is to prevent pilots adding a lot of weight in the cockpit, so to increase safety. I propose you vote yes.”

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: “It is a safety issue. At the last EGC, where I was organiser, we experienced numerous problems with club class gliders and take off mass. Pilots were trying to increase the mass of the glider. This is not good for safety. The proposal will discourage pilots to do this in the future.”

Mr Hansen: “This is not the first time we discuss this. France has previously proposed water ballast, but that was rejected. This is another way to do the same.”

The proposal was supported with 27 votes for, 3 votes against and 3 abstentions.

8.2.13 13.5 Meter WGC Trophy (Italy)

Stefano and Riccardo Briigliadori would like to offer the trophy for the 13,5m class FAI World Gliding Championship. The trophy will be dedicated to their father Leonardo Briigliadori, who was the biggest supporter in Italy of this new class. In fact, thanks to his efforts and strong will, in 2014 we will be able to organise the 1st Italian championship for the 13,5m class, the "Leonardo Briigliadori Cup".

The proposal was unanimously supported.

8.2.14 Introduction of Handicaps in the 20-meter 2-seater class for gliders modified for disabled pilots. (Poland)

It is proposed to establish a handicap in 20-metre Multi-seat Class in World Gliding Championships in 2014 for gliders equipped with Manual Rudder Control piloted by a disabled pilot requiring such device.

This proposal affects local Procedures of WGC 2014 in Rayskala

The main reason for handicaps use in the Worlds is to allow non-flapped two-seaters to participate on a level surface with the more advanced ships, which unfortunately are not available with manual rudder control (MRC). This deficiency actually precludes disabled pilots from competition at this level, as they can't choose the newest/flapped gliders. Multi-seat class seems also to be the best to accommodate disabled pilots as they always can have supporting person in their co-pilot.

The problem is not so exotic as we could have seen during last EGC in Ostrow. A disabled pilot was close to podium at very advanced stage in the competition. Such inclusion (of WGC into handicapped competitions) will also be meeting requirements of international conventions dealing with the rights of people with special needs (disabled).

Mr Georgas, Greece: "Is this possible because the glider is unflapped?"

Mr Macintyre, New Zealand: "For World championships, I believe this is a one-off situation that will not continue. Will there not be higher performance gliders with manual rudder control in the future?"

Mr Guerin, France: "We are against making the changes for this year. We support the principle, but don't think having a different handicap is fair."

Mr Geissler, Germany: "I am confused about the amended proposal, If the same pilot flies in another glider would he still have handicap?"

Mr Filla, Sweden: "I am also confused. Is the handicap for the manual rudder control or is it for the glider performance?"

Mr Cubley, Australia: "If this is for Finland, I would approve and I believe there will be manual control in flapped gliders within 2 years."

Mr Foltin, Slovakia: "Many delegates are puzzled and have different understanding of the impact. Reading the Steward's Report from Ostrow it was clear that we should try to find a way to accommodate handicapped pilots. My understanding is we should stick to the initial proposal. I would support the idea that we have a pilot taking part outside the scoring of the competition. This allows for participation. We want to be an inclusive sport rather than an exclusive sport. We would achieve these goals, but I am not sure gliders are available that will help us fulfil the intention."

Mr Sabeckis, Lithuania: "We use handicaps in the EGC, we need them in the WGC as well. Many countries have no possibility to participate in high performance gliders."

Mr Spreckley, UK: "I am confused now. I thought I knew what the proposal was about. We make a glider competitive by using handicaps if the pilot is disabled."

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: "We are ready to amend the proposal to read this only is used until high performance gliders with manual rudder control become available. The idea is not to do as Slovakia is saying, but it could be a way forward. I can accept that it is not an Annex A proposal for the time being."

The amended proposal deleting the Annex A inclusion was then voted.

The amendment was supported with 25 votes for, 8 votes against.

