



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*

Minutes

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

Version 1.0

held in Luxembourg
Friday 26th and Saturday 27th February 2016
at Sofitel Luxembourg Europe Hotel

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 (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President welcomed the Delegates to the 2016 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked them for coming to Luxembourg. The president then asked people that were participating in the IGC meeting for the first time to present themselves. IGC welcomed the first-time participation of the Delegation from China. The President also invited all guests present at the meeting, in particular the FAI president Dr. John Grubbström. Finally the President thanked the local organisers of the meeting, in particular Mr Carlo Lecuit and Mr Arny Weber for their support which allowed the meeting to be well prepared.

1.1 Absent Friends

IGC President Eric Mozer 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.

1.2 Roll Calls (Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki)

Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki, FAI IT Manager, called the roll. It was determined that 35 votes were present including 4 proxies (from Ireland to UK, from Latvia to Lithuania, from Slovenia to Italy, from Romania to Poland) thus 18 votes would be required for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 24 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

Mr. Leinikki again called the roll at the beginning of the second day, Saturday 28th February. There were again 35 votes present including the 4 proxies, still requiring 18 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 24 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

1.3 Administrative Matters (Mr. Vladimir Foltin)

Mr. Tor Johannessen and Mr. Bob Bickers were appointed to oversee the counting of ballots during the meeting.

The IGC Secretary Vladimir Foltin briefed the meeting about the practicalities for the Friday evening dinner, where the FAI President, all delegates, meeting participants, companions and FAI staff were invited to a dinner at Béierhaascht in Luxembourg.

1.3 Conflict of Interest (Mr. Eric Mozer)

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting, Lausanne 27th and 28th February 2015 (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Lausanne 27th and 28th February 2015 prepared by IGC Secretary of honour Mr. Peter Eriksen and called the Delegates for their approval. The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. IGC President's report (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The IGC President referred to the written report circulated before the meeting and added that it had been a challenging year. Hard working committees, a dynamic Bureau, new IGC Secretary and a workload that was steady and manageable. In particular, he has highlighted successful IGC participation at the FAI World Air Games 2015 in Dubai, where he also mentioned challenges (e.g. logistics) and benefits (e.g. glider pictures over Dubai and 7.000 CHF contribution to IGC account).

Mr. Mozer also mentioned that there are many interesting items for discussion at this meeting that may influence gliding sport in the future. He asked all the delegates to contribute to these discussions.

The President's report was unanimously accepted.

4. FAI Matters

4.1 Update from FAI (Dr. John Grubbström)

Dr. John Grubbström, FAI President, thanked the delegates for the friendly reception. Before starting his presentation he informed the Delegates that that it is his last year in service and the next year will be another person in his role.

The FAI president started with a short video on WAG 2015 followed by presentation starting with picture of a glider over the Dubai and quoted statement of IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer made before the IGC engaged in WAG 2015 -"If we get a single shot of a Glider against the Dubai skyline, it will be worth it". The presentation followed with information about Sebastian KAWA (POL) as athlete of the month for December 2015, the first time ever awarded to a glider pilot by the International World Games Association.

Dr. Grubbström then briefed the Delegates about FAI activities. First about FAI membership development - there were 114 full members in 2015, the new members were Algeria and Kosovo. Followed by Air Sport Development – there were 50 Cat 1 events held in 25 countries on 4 continents, 8 Red Bull Air Race World Championships. There were also 373 International Records ratified, 69.43% of them were World Records. However, it has been pointed out that sometimes it took 117 days for the results to reach the FAI Office and that at 17 events there were some problems with FAI sporting licences. Then the FAI events statistics were presented (724 events in total) showing CIAM as the most active having 334 events in 2015. Furthermore, it has been highlighted that since 2014 the FAI Executive Board/Head Office have been often present at Cat 1 Events.

Then Dr. Grubbström focused on media relations. It has been mentioned that there were more than 40 press releases all managed by a professional provider ensuring distribution and monitoring internationally. All that helped in drawing attention of media on activities of FAI and its Members and Air Sport Commissions. In this regard FAI also controlled TV production and distribution at three selected events (e.g. FAI World Aerobatic Championships) in addition to FAI WAG 2015. It resulted in production of news and a 26 minute highlight show with international distribution.

Furthermore, Dr. Grubbström mentioned developments in FAI IT services - e.g. Sporting Licence Database, Competition Management System or Registration System, soon to be followed by Online Record Claims, Delegate updates, inclusion of CIAM Judges and other projects. In the long term FAI aims at the incorporation of systems for all officials and allowing that NAC's will be able to manage online their own information.

Among administrative matters, the FAI focus has been on finances, FAI World Air Games, FAI Air Games Event Series, Records and Performances, Rules and Regulations Consistency and creation of FAI Mission and Vision as follows.

As far as WAG 2015 concerns, Dr. Grubbström highlighted that these have been the biggest FAI World Air Games ever. He also recognized the considerable efforts and investments of both, the Host and the FAI. However, there are still lessons to be learned for future high quality events of FAI through e.g. the post-event meeting with Local Organising Committee or Evaluation Workshop already planned for early April 2016.

Regarding FAI Sporting & Branding Strategy, FAI World Air Games proposed general direction, which is to ensure spectator awareness and media/sponsor interest, a clearly defined product, including its placing, pricing and promotion, support sponsorship opportunities and partner presence. The future is believed to be in multi-discipline air sports events that combine air sports with a logical fit. This, however, has to be still developed in joint effort of FAI Executive Board/Head Office, Air Sport Commissions and NAC's.

On Records and associated issues it has been mentioned that between 5 and 25% of record claims per year had to be rejected by FAI due to various reasons (e.g. not satisfying subclass rules, not superseding the existing record, not outperforming with minimum margin, no dossier received in due time by FAI or Continental Record not recognised by the Commission). The FAI future focus on records should be to speed up their ratification process and to work on better promotion of Record attempts and successes. One of the options envisaged is to promote "Recognized Air Sports Performance" e.g. in conjunction with Guinness Book of Records.

Dr. Grubbström covered also the topic of Rules and Regulations inconsistency. In this area FAI was facing several problems which resulted in the involvement of lawyers to assist in the review of Air Sport Commission rules and regulations. In parallel, Jury training is envisaged during 2016 which should encourage to use the rules, not prevent it. There is also a discussion about Licenses for FAI Officials.

Finally, Dr. Grubbström concluded his presentation with the FAI Mission and Vision statements:

"FAI - the global organisation for the promotion of air sports and recreational flying"

“A world where safe participation in air sports and recreational flying is available to everyone at reasonable cost”.

5. Finance (Mr. Dick Bradley)

The 2015 Financial statement and 2016 budget is available for download at the FAI web.

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2015 provisional Financial Statement

The IGC Treasurer Mr. Dick Bradley presented the 2015 provisional Finance Report and the 2016 budget.

The 2015 report showed an income of 44,081€. The expenditure was 59,351€ plus investment 11,480 €. The reserves were reduced with 15,269 € to 82,076 €. Budgeted income was slightly lower due to lower collection of sanction fees. On the other hand some expenditures were lower than budgeted e.g. Championships or Capital Expenditures.

The Financial Report was unanimously accepted by the meeting.

5.2 2016 Budget

The 2016 budget showed income of 42,675 € and expenditure of 35,600 €. The budgeted expense level was notably lower than in 2015 mainly due to lower number of Championships and decreased Capital Expenditures. The income was budgeted at a similar level as for 2015 and was 7,075 € higher than the expenditure.

The following short discussion followed on the budget.

Mrs. Kuijpers indicated that software for analysis as discussed at Flarm meeting should be budgeted too e.g. in IT expenditures. Treasurer responded that there is sufficient reserve budgeted for 2016 that will cover such expenditures.

Mr. Hansen asked whether there is any IGC policy on how much money we need to carry over each year on our accounts and if some support programs have been already considered. Treasurer responded that the Bureau is working on it.

FAI president Dr. Grubbström also contributed to the discussion i.e. that safety issues (e.g. Flarm) will be discussed during workshop on Dubai WAG and IGC was welcome to participate. Furthermore, he clarified that there is no FAI wide policy on how to use Air Sport Commission financial resources. Although these formally belong to FAI, they are managed by the Commission concerned.

The Treasurer clarified on Capital expenditures that IGC does it per project and tracks all individual invoices against the budget.

Mr. Vidal mentioned that IGC needs a reliable cash flow, because sometimes it takes too long to collect income, in particular the sanction fees.

After the discussion the Budget for 2016 was unanimously accepted.

6. Reports not requiring voting

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

6.1 OSTIV report (Dr Rolf Radespiel)

The OSTIV President, Dr. Rolf Radespiel presented the OSTIV Report.

Furthermore, Dr. Radespiel mentioned that legal status of OSTIV has changed to a non-profit organisation now registered in Germany. However, the role has not changed and OSTIV remained technically and science oriented international organisation without any political bias.

Then Dr. Radespiel promoted the next OSTIV congress which will take place in Australia in January 2017 during the WGC. He also invited delegates to promote OSTIV memberships in their respective countries.

6.2 Standing Committees

6.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3D Report (Mr. Ross Macintyre)

Mr. Macintyre referred to the written report, and commented that the committee is now mostly dealing with editorial matters, correction of terminology e.g. on absolute altitude which should come up in 2016.

6.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A (Mr. Rick Sheppe) and Handicaps (Mr. Christof Geissler)

Mr. Sheppe had nothing to add to the report. Mr. Geissler mentioned that there will be an update of the club class handicap to be used at WGC in Pociunai. The committee members were also invited to rework the club class list so it will not become old-timer or vintage class in the future.

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

Mr. Spreckley informed the Delegates that entering competitions in IGC Ranking List will require credit card (PayPal is also possible) and that the major improvement last year was in the area of tracking our sanction fees (one of the IGC concerns). Finally Mr. Spreckley informed that Mr. Reno Filla will take over the Ranking List management as of September-October 2016 and that he is pleased to hand over to someone who well understands the topic.

6.2.4 Air Traffic, Navigation, Display Systems (ANDS) Report (Mr. Rick Sheppe)

Mr. Rick Sheppe forwarded greetings to all delegates from Bernald Smith (former chairman of the committee).

Mr. Sheppe then continued with a short information on ANDS, where he mentioned that Galileo will be fully functional as of the end of 2016. Furthermore, Mr. Sheppe emphasised that it should be the highest priority that worldwide integration of space navigation systems is successful. Mr. Sheppe then informed the Delegates about drones and their potential impact on gliding activities. E.g. compulsory registration recently introduced in USA resulted in 44 000 applications during the first day of registration. All that bearing in mind that the model planes federation with 100 000 members asked their members not to cooperate with the authorities.

Furthermore, Mr. Sheppe mentioned work on IGC strategy in relation to Flarm and similar devices. One of the considerations is that Flarm will be compulsory to be used at IGC competitions in accordance with a future IGC guidelines that will be e.g. requiring recording of switching off of the unit.

Mr. Spreckley mentioned that IGC may want to discourage the use of such devices for tactical purposes, but that enforcement would be difficult.

Mr. Macintyre indicated interest in Flarm discussion in the context of following other pilots, but there are also safety concerns which should be not overlooked.

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

Mr. Strachan presented that three new GNSS flight recorders from three different manufacturers have been approved during 2015 and that GFAC approved other two changes to previously approved units (installation of external MOP sensors). The current work has been mentioned too e.g. problems with recording of MOP operation (location of sensor) and with time to create forward trust (Front Electric Systems - FES).

In subsequent reaction Mr. Filla added that Annex A would need to be aligned with the new requirements in relation to problem related to FES mentioned above.

Finally, Mr. Marc Ramsey was re-elected as GFAC member for another 3 years and Mr. Peter Purdie was newly elected as additional 6th member of GFAC for a 3 year term.

6.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen presented allocation of the new roles and responsibilities within the committee as follows:

Bid manager and chairman:	Peter Eriksen
Stewards:	Terry Cubley
Jurors:	Marina Vigorito

Then Mr. Eriksen briefly presented that the main scope of the committee is to manage bids before their acceptance by IGC (completeness, quality), propose officials for IGC events (Stewards and Jurors), support organisers after acceptance by the IGC Plenary in cooperation with the Chief Steward (monitor progress, quality, request for changes, quality assurance) and contribute to IGC competition development and quality assurance.

6.3 Working Groups

6.3.1 Championship Structure (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen briefly reported on the progress of the working group. It has been agreed that World and Continental Championships shall always be under IGC control and that priority will be always given to WGCs over Continental GCs, which may result in less support from IGC (in terms of officials) to Continental GCs. Furthermore, it has been considered that the Women's WGCs and Junior WGCs should be limited to only two classes per event and that IGC should still continue to give a priority to WGCs outside Europe at regular intervals, but it has been recognised that the current rule does not give a good distribution (potentially 3 WGCs in Australia over 4 years) therefore, a revision is necessary and envisaged.

Although there is a consensus on the above principles, the views of members are not yet fully aligned on all aspects. Therefore, several aspects are still under the discussion like whether handicapped classes are relevant for WGCs (except Junior WGC and Women's WGC), whether a cost reduction is a primary goal for the WGCs or we would rather look at quality versus cost and, whether a focus on entry fee is appropriate taking in mind that the cost of participation in a WGC vary significantly especially taking into account that e.g. the cost of an additional IGC official at a WGC is less than 25€ per participant. Regarding reduction of overall cost of participation Mr. Eriksen mentioned a few considerations that are being discussed.

Finally, the next steps of the group were presented potentially leading to presentation of possible scenarios for discussion at the IGC Bureau meeting in October 2016 followed by discussion and decisions at the IGC Plenary meeting 2017.

Mrs. Kuijpers then mentioned that we may look at the other air sports when looking for improvements on how to manage IGC competitions. Mr. Eriksen responded that the group does not want to reinvent the wheel and that even multisport events will be considered.

FAI President added that FAI may enter into commercial contracts where we will 'sell our products', but there is also risk associated with it. FAI formed FAME exactly for that purpose so it could be the body to takes the risk.

IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer mentioned his involvement in this work with the help of others that has taken place some time ago. Based on that experience he sees it necessary to take outside look and still remain relevant and that the group would need to take care that this work stays on track to satisfy our community, customers and public. The work should not be limited to the WG and invited IGC delegates to provide inputs via him or to Mr. Eriksen as there are many competent people in our sport that could contribute on this important work.

6.3.2 Safety (Mr. Rene Vidal)

Mr. Vidal provided a verbal report and informed that written report on group past activities will be sent in a short time (available online among other meeting documents). It has been mentioned that the group considers using of mobile phone applications for creation of own safety database and conduct of surveys e.g. as in Lithuania. Furthermore, OSTIV idea of safety award will be further developed by the group. Then Mr. Vidal informed that risk analysis software to evaluate risk of mid-air collisions is also being considered. Finally, the Delegates have been briefed on the discussions that occurred at the separate meeting on Flarm organised just prior to the IGC Plenary meeting.

6.3.3 Scoring Software (Mr. Angel Casado)

Mr. Casado mentioned that there is a presented proposal and he has nothing else to add to the working group report.

6.3.4 History Committee (Mr. Tor Johannessen)

Mr. Johannessen briefed the Delegates about activity of the group. The work requires time and resources including technical support. In that regard Cloud and drop box are considered as means to collect all historical information.

Mr. Mozer invited all Delegates to contribute and support this important work as we need to inspire young people to join the sport. He also expressed his appreciation of the work the group, in particular effort put in by its chairman Mr. Johannessen.

6.3.5 Country Development (Mr. Alexander Georgas)

Mr. Georgas verbally presented the work that has been done by the group over the year. Although no written report has been presented before the meeting, it will be sent to all Delegates by email. Mr. Georgas explicitly thanked all who responded to the IGC membership survey and despite the figures

not being very precise, they help in understanding where we are and what we need to do in this matter. Mr. Georgas also highlighted important collaboration with the EGU working group on club development, but unfortunately the group has been ceased for the time by EGU so the group members now try to figure out how to continue this activity in the future.

6.3.6 IGC Media (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley briefly introduced this new group that was created after the IGC Bureau meeting in October 2015. Additional information, e.g. on communication channels that were explored during SGP events, has been presented under the item 7.4 in relation to Sailplane Grand Prix.

6.3.7 13.5 Meter Class (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley mentioned that there was nothing new to report and discussion may take place during the second day of the meeting along with the proposals.

Mr. Mozer added that there will ample of opportunity to discuss all relevant issues there.

6.4 IGC Representatives

6.4.1 CASI Report (FAI Air Sport General Commission) (Mr. Tor Johannessen)

Mr. Johannessen informed the Delegates that the last CASI meeting took place in Rotterdam along with the FAI General Conference. Although, he was not present there, IGC was represented by Mrs. Marina Vigorito, the CASI secretary.

Mrs. Vigorito than briefed the meeting participants on the agenda discussed there. There was a presentation on multisport aviation events by the FAI Secretary General and Sports representative that was discussed at length. Part of the discussion (still ahead of the event) was dedicated to WAG 2015. Furthermore, there were some issues with sporting licences (applicability e.g. to gliding badge flight), but this issue has been identified and will be resolved soon¹. IGC will make the formal proposal to CASI on this. Mrs. Vigorito also invited the Delegates to pass the message to their NACs and pilots so they have their sporting licences valid.

Mr. Bradley asked for clarification, whether the current status of the rules is that pilots have to have sporting licence also for badge flights. Mrs. Vigorito confirmed that the rules are like that. Mr. Rutkowski then asked when IGC can expect this to be rectified. Mr. Mozer indicated that this will be treated as a matter of priority and it will be resolved as soon as possible at the next CASI meeting, if not sooner.

6.4.2 EGU/EASA (Mr. Patrick Pauwels)

Mr. Pauwels invited Delegates to read the full report. The EGU annual conference was held in Graz, Austria the week prior to IGC meeting. Many European regulatory issues were discussed there e.g. General Aviation roadmap initiative launched by the European Commission two years ago. The new Executive Director of European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA - technical agency of European Commission), Mr. Patrick Ky is seen as very willing to listen to general aviation and deliver quick improvements. In the future a separate operations rule books for ballooning and also gliding are now considered, but EGU/Europe Air Sports would need to actively contribute. A number of EGU members provided valuable support and the aim is to have the very first draft of a gliding rule book ready by the end of this year with the work to conclude in the beginning of 2018. EGU can now make some fundamental changes for the future of our sport in Europe. Mr. Pauwels invited European federations and NACs that are not yet members to join EGU to support these tasks. EGU needs everyone involved.