Mr Rutkowski: We propose to use the rules defined by the Olympic committee for the Para Olympics to define who can participate as pilot, we also suggest the pilot with the disability must have a higher IGC ranking than the other pilot on board."

Dr Jürgen Knüppel (CIMP President): "The idea is a good idea, but we need to specify what disabled means and I will propose to talk to other organisations about this."

The proposal was supported with 25 votes for, 3 votes against and 4 abstentions.

8.2.15 Options for Finish Ring (Germany)

Section A

It is proposed that the Finish Ring is either a circle of 4km Radius around the airfield central reference point or a circle of 3 km Radius around each threshold of the runway, which will be used for direct landing during competition

In case of a long runway and a reference point of the finish ring centred on mid runway can leave a much shorter distance than 3 km from finish ring to threshold of runway. Therefore either larger radius or reference points of finish rings centred at runway thresholds.

Section B

It is proposed that the minimum finish ring altitude is 50m above launch altitude (reference QNH at launch)

Distance and duration of a flight performance is measured at crossing of the finish ring.

Speed points are only given if the pilot reaches the threshold, or more precise, the contest site boundary. Landing beyond finish ring and before reaching contest site boundary is treated as out landed at finish ring (max. distance points).

Competitors crossing the finish ring below the min. finish ring altitude and reaching the contest site boundary, shall be penalized.

The finish ring min. altitude can be set higher if the special approach situation of obstacles, living areas, crossing of public roads and others make it necessary.

Straight and direct landing on runway after crossing finish ring is strongly recommended. Flying traffic pattern after crossing finish ring needs special attention to direct approaching competitors.

The goal of a task should always be landing on the airfield, or more precise, within the contest site boundary. Crossing the finish ring radius measures the performance of the competition flight in terms of task speed and distance.

Reaching the contest site boundary requires certain energy, meaning speed and altitude at crossing of finish ring that is some kilometres distant.

Therefore, full distance points are given when crossing the finish ring and speed point are only given when crossing the contest site boundary; minus any penalties in case min. finish ring altitude is not achieved minus any other penalties for dangerous flying or similar. By having the contest site boundary as the ultimate goal, the necessity of a higher minimum finish ring altitude is not necessary and therefore concentration on making the min. finish ring altitude receives secondary priority. Anyway, a min. finish ring altitude of 50 m at approx. 3 km distance to the runway should be maintained as a safety buffer and to make sure that a continuous descent towards the runway can always be performed.

It is known that there are solutions like having a certain finish ring altitude for each class depending on their glide performance and depending on the wind situation. But this makes task setting for various classes even more complex and difficult for the organizer.

After crossing the finish ring the pilot can reduce speed and improve glide path, can drain water ballast, arrange with others when approaching in gaggles, set final landing configuration and perform landing with lowest level of stress as possible. This applies for pilots crossing finish ring with sufficient energy (speed and altitude) which is the majority of all pilots. Those pilots crossing finish ring with lack of energy for making the contest boundary site, have the same stress, never mind whether the contest site boundary or the finish ring itself would be the ultimate goal to gain speed points.

Straight and direct landing on the runway within contest site boundary must always be the primary goal of a task and finally it is the safer option than pursuing any landing between finish ring and runway.

Mr Sheppe, USA and Annex A: "We do not support because it is about geometry. This should only be in local procedures, not in Annex A."

Mrs Kuipers, the Netherlands: "For Part B, I want to add that many pilots don't have a good feeling about pilots getting speed points when not landing on the airfield."

Mr Cubley, Australia: "If you pass the finish line you should get speed points."

Mr Bradley, South Africa: "One of the reasons for the ring is to stop low arrivals with low energy. This will be counterproductive. The pilot may have good reasons for not getting back to the airfield."

Mr Spreckley, UK: “The ring is defined in local procedures, like the 30km ring used in Uvalde, which gives options. We have had accidents with finish lines, I have watched that 3 times. The ring is a good idea, it moves the risk away but you have to manage the application of the Finish Ring procedures. We removed the 5 min penalty it forced pilot to reach the airfield. If you take away the speed points, many pilots will go for 600 points and try to get to the airfield.”