Mr. Stuck reinforced the message of Mr. Pauwels and highlighted that it is less than 0.5€ per member to pay to EGU for membership. He added that there are still European nations organising EGC and WGC who are still not members of EGU which is in his opinion sad to see.

Mr. Mozer then asked whether there is any collaboration with ballooning. Mr. Pauwels responded that it has been considered by EGU, but it was decided to work separately, but continue exchange of information. FAI President Dr. Grubbström informed that FAI has a memorandum of understanding with Europe Air Sports, which EGU is part of. Future for sport aviation in Europe is very much in

¹ Post meeting note: The issue has been resolved by CASI and sporting licences are not required for gliding badge performances.

hands of EASA so we need to cooperate. Mr. Foltin briefed the Delegates that European Balloon federation has been created only recently and EGU is much more advanced in its relations and collaboration with EASA. Mr. Rutkowski appreciated the work in progress on a rule book for gliding, but was not clear what does it actually mean for pilots. Mr. Pauwels clarified that it will be the Gliding handbook that will incorporate all gliding related European rules, including all additional new aviation rules for gliding. Mr. Foltin added the fact that the handbook will cover all aspects of gliding (e.g. airworthiness, operations, licensing, airspace etc.) that are regulated at common European level. On another topic Mr. Bickers (on behalf of UK IGC Delegate) informed that Kenya gliding has a problem, because the new aviation rules banned gliding, until the time there will be a gliding federation with their own rules approved by the local authority. Kenya looks for help and EGU may be the right partner.

6.4.3 Environmental Commission Report (Mr. Bernald Smith)

Mr. Sheppe verbally reported on behalf of Mr. Smith who was not present at the IGC meeting.

6.4.4 FAI Medical Commission (CIMP) (Dr. Jürgen Knüppel)

CIMP President Dr. Knüppel delivered presentation on FAI Casualty Guidelines that were developed by CIMP. The work on this, including emergency response checklist, has been triggered by the fatal accident that happened at WAG. There is one FAI document on this matter, but it is not yet broadly available therefore, it has been made available to the delegates and Dr. Knüppel invited them to provide their comments to his email fustis@gmx.net.

FAI president Dr. Grubbström in this context mentioned his appreciation of this work because of his previous experience as head of emergency response centre medical part. However, at first FAI should do everything possible to avoid accidents. Safety work has a priority over all other objectives. Mr. Hansen commented that the media part of this matter is important. There should be one person responsible for communication with media and all others should remain silent on the event towards the outside world. Dr. Knüppel mentioned accident at WGC in Bayreuth where the organisation had a media contingency plan and it was a good tool indicating who should do what in such situation.

6.4.5 On-Line Contest Report (Mr. Christof Geissler)

Mr Geissler informed that this item will be covered in the presentation by Mr. Reiner Rose that had been rescheduled to second day of the meeting.

Future plans of IGC-OLC World League (Reiner Rose) - Presentation

Mr. Reiner Rose presented an interesting information on IGC-OLC e.g. that the contest is still growing, there are 110 million clicks on the website. He also mentioned that IGC-OLC website has a design bug which impacts only the Northern Hemisphere. One combined league for both North and South hemispheres will be launched soon with the aim to announce winner at the IGC Plenary meeting.

6.5 IGC Specialists

6.5.1 Trophy Management (Mrs. Marina Vigorito / Mrs. Gisela Weinreich)

Mrs. Weinreich took over the trophy management from Mrs. Marina Vigorito at the end of 2015. The meeting expressed appreciation of Mrs. Vigorito efforts in this work. Mrs. Weinreich mentioned that she has nothing else to add to the report.

6.6 FAI World Air Games Dubai 2015 (Mr. Eric Mozer)

Mr. Mozer introduced this agenda item with the reference to the video shown to the delegates before the presentation of the FAI President Dr. Grubbström which should have given the Delegates a good flavour of the WAG event.

That was followed by Mr. Stuck's presentation with a lot of hindsight information about the event. It started with showing the Skydive Dubai desert airfield, the Skyline of Dubai skyscrapers near the Palm runway with the grass area next to it that was used for the main part of the WAG event. It was also mentioned that there was an incredible infrastructure installed just for the event and other relevant infrastructure belongs to Skydive Dubai, well supported organisation by the Crown Prince who is an active skydiver. There was some minor thermal activity despite being warned that there might be none in December. The opening ceremony, where all sports have been presented, was full of internationally famous cultural performances in front of 4.000 people. The participants enjoyed very

good local arrangements for lodging and catering. Mornings were always dedicated to balloons. The desert drop zone airfield, used for gliding, was 45 km away from the main part of the event. The airfield was 1500 m long and 20 m wide with unfriendly edges (big stones). The gliders used at the event were leased by the Dubai organizers from the French gliding federation (FFVV) and were shipped to the location. There were two tow planes used to tow the gliders to the same altitude 1000 m above the start line. There were severe airspace limitations and therefore the race had been only out-and-return course that was in total 23 km long. 6 pilots from different nations competed at the gliding event and there was a good cooperation among them throughout (there were few local helpers). The team needed to adjust the same mass and Centre of Gravity before each flight and that challenge was managed well. The tracking has been managed by the IT expert Mira Válek from Czech Republic who kindly accepted it on a short notice. Unfortunately, the IGC files were processed only after landings (Flarm data could not be used because of predicted fix). There was a qualification round with everybody flying against each other pilot that was followed by final races in pairs based on the results after the initial qualification. There was a best two out of three flights in each semi-final and finals race. The event was won by Sebastian Kawa from Poland who closely outperformed Werner Amman from Austria on second place and Tilo Holighaus from Germany on third place. The two seater self-launch Arcus M, that had been made available for the event by one of the manufacturers, flew over the skyscrapers and did some ridge flying along the line of Skyscrapers and eventually used the Palm airport for landing. The video of that flight taken from helicopter got a lot of attention on the internet. That glider even managed to make a three hour thermal flight later.

Mr. Stuck also created an article about the event for the French gliding magazine which contained additional interesting information. All Delegates were invited to read it. The English translation of the article made by IGC President Mr. Mozer has been emailed to all Delegates during the meeting.

In a subsequent discussion, the FAI president Dr. Grubbström in reaction to the presentation, mentioned that there were not many who would believe IGC would make an event in Dubai. Despite that the Gliding contest had a huge audience via social media and that is where the audience is now. An easy to understand concept of the race made it possible to spread it to a broader audience than our traditional groups. Furthermore, he referred to airspace matters which need to be understood in the context of the local environment of Dubai with two major aerodromes in a close proximity that are bigger than London Heathrow. Mr. Casado informed the Delegates the internet statistics of viewers of the gliding event are not yet available. There were 1.500 daily visitors of gliding only web pages and around 3.000 gliding video views. Mr. Mozer concluded that IGC has achieved its goal to hold a safe and interesting competition. It was also important to get a photos and videos of a glider in front of Dubai's skyscrapers that was viewed worldwide by thousands. Mr. Mozer also commented that the race that was developed for the WAG was a race option that could be used in any location in the world. Mr. Wolfgang Weinreich, the former FAI President, added that during a day of Dubai's national holiday the Palm Drop Zone was overcrowded by spectators. Mr. Bernd Weber, speaking on behalf of the German IGC Delegate added that the glider present there was also used for some initial gliding lessons so the gliding in Dubai might have started already. Mr. Sheppe added that the FAI staff that was present on site took care of all gliding problems. Then the FAI President Dr. Grubbström introduced the WAG opening ceremony video that was subsequently shown to the Delegates.

7. Championships (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

7.1 Reports from Past Championships

For past championships, the Jury President's or Chief Steward's reports were made available to the relevant committees and the IGC Bureau. The reports were not presented and there were no remarks to their content presented at the meeting.

7.1.1 1st FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2015 Pociunai, Lithuania

There were issues identified in the steward report and these and more was discussed under the proposal for the 13.5 meter class scheduled for the second day of the IGC Plenary meeting.

7.1.2 8th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2015, Arnborg, Denmark

7.1.3 9th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2015, Narromine, Australia

7.1.4 18th FAI European Gliding Championships 2015, Ocseny, Hungary (20m, 18m, Open)

7.1.5 18th FAI European Gliding Championships 2015, Rieti, Italy (Club, Std., 15m)

7.1.6 1st FAI Pan-American Gliding Championship, McMinn County, USA (15m and Handicap)

There were no remarks to any of the above competitions under (agenda items 7.1.2 – 7.1.6).

7.2 Reports about Future Championships

For future championships, general information was made available through the Bulletins; only items requiring action or special attention from the Plenum were presented.

7.2.1 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Pociunai, Lithuania (Club, Std., 20m)

Mr. Sabeckis informed that the preparations are under control by the experienced organisers who also committed to reflect on all remarks from the steward report on the recent WGCs in 13.5 meter class.

Mr. Gyöngyösi asked about entry fee for the 20m two seat class, where the bid was confusing on this point and could have been interpreted that there are two entry fees required for entries in this class. After the clarification with the IGC bureau it has been confirmed that there will be one entry fee per competing glider in any class, but both pilots representing the same NAC will be required to register (many countries registered only one pilot in this class).

In response Mr. Gyöngyösi had a more general remark on bid from the Czech Republic which states the same as the Lithuanian bid in relation to 20m two seat class entries. IGC President Mr. Mozer reassured the Delegates that intention is to go for entry fee per entry and not per pilot / crew member.

7.2.2 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Benalla, Australia (15m. 18m. Open)

Mr. Cubley informed that the 1st Bulletin has been sent out, the deadline for final entries is until the end of August 2016 due to some countries pilot selection process. A preliminary number of competing pilots will be collected at an earlier stage to enable organisers to manage the required resources in advance (through an advanced registration without pilot names).

7.2.3 2nd FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2017 Leszno, Poland

Mr. Rutkowski had an unpleasant duty to announce that due to series of factors the Polish NAC and the local organisers had to resign from the organisation of this championship.

Mr. Eriksen then asked if the IGC Plenary would be willing to empower the IGC Bureau to organise the new transparent selection process for this competition. The aim is to invite all delegates to bid and the IGC Bureau will then select the organiser. IGC President Mr. Mozer thanked the Polish NAC and IGC Delegate for this early announcement of facts. In his view the Championship Management Committee should manage the selection of the new venue for the IGC Bureau (see also agenda item AOB).

7.2.4 9th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2017, Zbraslavice, Czech Republic

Mr. Cihlář informed the Delegates that website is ready and operational and that all preparations are in progress and expected to be completed within the envisaged time frame.

7.2.5 10th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2017, Pociunai, Lithuania

Mr. Sabeckis briefed that a test contest is going to be organised together with the Lithuanian national gliding championship where international entries will be also accepted. Some countries already registered for that event.

7.2.6 35th FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Pribram, Czech Republic (18m, 20m, Open)

Mr. Eriksen came back to the reservations made by the IGC Bureau when accepting the bid. However, now all issues had been satisfactory resolved through a dialogue with the organisers. The conclusion is that there is enough space to organise this competition safely with the expected number of entries. Mr. Cihlář indicated that there is an intention to get two entries per NAC in 20m two seat class and that such proposal will be tabled in time for the next IGC Plenary meeting in 2017.

The OSTIV President, Dr. Rolf Radespiel indicated that Pribram is very likely to be selected as the location for OSTIV conference. OSTIV hopes that there are a sufficient facilities to host the congress and for that purpose OSTIV will get in touch with the local organisers in the near future.

7.2.7 35th FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Ostrow Michalkow, Poland (Club, Std., 15m)

Mr. Rutkowski informed that all preparation for this event are going well, the organisation team is set and the director will be the same as for the EGC in 2013. Many same people will be involved (including Mr. Rutkowski) in the organisation to ensure smooth run of the event.

Mr. Frank recalled that at the last day of EGC in 2013 there were many discussions about the closing ceremony held on the last contest day. Mr Rutkowski assured the Delegates that it will not happen again.

7.2.8 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Moravska Trebova, Czech Republic (Club, Std., 20m)

Mr. Cihlár informed the Delegates that the preparations are in a similar stage as preparation for the Women WGC 2017 in Zbraslavice and he has nothing to add on top of that.

7.2.9 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Lasham, UK (15m, 18m, Open)

Mr. Spreckley informed that there is no real news. The announcement of the name of competition director (Mr. Andy Davis - two times World Gliding Champion) has been done already in summer and he should be one of the main factors of success of the event. It has been also mentioned that Lasham is undergoing reconstructions and changes. A web page will be made available soon and the test event will be held in August 2016 along with the UK national championships in open class.

7.3 Approval of Competition Officials (Peter Eriksen)

Acceptance of all nominations at once. More use of remote jurors (new technology, low number of protests etc.)

7.3.1 Approval of Officials for 2016 Competitions

The following FAI/IGC officials were approved for competitions in 2016:

a. 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Pociunai, Lithuania

Chief Steward: Terry Cubley (AUS)
Steward: Lasse Virtanen (FIN)
Jury President: Bob Bickers (GBR)
Jury Members: Peter Eriksen (DEN), Marina Vigorito (ITA) *both remote*

b. 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Benalla, Australia

Chief Steward: Renato Tsukamoto (BRA)
Steward: Robert Moore (AUS) *still to be confirmed*
Jury President: Rick Sheppe (USA)
Jury Members: Bob Bickers (GBR)
Peter Eriksen (DEN) *remote*

7.3.2 Approval of Chief Stewards for 2017 Competitions

The following FAI/IGC officials were approved for competitions in 2017:

a. 2nd FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, venue to be selected by IGC Bureau before 31 May 2016

Chief Steward: Roland Stuck (FRA) *only Chief Steward due to the number of participants*
Jury President: Marina Vigorito (ITA)

b. 9th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2017, Zbraslavice, Czech Republic

Chief Steward: Frouwke Kuijpers (NED) *only Chief Steward due to the number of participants*
Jury President: Gisela Weinreich (DEU)

c. 10th FAI Junior World Gliding Championship 2017, Pociunai, Lithuania

Chief Steward: Christof Geissler (DEU)
Jury President: Juha Silvennoinen (FIN)

d. 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Moravska Trebova, Czech Republic (Club, Std., 20m)

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels (BEL)
Jury President: Peter Ryder (DEU)

e. 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Lasham, UK (15m. 18m. Open)

Chief Steward: Dick Bradley (RSA)
Jury President: Robert Danewid (SWE)

Guest speaker: Mrs. Margherita Acquaderni - Organizing the Sailplane Grand Prix Final in Varese from an organizer's perspective.

Mrs. Acquaderni started her presentation with a view to history of the club and the aerodrome that has been founded by Orsi family back in 1961. Then she continued with explanation what steps has been necessary to be taken in order to be able to apply for the SGP final. She mentioned that the event got a noteworthy support, including sufficient funding, from the local and regional authorities and also from the Italian Aero club, all of which well helped the organisation. In her opinion a good and stable funding is one of the crucial elements for the success. Then Mrs. Acquaderni mentioned media activities and the media team that took care of it before, throughout and also after the event. There were also several occasions for public to enjoy the race along some other aviation activities that were prepared by the organisers. Mrs. Acquaderni concluded her presentation by referring to the key words that were shared by all - organisers, pilots and crews and, FAI/IGC support team - Reliability, Enthusiasm and Passion.

Following Mrs. Acquaderni presentation Mr. Vidal shared his experience of the event from pilot's perspective. Finally, FAI president Dr. Grubbström thanked Mrs. Acquaderni and her team for the successful and safe organisation of the event and emphasised that also the representatives of FAI sponsor Breitling were happy to be part of it.

7.4 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley delivered one presentation on all SGP matters. Related aspects are mentioned under the relevant agenda items below.

7.4.1 Report on 6th series

Mr. Spreckley presented that during this series the cooperation with FAI was very good especially on communication. A live scoring system was under development and tested during the series and is now fully functional.

7.4.2 SGP Final 2015, Varese, Italy

On the SGP final Mr. Spreckley mentioned the following. The media team was provided by the IGC/SGP team, Silent Wings presentation studio was supported by the SW owners, there were excellent race highlights that included interviews and analysis videos. Furthermore, the dedicated SGP scoring program has been used for the first time. The event has been well supported by great local organisers and local video team, which allowed for a good media coverage focus on social media. Finally, the overall winner of the Championship was Mr. Maximilian Seis from France. The conclusion was that overall the event was a great success and the race coverage produced a very positive feedback and response also in the host country.

7.4.3 Progress for 7th series

The preparation for the 7th series are progressing well and 10 events including the final in Potchefstroom, South Africa are planned. The IGC team intends to build on experience from Varese.

7.4.4 Management and future

A new branding of national events has been launched and it allows for better recognition of events locally. The current priorities are to continue in development of a semi-professional management team and aid for local organisers and, eventually a good funding through reliable partners.

7.5 Sailplane Racing Website (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Georgas briefly presented some new features of the Sailplane Racing Website and informed about its future developments in relation to online scoring and presentation of videos.

Then the discussion followed on all present aspects of SGP:

Mr. Mozer asked for a little bit more information on the new branding strategy. Mr. Spreckley responded that branding is an important part e.g. a video will always start with the same sequence. In the past all qualifying GPs were having a different look, but in the future all these events will look similar. The SGP management team stepped back from calling it qualifying and introduced reference to nations which should help promotion in particular at the local level.

FAI president Dr. Grubbström congratulated the whole team for doing things using the right approach and especially for doing it in line with the FAI. He highlighted that our common brand is FAI and we all together have to promote that brand e.g. as FIFA does. Mr. Spreckley in his response did not disagree, but also could not fully agree with that. The FAI does have 10 sports which have a different identity and one of the aims of the SGP team is to build up a gliding identity as part of common FAI identity.

Mr. Mozer asked about the combined event and what it will mean for gliding. He also queried funding, in particular the time which would allow the SGP team to go forward with accumulated funding and, also asked about what would be the funding threshold. Mr. Spreckley responded first on the new naming convention e.g. the name would be FAI SGP Series 7 Germany, but it may be also called locally as the German FAI SGP Series 7. In response on funding, it has been mentioned that that it is not yet laid down and it needs to be done by the end of summer 2016.