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: “The proposal is too complex. This should be in the Local Procedures. In Poland we are more concerned about pilots looking inside the cockpit to verify the height.”

Following the discussion, Germany withdrew the proposal.

8.2.16 Handicap for gliders with winglets (Germany)

This Proposal affects Sporting Code Section 3 Annex A, Appendix 3, IGC Handicap List

During past IGC sanctioned championships most pilots refrained from flying with winglets although they use them during non-championship flights. This is done in order to avoid the 0,01 minus point in handicap. However most winglets reduce stalling speed of the glider, make stalling behaviour smoother and winglets typically improve handling behaviour of the gliders during circling in thermals. This might be advantageous in concentration and situation awareness.

Winglets that are used can only be certified ones (or with permit to fly); flying with or without winglets needs to be decided at scrutineering as it is also a mass issue.

This regulation might constitute a minor disadvantage in performance to older gliders that cannot be equipped with winglets. Due to flying with limited wing loading in club class (limited by IGC ref. mass), the advantage in gliding or climbing performance will be minor if at all. Real measured and comparable data with and without winglets at the relevant wing loadings are not available.

The definition of Club Class in SC3 6.5.8 writes about preserving the value of older high performance gliders but it is not an old-timer class that wants to feature its original delivery configuration. It is an FAI championship class that should not be cut off from any developments and retrofitting possibilities.

Retrofitting club class gliders with winglets can also assist in better preserving the value due to gain in handling.

By now it is also accepted to retrofit club class gliders with the latest technology in instruments, avionics and bug wipers without change in handicap; winglets should be included.

Germany decided to withdraw the proposal after consultation with subject matter experts.

8.2.17 Minimum handicap in Club Class (Germany)

This proposal affects Sporting Code Section 3, Annex A, Appendix 3, Club Class handicap list.

It is proposed that the minimum handicap in club class should be limited to 0,98.

Today's handicap list features its minimum at 0,98 and the maximum at 1,09. Whereas 1,09 is defined as the max. of today's handicap list. The lower end of 0,98 is not defined as a minimum. The range of handicap should be restricted for a sensible task setting. And it should be avoided to start handicapping of lower performance gliders with missing or non verified data.

The proposal was supported with 27 votes for, 2 votes against and 2 abstentions.

8.2.18 Change of deadline for bids (France)

It is proposed to change the deadline for bids and notification of proposals for next Plenary from September 30th to October 31st.

In northern hemisphere, the gliding season finishes usually in September. It is difficult to respect the current deadline due to the gliding activity. By moving the deadline of 1 month (end of October instead of end of September), it will be much easier. Moreover, September is too close from the WGC of the summer and it is impossible to have a feedback from the championship and proposals that solve the problems encountered.

Mr Peter Eriksen, IGC secretary explained that this would interfere with the planning of the autumn Bureau meeting.

Mr Smith: “FAI should move into the modern world and not have these long lead times.”

The proposal was lost with 4 votes for, 20 votes against and 8 abstentions.

8.2.19 Gate closure (France)

It is proposed to be add a section to Annex A para 7.4.3 of the Sporting Code, Validity of Starts

c. The start gate shall be closed at the end of legal daylight, or when all competitors are accounted for, which ever is earlier.

Gliding races are very impacted by the gate closure, especially in a class with handicaps. The gate closure should have the same definition as the arrival line/ring closure.

Competition must not be impacted by external matters (last day competition dinner, prize giving...).

Mr Eriksen: "Gate closure was used successfully during the 2013 WWGC when the Tour de France race closed the airspace around the airfield for some hours."

Mrs Vigorito, Italy: "We have to be careful with the word "shall""

Mr Hansen, Denmark: "There can be technical reasons for having to close the gate."