7.6 Presentation of Bids for Future Championships (Mr. Eric Mozer)

7.6.1 3rd FAI 13.5m Class World Gliding Championships 2019

- Pavullo, Italy

7.6.2 11th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019

- Szeged, Hungary

7.6.3 10th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2019

- Lakekeepit, Australia

7.6.4 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019 (18m, 20m, Open)

- Turbia - near Stolowa Wola, Poland

7.6.5 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019 (Club, Std., 15m)

- Prievidza, Slovakia

7.6.6 2nd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2017 (Std., 15m both monotype)

- Argentina (as late bid accepted for presentation by the meeting)

7.7 Presentation of bid to host the IGC Plenary Meeting 2017

- Aquaworld Resort Hotel, Budapest, Hungary

7.8 Question to all bid presenters

Mr. Bradley questioned Italian and Hungarian bids on possible airspace restrictions during the events. Mrs. Vigorito for Italian bid responded that flatland in Italy could not be used due to airspace restrictions, but tasks are never set in this direction. Mr. Gyöngyösi for Hungarian bid commented that there is a military zone 70-80 km to the North with 5000FT limitation and 50km further North there is a Military control zone. Nevertheless, Hungarian gliding has a good cooperation with military which allows for a good area for task setting as it has been proven during the EGC held recently. The general altitude limit is 9500FT, which is above what is normally necessary.

Mr. Spreckley asked on the Hungarian bid on possibility of flights to Romania. Following that Mr. Geissler asked about the runway condition (very bumpy) and also about possibility of flights to Romania. Mr. Gyöngyösi responded that there is no intention to fly to Romania nor to Serbia where there is a restricted area along the border right now. However, it should be removed by the date of competition which would mean a little more airspace along the common border. On runway condition Mr. Gyöngyösi confirmed that it will not be an issue and it is also a different aerodrome that the one used during EGC 2015 when it was an issue. Mr. Bradley then queried what classes will be used in Hungary. Mr. Gyöngyösi responded that these will be the usual classes for juniors.

Mr. Spreckley asked about prices for the IGC meeting 2017. Following that Mr. Bradley asked about prices for the meeting room facilities. Mr. Gyöngyösi indicated that hotel rate should be from 80€ for a single room and that meeting room should cost around 350€ per day, but only in case there will not be a government funding. Finally on this topic Mr. Leinikki asked for a clarification whether the travel costs of FAI staff member and IGC secretary will be covered by the organisers. Mr. Gyöngyösi confirmed that these costs are part of the offer.

Mr. Frank asked the last question about situation in the club in Szeged as the last time there were some turbulences/tensions within community. Mr. Gyöngyösi assured the Delegates that issues have been resolved already some time ago and it is not a problem anymore.

Farewell speech of FAI President.

Dr. Grubbström thanked IGC for invitation and expressed appreciation of support received during the meeting. He noted very good global attendance compared to other established sports. He emphasised that FAI and IGC subcommittee should continue work on the rules as FAI was held legally accountable in a subsequent suit in Switzerland (min expected cost is 20.000 CHF to manage the case). Unfortunately, handbooks for FAI Officials are not always aligned and a higher lever rules are already slightly different. Therefore, the officials are not always aware of that as handbooks are not always aligned or updated. The FAI President commented on one of such legal cases to promote consistency and adherence to the existing rules within FAI.

Dr. Grubbström concluded that in his opinion gliding has a fantastic future and that he has seen many interesting gliding locations throughout the world presented at the meeting which would be worthy of a visit. Finally, FAI President highlighted that FAI and its air sports must be easy to understand, be able to produce quick results and sell the story with individuals in the lead to succeed in front of public.

IGC President Mr. Mozer thanked FAI President Dr. Grubbström for joining and active participation at the meeting and following that concluded the first day of the IGC Plenary meeting.

8. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

8.1 Year-2 Proposals

Unless specifically mentioned in the minutes, Year-2 proposals endorsed by the meeting will be valid and included in the FAI Sporting Code from the 1st October 2016

8.1.1 Contest Numbers, Annex A, 4.3 (Annex A Committee)

Proposal on Annex A, 4.3 to simplify requirements for Contest Number as follows:

- *To delete the requirement for contest number on underside of the right wind.*
- *To modify requirement for high of contest number on the tail fin and/or the rudder – must be at least 30 cm high is replaced by should be*
- *Added opportunity for organizers to require modification also in case of low contrast or otherwise illegible and, deleted option in case not complying with the all requirements on contest numbers.*

Mr. Cubley briefly introduced the proposal which allows for a greater flexibility for organisers.

Votes for: 32, against: 2, abstentions: 0

The proposal was adopted.

8.1.2 Maximum Take-off Mass, Annex A (Australia)

Amended proposal on Annex A to read:

That the maximum take-off mass for the 20m multi seat class be increased to 800Kg ~~subject to EASA approval.~~

Mr. Cubley highlighted that this is not proposal from Annex A committee and that the committee is neutral as it did not reach consensus. Mr. Cubley explained the rationale of proposal plus presented amended proposal as reflected above.

In the following discussion Mr. Hansen said that manufacturers may not be very happy about this proposal and asked whether 850kg would not be more sensible in order to avoid to have such a proposal the next year. Mr. Rutkowski reminded that when IGC started this class it adjusted the limits

to the limitations existing at that time. Then he asked, why manufacturers produce heavier gliders and turned towards to OSTIV and asked if there are design criteria for that. OSTIV responded that it has been discussed in Sailplane Development Panel. Also EASA now provides for higher masses and there is no technical argument against this proposal therefore, it is a kind of hypothetical question. Mr. Hansen said that if EASA limit is 850kg he proposes this limit as amendment. Spain seconded the proposal from Mr. Hansen. Mr. Cubley was not against, but there are some gliders with lower limits that may not be certified to 850kg. Mr. Georgas suggested for consideration that a lower limit may be a part of local procedures. Mr. Spreckley was against the amendment as nearly all gliders flown at WGCs are able to meet 800kg limit, but not all meet 850kg and those may be devaluated. In addition, all heavier gliders may fly at 800kg, but lighter may not fly at 850kg. Mr. Rutkowski asked on who drives the change, whether it is IGC or manufacturers. Mr. Geissler expressed that he is completely against the amendment to the proposal as 800kg fits the purpose and echoed the same reasons as mentioned by Mr. Spreckley earlier. Mr. Mozer asked OSTIV whether it would possible to certify all gliders to 850kg and OSTIV responded that it is possible, but this is problem for EASA and not a sporting problem.

Vote for 2nd amendment: for: 3, against: 29, abstentions: 1.

The 2nd amended was lost.

Vote for original amendment for: 34, against: 0, abstentions: 0, the original amended was accepted.

Mr. Cubley forwarded a motion, in the context of upcoming WGC in Pociunai, to apply the proposal as of 31 March 2016. Lithuania supported the motion.

Votes for the proposal as originally amended and with the motion from Mr. Cubley: 34, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal as amended by motion was adopted and the new limit will be valid from 31 March 2016.

8.1.3 Changing Team Cup calculation formula, Annex A (Poland)

The proposal to change para. 8.5.4 of Annex A to read:

The Team's Daily Score is the average team cup score of all team members (rounded to two decimal places). Point 8.5.5 is to be removed and following points of the paragraph are to be renumbered.

Mr. Rutkowski briefly introduced the proposal.

Votes for: 32, against: 0, abstentions: 2

8.1.4 To adjust the scoring of competition days where almost no gliders come back, Annex A (the Netherlands)

Amended proposal on Annex A to read:

Following the acceptance, in principal, of the philosophy to devalue competition days in which few pilots finish the Task, we offer the following implementation in this Year 2 Proposal.

Define n3 as the number of finishers, regardless of speed. Define n4 as the number of competitors whose scored distance is at least Dm/2.

Define the "completion ratio" as the number of finishers divided by the number of pilots who attempted the task. Completion ratio (CR) = n3/n4.

Define a new Day Factor FCR. FCR = the lesser of 1 and 1.2 CR + 0.6

Apply FCR in the same manner (and in addition to) the current Day Factor, F.

Mrs. Kuijpers briefly reminded the reasons why this proposal has been tabled and asked Mr. Filla to explain it further to the Delegates as the wording is difficult to understand. Subsequently Mr. Filla presented the proposal where he visualizing current scoring and the difference introduced by the proposal.

In the following discussion Mr. Johannessen recalled that previously IGC tried to reduce influence of a task setter on formula and that this proposal may be contrary to that. Mr. Boudierlique indicated that there may be a problem with formula because there may be a situation when a nice 500km long task will, under certain circumstances, receive only 600 points. Therefore, he suggested postponement of the proposal in order to rethink it e.g. to adjust formula in such a way that 1000 points thresholds will differ for a various classes. Mr. Roine asked a technical question. The Proposal introduced minimum boundary. Why it has not used another way to resolve the issue? Now pilots may be considering if to land out 49 or 51 km out. Mr. Ryder remarked that gliding is the only sport where a pilot influences

performance of another pilot and he understands why. Then he asked whether it has been tested at the competition already. Mrs. Kuijpers responded that it has not been tested in the Netherlands. Mr. Frank commented that it has been used in Denmark for a number of years, but with a different formula, which is based on assumption that the task setter sets feasible task and that solves the situation. Mr. Geissler thanked Mr. Filla and others for their explanations and in particular appreciated input from Mr. Roine. Furthermore, the input from Mr. Boudierlique has been understood as important in the context of maximum number of points in different classes. Therefore, he seconded delaying this proposal after a group of specialists come to some conclusion if the meeting procedures allow for that. Mr. Filla responded that for that reason we have Year 1 and Year 2 proposals, but understands Mr. Geissler's point that there may be a lack of communication. In response to Mr. Roine he explained further why the number of pilots launched has been changed to number of pilots reaching a specified minimum distance. It is because the day must be devalued also if weather deteriorates later during the task and in order to avoid tactics associated with launching and immediate landing to devalue the task. 50km has been seen as a compromise determined from the minimum distance Dm (100 km). Mr. Sheppe then expressed his and Annex A committee support to the delay of the proposal due to an excellent opportunity to review the scoring formulas in general. There are three fixed values that are applicable to all classes (e.g. 100km, 250km ...). Mr. Sheppe also mentioned that he has tried to do it last year but it failed therefore, he supports Mr. Boudierlique in the proposal to look into the overall scoring formula. Mrs. Vigorito agreed that there cannot be the same distance for Std. Libelle and Quintus. Mr. Bjornevik added that it is a complicated issue and although Mr. Filla illustrated it well, he supports to delay and rethink it again. He then responded to Mr. Boudierlique that a good distance day should be a day with 1000 points. A normal 1000 points day has 600 points for distance and the proposal degraded it slightly. Regarding the minimum distance for a different gliders, Mr. Bjornevik also has seen it as a problem, but that would deserve a different discussion than this one. Mr. Hansen stated that this formula is for pilots and that there is a way out for task setters. He mentioned that in the past 10 pilots in the 15m class did 500km on the 1st day and that all others landed out. As a result there was no way for those who landed out to compete for a leading position anymore. Therefore Mr. Hansen fully supported the proposal. Mr. Boudierlique proposed an amendment, to postpone the proposal and to create a working group of volunteers to study it further and come up with a new Year 2 proposal and that has been seconded. Mr. Sheppe did not support it, but would accept overall review of the scoring formula. Mr. Spreckley indicated possible support if that would be a real solution next year, otherwise supported the original proposal. Mr. Frank added that there is another alternative that can be studied and eventually presented next year. Mr. Casado did not support the amendment and supports complete review of the formula. Mr. Macintyre reminded that there are two different questions, one is postponement and another is overall reassessment of the formula. Mr. Sheppe asked to state clearly the proposed amendment. Mr. Boudierlique repeated the amendment to postpone as mentioned earlier and supported Mrs. Kuijpers to come up with an amendment or, the new redrafted formula.

Mr. Leinikki, the FAI representative, clarified that the creation of a new committee would require 2/3 majority vote. Mr. Spreckley stated that there is no need for another working group as input could be done through the work on Year 2 proposal. Mr. Macintyre reminded that the first vote should be to vote on the amendment and only then vote on the original proposal. Mrs. Kuijpers agreed with the amendment to postpone it by 1 year and supported creation of a working group to redraft the formula. Proposal has been then postponed by its initiator Mrs. Kuijpers on behalf of the Netherlands.

Mr. Rutkowski then asked a procedural question on who will be the holder of Year 2 proposal. Mr. Mozer confirmed that it will be the initiator, the Netherlands. Mrs. Kuijpers then concluded that IGC would lose one year between the Plenary meetings despite there is a beautiful formula. Then she asked for input which will be repeated through message via igc-delegates email channel after the meeting. Then a working group could be created on a complete review of the formula. Mr. Spreckley suggested that IGC has Annex A committee to conduct complete review of the formula from this context. Mr. Mozer suggested that it should be the Netherlands to lead the work on this supported by IGC committees, in particular Annex A committee. Mr. Georgas asked whether the discussion should take place also on other parameters and limits where the Year 1 proposal will be the baseline.

Finally, the original proposal was friendly amended without a vote and will be presented at the next IGC Plenary meeting.

8.1.5 SGP results in IGC Ranking List, Annex D (France)

The proposal to change present para. 7.2 of Annex D on Pilots Rating score which now reads:

Only the top ten Pilots receive a Pilot Rating Score.

Pilots Rating Score = 400 x (point score / max point score) + 600

to be replaced by:

Only the top ten Pilots (with more than zero points) receive a Pilot Rating Score. Rating score (pilot with place N) = Competition Rating – 10 x (N-1)

Mr. Boudier briefly introduced the proposal and presented comparison table showing the impact of the proposal.

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Spreckley, on behalf of Annex D committee, presented another solution together with a short impact table. He mentioned that the French proposal may be good for SGP final but it is not good for national SGP events. Mr. Boudier responded that as they did not see comparison of final results and that the daily place based scoring system should be consistent with the results in the IGC ranking List. Mr. Filla added that there is a challenge to combine two different systems, but he understands the reasons why we need to have it. Mr. Rutkowski suggested to do some comparison of the two solutions e.g. with 50 pilots in class, then to see how are the results distributed and only then to try to replicate such a distribution in the formula for SGP results. Mr. Boudier answered by a more detailed explanation of the previously presented tables. Then in response to Mr. Spreckley confirmed favouring the SGP results compared to the usual 1000 point system result, but one should also see it in the context of the names in the SGP final as presented in the file. Then Mr. Georgas expressed his support to the spirit of the proposal however, also suggested to find a formula that would better represent the situation as occurs in the normal competitions. Mr. Vidal agreed with that and preferred to see performance based results. Mr. Boudier added that if the alternate solution would be put forward it would mix apples and oranges as points in normal system are represented by kilometres and speed while in SGP we take into account only speed.

Votes for amendment: 27, against: 4, abstentions: 3

The amended proposal was adopted and subsequently Mr. Boudier on behalf of France decided to withdraw the proposal.

8.1.6 IGC Ranking list dynamism, Annex D (France)

Amended proposal on Annex D to read:

The base quality factor should be reduced for the preceding competition in a sequence as it is done for CAT 2 competitions. The 60% percentage should be set at a lower value. ~~Two values seem possible:~~

- ~~• 40% to act exactly as it is done for CAT2 events or~~
 - ~~• 50% to keep a good value for WGC preceding in a sequence.~~
- ~~The exact value (40 or 50%) to be determined during plenary.~~

Mr. Boudier briefly introduced the proposal and highlighted the options within in order to allow selection of the best one.

Mr. Filla indicated inability to determine what value would be the best. Mr. Mozer suggested to Mr. Boudier to amend it and to vote only on the first part of their proposal without values which was accepted by France.

Then Mr. Spreckley, on behalf of Annex D, explained national vs international competitions relations and relevant background. Mr. Georgas supported improvements, but to him the Ranking List formula is complicated therefore he is worried to vote on unclear proposal. He would prefer to have this sort of information in before the vote takes place. Mrs. Kuijpers agreed with him and suggested postponement by one year in order to prepare examples of actual impact on the Ranking List. Mr. Boudier was not ready to show example as it would be very complicated and added that only those pilots who would stop flying WGCs will be affected. Mr. Sheppe was not certain, but tended to oppose the proposal, understanding that it would blur the distinction between CAT1 and CAT2 events which would not be desirable.

Votes for amendment: 1, against: 29, abstentions: 4

The amended proposal was lost.

8.1.7 Start options, Annex A para 7.4.4, (Germany)

Amended proposal Annex A para 7.4.4 to read:

Additional start option: The competitor will be credited with one of a set of predetermined start times. First predetermined start time is the opening time of the Start, followed by additional start times every 4510 - 30 minutes. The exact interval to be decided by the contest director.

Mr. Geissler explained the proposal and the reasons behind, mainly reduction of motivation to start late and to follow early starters. The proposal reduces by far the possibilities of using Flarm as tactical device and reduces gaggles.

The discussion started by Mr. Rutkowski stating that this proposal may somehow introduce creation of gaggles. Mr. Geissler responded that there is a potential for smaller gaggles due to splitting the class into smaller groups. Following that Mr. Frank stated that it is a good proposal and highlighted that it is an option for the organiser and not a must. He concluded that IGC has to think on how to manage the starts and this is thinking out of the box therefore he supported it. Mr. Spreckley supported it too and made an amendment based on the experience at French masters competition where it was very popular among pilots when tested. He also added that the proposal does not have a big influence on gaggles, but has influence on late starters whether to go or not to go. Mr. Spreckley concluded that he believes that 10 minutes is the right time. The proposed amendment has been seconded by others.

In the following discussion Mr. Cubley noted that 10 minutes may not always work and that the exact time should be at the decision of the contest director.

Vote for amendment: 24, against: 6, abstentions: 5

Amendment has been accepted.

Next Mr. Cubley proposed second amendment where he suggested to add after 10 minutes 'or time decided by contest director'. Mr. Bjornevik agreed with that and added that the time should not be 30 minutes and that there should be a maximum time. Mr. Rutkowski supported that and Mr. Cubley eventually suggested minimum 10 minutes and maximum 30 minutes. Mr. Roine stated that he supports the original amendment as proposed by Mr. Cubley. Mr. Spreckley supplemented the discussion by saying that IGC may not rely always on Competition Directors as they also make mistakes. In his opinion 10 mins is the right time span. Mr. Rutkowski added that we should also set the minimum time increments. Mr. Bjornevik agreed with Mr. Spreckley on the 'simple' 10 minutes interval. Mrs. Kuijpers mentioned that it should be possible to also make it longer.