Mrs Kuipers, the Netherlands: "We should have the possibility to close the gate. Suggest to keep this as a year-1 proposal, and then word it correctly for next year."

Mr Rutkowski: "We need to reword the start gate proposal to be more general and make it more acceptable."

Mr Spreckley, UK: "We support Poland. The gate should normally be closed end of daylight. I would reject the current proposal."

The proposal was amended to replace "shall" with "should normally".

The amendment was supported with 29 votes for and 4 abstentions.

The amended proposal was accepted with 28 votes for, 2 votes against and 3 abstentions.

8.2.20 Arrival closure (France)

It is proposed to modify Sporting Code Annex A, para 7.7.3 Validity of finishes, section c. to read:

The finish line or finish ring shall be closed at the end of legal daylight, or when all competitors are accounted for. Competitors still on task after close of the finish line or finish ring shall be considered as outlanded at the last valid GNSS fix immediately preceding the closing time.

As a consequence, the finish line cannot be closed on a time defined by the competition management.

The race is very impacted by the finish line/ring closure, especially in a class with handicaps.

Mr Foltin, Slovakia: "This has an impact on the penalty list."

Mr Hansen, Denmark: "The Year-2 proposal should follow the same principles as we discussed for the start gate."

The proposal was amended to replace "shall" with "should normally"

The amendment was endorsed with 28 votes for, 2 votes against and 2 abstentions.

The amended proposal was supported with 29 votes for and 3 votes against.

8.2.21 Handicap in the 20-Meter 2-seater Class (late proposal from Lithuania)

22 delegates accepted the proposal to be presented

It is proposed to use a handicap in World Gliding Championships at 2014 and 2016 in 20-meter Multi Seat Class.

This proposal affects Local Procedures of WGC 2014 in Rayskala FAI sporting code section 3 , 6.5.2

The main reason for handicaps to use in the Worlds 2014 and 2016 is to create the opportunity to participate pilots at the highest levels who do not have access to gliders of the highest standard of performance.

The definition of 20m. Multi-seat Class says: Except in World championships, scoring formulas may include handicap factors.

If handicaps are to be used, the gliders must have a handicap factor within the range agreed for the competition.

It is important for the overseas pilots to whom participation in Europe are expensive, and non-application of the handicap, force them to rent expensive gliders. For the pilots to rent handicapped glider will be cost twice less.

Mr Georgas, Greece: "The glider manufactures have invested in new designs as the WGC is flown without handicaps. It would be wrong to change that now."

Mr Macintyre, New Zealand: "It is too late to change this."

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: "Only 17 countries have registered for the competition, but more than 100 gliders have been produced. Some of these are available for rent."

Mr Spreckley, UK: "I have some sympathy for the proposal, but we voted on this several years ago, and the procedures for class change 4 years."

Mr Mozer: "I will have to rule the proposal out of order. This is a question of class definition which requires a 4 year notice."

Mr Rutkowski, Poland: "Are you sure you can rule the proposal out of order?"

Mr Mozer: "Yes, this proposal is out of order."

2.2.22 Accept a second entry per NAC in 20 Metre Multiseat Class (Late proposal from Poland)

10 delegates voted for discussing the proposal, 20 voted against, there were 2 abstentions.

The proposal was not tabled.

9. Vote on bids

9.1 9th FAI Women's World Gliding Championships 2017

Awarded to Zbraslavice, Czech Republic

9.2 10th FAI Junior World Championships 2017

Awarded to Pociunai, Lithuania

9.3 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017

Club, Standard and 20-meter 2-seater classes awarded to Moravska Trebova, Czech Republic

15 meter, 18 meter, Open Classes awarded to Lasham, UK

9.4 2nd FAI World 13.5 Meter Class Gliding Championship 2017

Awarded to Leszno, Poland

10. IGC awards (Eric Mozer)

10.1 Lilienthal Medal

The Lilienthal Medal was not awarded.