Vote for the second amendment: 19, against: 12, abstentions: 3

The amendment has been accepted.

Subsequently Mr. Boudierique suggested to test it at the next EGC. Then Mr. Bradley asked whether there will be a need to modify scoring systems. Mr. Spreckley suggested a motion not to use it at the next WGC. Mr. Cubley declared that Australian organisers will not use it in their local procedures. Mr. Filla in response to the scoring software question said that it is not an issue as the scoring could be also done manually. Mr. Foltin added that we should also bear in mind that local procedures are always approved by IGC Bureau after their scrutiny by the chief steward and the Annex A committee and in such a way they should be clear to competing pilots.

Vote for the proposal, as amended: 25, against: 6, abstentions: 4

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.1.8 Abstentions in IGC voting, IGC Internal Regulations, (New Zealand)

tabled as postponed agenda item from IGC Plenary 2015

Mr. Macintyre introduced the proposal and suggested the amendment that only first sentence of the proposal should be considered by the meeting.

The amended proposal to read:

Decisions being voted on at the IGC Plenary meetings shall be decided normally by a simple majority vote where abstentions shall not be counted as eligible votes.

Mr. Sheppe asked what 'normally' means and how it should be interpreted. Mr. Macintyre responded there may be occasions where FAI rule requires otherwise. Mr. Leinikki highlighted that the proposal affects decisions made by the IGC Plenary. He also added that there are other procedures for votes,

awards etc. that are regulated by the FAI. Finally, Mr. Macintyre clarified that normally means as usual.

Vote for proposal: 12, against: 13, abstentions: 10

The amended proposal has been lost.

8.2 Year-1 proposals

Mr. Leinikki again called the roll following departure of some delegates. There were again 35 votes present including the 4 proxies, requiring 18 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 24 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

8.2.1 Competing without C of A or Permit to Fly (Annex A Committee)

Mr. Sheppe on behalf of the Annex A Committee introduced the proposal as follows:

To allow microlight motorgliders with national registrations to compete without CofA or Permit to Fly.

Vote for proposal: 31, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.2.2 Airframe parachute (Annex A Committee)

Mr. Sheppe on behalf of the Annex A Committee introduced the proposal as follows:

To allow certified airframe parachute systems in place of personal parachutes.

Mrs. Vigorito noted that in case a parachute is required by law it must be worn.

Vote for proposal: 30, against: 0, abstentions: 3

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.2.3 Definition and scoring of 13.5 meter class (Italy)

Mr. Spreckley briefly introduced background of creation of the 13.5 m class. It has been triggered by review of the World class so that it will be also home for ultralight gliders and microlight motorgliders. There were no PW5 gliders at the recent WGC, but there were a few pure gliders flying. However, it is likely that some people will make new pure sailplanes to have the best performance in this new class. As a consequence ultralight microlight motorgliders will be disadvantaged.

Mr. Ghiorzo then presented the proposal on behalf of Italy. He started by explanation of Front Electric System (known as FES) which introduced a fantastic energy solution for gliding i.e. a quick and reliable system which is not subject to monopoly of one manufacturer. Furthermore there are several similar systems to be introduced soon. This system has also safety features that may attract others who did not join contests flying due to additional stress associated with outlandings. Then the brief statistics of gliders used at the recent WGC has been presented. The proposal is about a concept of energy management including MoP associated energy. The concept may provide for time specific actions/events which is also great for media. Furthermore, it has some other advantages compared to the current events like less demanding aerodrome facilities including towing or, a possibility to run it in one or at a different locations. Mrs. Vigorito complimented the presentation and confirmed that the concept will be tested in Italy to determine if it works. Mr. Foltin then added that he sees a big potential in this class and the Italian proposal is visionary and therefore worthy of a close look. In particular, a potential of pan-continental races should be worthy of exploring. Then Mr. Macintyre queried whether this proposal contains a class change. Mr. Foltin responded that the class as described in the Section 3 of SC (wingspan limitation of 13.5 meters) is not proposed to be changed, but the proposal addresses other competition related limitations that should be processed as the change of Annex A. Mr. Strachan noted that IGC flight recorders would need to be adapted to the new concept. Mr. Georgas then stated that it is a brilliant and exciting idea of measuring energy during gliding tasks and that in principle we are doing it nowadays, but not looking at it from the energy management perspective. Mrs. Kuijpers indicated that she does not like creation of new classes, but she is happy to see this concept as it is 'green' and good for public. Therefore, she could support it including the idea of a pan-continental flight as expressed by Mr. Foltin. She concluded that such a contest (Euroglide) is already there and is very popular. Mr. Rutkowski support it too as he did not like cutting the wings approach which would inevitably lead to just another class of the same kind. Then he mentioned that there are not so many gliders ready for this class and asked how many manufacturers are already supporting it. Mr. Foltin added that the design possibilities in this class are

a bit wider than in case of conventional manufacturers where the certification requirements are also consequence of a higher MTOM.

Mr. Ghiorzo added that there are many others tempted by this idea. Regarding the contest he mentioned that it is not necessary to change and revise the complete scoring system, but instead a bonus could be introduced to sort out the issues. In addition, a self-launching capability should allow use of different and until now unknown locations which could open new opportunities for gliding from the worldwide perspective. He then concluded that Italy can support the IGC Bureau proposal that will be discussed next therefore, this proposal has been withdrawn. Nevertheless, the Delegates indicated in an informal vote their support to the idea as included in the Italian proposal and as discussed at the meeting with 28 voted for, 1 against and 1 abstention.

8.2.4 Definition of 13,5 meter class (13,5 meter class WG)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal and suggested the following amendment that should be considered by the Delegates due to foreseen legislation changes that may affect the future.

The amended proposal to read:

That from FAI WGC in 2019 the 13.5 meter class will be restricted to gliders / microlight gliders with a Means of Propulsion.

Mrs. Vigorito suggested additional amendment to change 'means of Propulsion' by term 'self-launching capability'. Mr. Foltin suggested that this is a Year 1 proposal and such amendment that may restrict our possibilities to be explored for the Year 2 proposal. This has been then supported by Mr. Georgas. Following that Mr. Filla asked if it is legally possible to be introduced as proposed and Mr. Boudierlique asked whether it would not trigger a class change. Mr Hansen concluded that everybody seems to be very positive on this idea and expressed support for the idea as presented by Mr. Foltin not to restrict it to self-launching only. He added that the proposal may eventually go for electric propulsion, but that may also change in time. Mr. Geissler expressed that he is completely against the amendment as it would be then restricted to ultralight gliders only. He suggested that IGC should rather open the door and not to close it and also that OSTIV should be involved in preparation of Year 2 proposal. As a consequence of the discussion Italy decided to withdraw the proposed amendment.

Then the Delegates voted on the originally amended proposal.

Vote for proposal: 31, against: 1, abstentions: 1

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.2.5 List of penalties - dangerous flying (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal as follows:

Documentation by video about dangerous or hazardous flying of participants may not be used as basis of penalties. Unless being produced from the ground at the championship airfield by the CD, his deputy, Chief Steward or Steward.

Mr. Geissler explained the situation at the Championships that has triggered a tension within the teams which may in the future eventually lead to unwanted behaviour e.g. using video evidence to challenge achieved performance of other competitors.

Mrs. Vigorito expressed strong support for the proposal. Mr. Hansen indicated that he is very opposed as evidence is always evidence and should be considered in the right context. Mr. Boudierlique also indicated his strong support for the proposal. Mrs. Kuijpers stated that she is against it because evidence that is available should be analysed. Mr. Rutkowski did not understand why IGC needs to prohibit use of this evidence and why it could not be used in combination with other information. He added that not only smartphones, but also cameras etc. could be used to stop pilots to misbehave. Mr. Georgas said that he is not sure what the proposal would create if the evidence is reviewed by non-qualified people. Mr. Foltin added that those who do not misbehave should not worry. Mr. Macintyre informed that there was a GoPro footage of dangerous flying at Junior WGC, but additional analysis showed it was not so obvious. Mr. Hansen said that the proposal restricts video evidence by only those mentioned there, but that is only small part of the flight and then he asked about the remaining part of flight. Mrs. Vigorito asked Mr. Geissler whether the intention is to not allow use of this evidence as a basis for the penalty. Mr. Geissler responded that the proposal came out of situation where Team Captain was told that there is a video evidence which might have been

used for disqualification for dangerous flying and that created unnecessary emotions in the team. However, he is not against combination of evidence to stop a bad pilot behaviour. Mr. Sheppe added that the first sentence of the proposal is already true, but Competition Director should be allowed to judge and decide the case including all evidence, including video, that would be available. Mrs. Kuijpers suggested an amendment, to turn the logic around and to authorise Annex A on suggesting Competition Director on how to use video evidence (e.g. through a guidance). Mr. Spreckley reminded the Delegates of introduction of GNSS FRs back in 1995 which introduced much more additional evidence than before. Mr. Cubley stated that such amendment is against the proposal and therefore it should not be accepted. Mr. Vidal suggested that IGC should wait for guidance and the Safety Working Group may work on that. Mr. Filla gave an example of situation when one pilot was flying below the other and where it was not possible to say what has happened especially when pilots have had completely opposite statements. However, in combination with video evidence this situation could have been analysed and conclusion drawn. Mr. Macintyre suggested to amend the proposal to read 'as the only evidence'. Mr. Bradley expressed that he is strongly against as it would limit hands of organisers and in case of accident it could be used anyway.