AOB

Nothing to report

11. Announcement of date for the 2015 IGC Plenary Meeting (Eric Mozer)

11.1 Useful dates and other practical information (Peter Eriksen)

Tentatively the next IGC meeting will be held in Lausanne on the 27th and 28th February 2015.

Notification of proposals must reach the Bureau by Wednesday 1st October 2014;

Bids must reach the Bid Specialist by Wednesday 1st October 2014;

Proposals, nominations and reports requiring voting must be finalised and delivered to the secretary on the 31st December 2014.

Reports not requiring voting shall reach the secretary not later than Wednesday 7th January 2015;

All material will be made available for delegates by Wednesday 14th January 2015.

12. Closure

The IGC President Mr Eric Mozer thanked Mrs Margherita Acquaderni for organising a very successful meeting in Varese, for the hospitality and friendliness the delegates had met.

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

Peter Eriksen

Secretary, IGC

Appendices:

A IGC Committees and Working Groups, Representatives and Specialists

Appendix A

IGC Committees and Working Groups

March 2013

Updates in **bold**

Standing Committees	Chairman	Members	Committee Scope
ANDS	TBD	Angel Casado; Bruno Ramseyer	Oversight of technical developments in navigation and airspace management
Championship Management	Dick Bradley	Brian Spreckley, Goran Ax	Bids; Organisational support; Competition Development and QA
GFAC	Ian Strachan	Angel Casado; Marc Ramsey; Tim Shirley; Hans Trautenberg	Flight Recorder approvals
Handicaps	Christof Geissler	Stefan Ronig (Germany) Tobias Geiger (Australia) Russell Cheetham (UK) Denis Guerin (France) Sam Giltner (USA)	Evaluation, review, and publication of handicaps for the IGC Club Class and 20m Class
Sporting Code 3 D, Annex A	Rick Sheppe	Axel Reich; Jiri Cihlar; Terry Cubley	Rules; Scoring; Procedures
Sporting Code 3 D, Annex B	Ian Strachan & Bernald Smith		Documentation
Sporting Code 3 D, Annex D	Brian Spreckley	T.b.d.	Ranking List
Sporting Code 3 D, Main Section and Annex C	Ross Macintyre	Tony Burton; Tor Johannessen; Axel Reich; Judy Ruprecht; Artur Rutkowski	Documentation

Working Groups	Chairman	Members	Objectives
Continental Records	Hans Obermeyer	Goran Ax; Klaus Ohlmann; Beryl Hartley; Dick Bradley; Judy Ruprecht; Nina Shalneva	Development of protocols and procedures for Continental Records
Country Development	Alexander Georgas	Rene Vidal; Terry Cubley; Markus Graeber	Creation of support for emerging gliding nations
GP Development	Roland Stuck	Brian Spreckley; Visa-Matti Leinikki; Rene Vidal	GP Management and development
History Committee	Tor Johannessen	Angela Sheard, Peter Selinger, John Roake, Frauke Elber, Manfred Reinhardt	Collation of IGC history
Scoring Software Testing	Rick Sheppe	Peter Platzer; Tim Shirley; Hans Trautenberg; Peter Ryder; Angel Casado	Set procedures for IGC software
Safety	Rene Vidal	Vladimir Foltin; Louis Boudierlique; Marina Vigorito (Corresponding members: Helmut Fundt; Brian Spreckley; Roland Stuck; Rick Sheppe; Markus Graeber)	Implementation of the OSTIV SDP Safety Pays recommendations

IGC Representatives

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

IGC Specialists

IGC Treasurer	Dick Bradley
Membership	Will be part of Country Development
Sailplane Grand Prix	Roland Stuck
Simulated Gliding	Vacant
IGC Trophy Management	Marina Vigorito
Webmaster	Will be part of Country Development
Communications and PR	Will be part of Country Development
Ranking List	Brian Spreckley
IGC Journalists	Angela Sheard Marina Vigorito Jill McCaw