Vote for proposal: 6, against: 26, abstentions: 1

The proposal has been lost.

8.2.6 Individual ranking list and 20m two-seat class (France)

Mr. Boudier introduced the amended proposal and added that in situations when there are two pilots as a crew, IGC ranking list takes it into account as an individual results. France does not support inclusion of this class results into the individual ranking list therefore created this initiative. Mr. Boudier then explained that there are two separate proposals as mentioned below and each should be processed individually.

8.2.6.a – Individual ranking list and 20m two-seat class (France) – Part 1

Amended proposal Part 1 to read:

The results from the two seaters 20m championships already in our RL (2014 and later) should be removed from the individual RL as it was done before. No other future results in this class should added in the individual RL until our rule (Annex A and D) make it possible.

The application date of this part of the proposal is 1/4/2016

Mr. Pauwels mentioned that aviation regulations state that there is only one PIC in a glider and that may probably solve the issue. Mr. Spreckley said that this has been proposed in the past and that the IGC ranking list takes into account only the result of a higher ranked pilot. The question only should be if we want to include this class in the ranking list or not. Mr. Mozer, clarified with France whether they would prefer separate votes on the proposal (Part 1 and Part 2). Mr. Boudier confirmed that and asked for deletion of the last sentence of Part 1. Mr. Spreckley then clarified that if this proposal is voted favourably, IGC will remove all 20m two seat class results from the IGC ranking list.

Vote for proposal: 10, against: 18, abstentions: 5

The proposal has been lost.

8.2.6.b – Individual ranking list and 20m two-seat class (France) – Part 2

Amended proposal Part 2:

The status of the 20m class and the individual RL must be clarified for the future.

Two options are possible:

Main option: The two seaters pilots are considered as a crew and no input can be done into the individual RL (preferred by France).

Subsidiary option: Only the "first" pilot counts in the two seater 20m class and his performance can be taken into account in the individual RL. That means that the Annex A must be changed and the spirit of the two seater 20m class is changed a lot. The "crew" idea must be removed.

In any case, the results of two seaters can be taken into account in the feminine or junior RL, only if during all the flights of the competition, both pilots of the two seaters meets the criteria of the above RL.

Mr. Boudierlique stated that there is a history behind this proposal and perhaps Mr. Spreckley may explain it further. Mr. Hansen suggested to vote first on subsidiary option and only than the main one. Mr. Georgas added that he is not fully against it, but would welcome it more detailed. Mr. Mozer asked whether it would be accepted to vote only on the first sentence of the amended proposal Part 2 as indicated above. This was accepted by France.

Vote for amended proposal: 31, against: 0, abstentions: 2

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.7 Participation of World Champions at WGCs (Denmark)

The amended proposal to read as follows:

3.4.3 b - The safe number of entries per class depends on the local conditions and operating procedures. Therefore the entry numbers per class for each specific contest will be decided by the IGC on the basis of evidence provided by the Organisers, subject to the provision that the maximum number of entries per class shall be 50 ~~plus the reigning Champions in the appropriate class.~~

3.4.3 c - to be deleted. Change regards to Junior WGC and Women WGC will be ~~accepted~~ excepted.

Mr. Frank introduced the originally amended proposal with deleted last part of para 3.4.3.b as indicated above.

Mr. Boudierlique added that there may be a situation when juniors and women would not be selected in the original team. The proposal has been further amended by Denmark so that the last sentence will end by word 'excepted' instead of 'accepted'.

Vote for amended proposal: 17, against: 8, abstentions: 8

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.2.8 Use of WGS84 and OpenAir (Scoring Software Working Group)

The IGC Bureau suggested that the proposal, as listed below, should be remitted back to ANDS for further discussion:

- *To always use the WGS84 ellipsoid as the earth model for calculating distance of world records, badges, diamonds and diplomas,.*
- *To use the WGS84 ellipsoid as the earth model for calculating distances of competition tasks, even when the differences will be minimal for coherence.*
- *To always use the definition of the OpenAir format for detecting whether or not the glider is inside an area (ex. AA sector),*
- *The problem with the AA sectors could be solved by requiring (in Annex A) that these areas must be defined in the same way as airspace, using the OpenAir format. Then the presence within any assigned area could be detected in the same way as the detection of air space infringement*

Mr. Strachan, stated that this proposed should be voted at the IGC Plenary meeting. Mr. Spreckley reminded that working groups cannot place a proposal without its acceptance by the IGC Bureau and that the Bureau was not in favour of this proposal because of lack of consensus between Annex A committee and Scoring Software Working Group. Mr. Casado objected the proposed approach and reminded that he was willing to place this proposal as the Spanish delegate which has been shortly confirmed by IGC Secretary (email of 9 January 2016).

The proposal has been then changed to the late proposal by Spain and accepted for discussion by 27 votes.

Mr. Casado then introduced the proposal and its rationale and highlighted a consistency issue and importance of use of only Open Air format. Mr. Georgas confirmed that the proposal addresses an important problem on how to calculate results and that it could be a useful way that may standardise our scoring. Then he queried whether only the Open Air format would be capable to achieve that. Mr. Casado confirmed that it would and added that also some other formats could be explored. Then Mr. Georgas suggested the amendment as below which was accepted by Spain:

The amended proposal to read:

~~• To always use the WGS84 ellipsoid as the earth model for calculating distance of world records, badges, diamonds and diplomas;~~

~~• To use the WGS84 ellipsoid as the earth model for calculating distances of competition tasks, even when the differences will be minimal for coherence.~~

~~• To always use the definition of the OpenAir format for detecting whether or not the glider is inside an area (ex. AA sector);~~

~~• The problem with the AA sectors could be solved by requiring (in Annex A) that these areas must be defined in the same way as airspace, using the OpenAir format. Then the presence within any assigned area could be detected in the same way as the detection of air space infringement~~

To establish a set of mathematical methods and formulas to calculate performances in contest, badges and records.

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Strachan added that the concern in the proposal is airspace. Mr. Rutkowski said that it looks from the proposal that we do not have right methods and formulas. Mr. Casado responded that IGC has WGS84, but in order to allow for a more study in this matter, he prefers not to refer to it.

Vote for amended proposal: 30, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.2.9 The change to SC3 rule 2.2.1 (UK) - Late proposal

The IGC Delegates did not accept this late proposal for discussion by 20 votes against.

8.2.10 Loss of Height on the Silver/Gold duration flight (SC3 committee) - Late proposal

The proposal has been accepted for discussion by 27 votes for.

Mr. Macintyre explained the proposal to the Delegates. The proposal to read:

SC3 text changes: Delete 2.4.4 on duration evidence in its entirety, and Delete reference to LoH in the Silver/Gold duration definitions (2.2.1b and 2.2.2b)

Mr. Rutkowski added that it should be considered that 1000 m of height can be converted to 20 minutes flight.

Vote for proposal: 24, against: 3, abstentions: 5

The proposal has been accepted.

8.3 Other proposals

8.3.1 IGC internal procedures - abstentions in IGC voting (IGC Bureau, SC3 Committee, Sweden and New Zealand)

The Bureau decided to postpone discussion on this because draft procedures had not been distributed to the Delegates yet. However, it has been indicated that the procedures would cover management of Year 1 proposals to become Year 2 proposal including involvement of all relevant parties.

8.3.2 SGP pilot criteria (Germany)

The proposal was withdrawn by Germany.

8.3.3 Study on Country Ranking List, Annex D (France)

Mr. Boudier presented results of the French study on Country Ranking List. The presentation covered the current status of the rules, objectives of the new ranking which should be that all pilots flying WGC from the country would be counted in the country ranking, all WGC would be taken in account and that the ranking can be updated after each WGC. Simulation took into account 2 year period and covered all kinds of WGC. Mr. Boudier concluded by saying that their idea is to present the proposal next year.

Mr. Georgas stated that he can see an interesting idea in this, i.e. possibly of a different ranking for overall ranking list and separate ones for women or juniors. Mr. Sheppe asked why we have the team cup if there is country ranking and added that the term team cup is not used in the ranking list context. Mr. Boudier responded that this is correct, but IGC/FAI gives medals. The country

ranking that exists today is based on individual ranking of 5 best pilots in the ranking list, but the proposal will take into account all results and not only the best two.

Mr. Mozer, IGC President thanked France for the efforts spent on this study.

9. Vote on bids

9.1 3rd FAI 13.5m Class World Gliding Championships 2019

Unanimously accepted.

9.2 11th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019

Mr. Trimmel stated that the previous EGC 2015 in Ocseny was a very good event.

Unanimously accepted.

9.3 10th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2019

Unanimously accepted.

9.4 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019

- Club, Standard and 15 Meter Classes: Prievdza, Slovakia

Unanimously accepted.

- 18 Meter, 20-Meter 2-seater and Open Classes: Turbia - near Stolowa Wola, Poland

Unanimously accepted.

9.5 2nd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2017

- Standard and 15 Meter Classes (both using monotype): Santa Rosa de Conlara, Argentina

Unanimously accepted.

10. FAI/IGC awards (Mr. Eric Mozer)

10.1 Lilienthal Medal

The Lilienthal Medal was awarded to Mr. Rainer Wienzek, Germany.

10.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma

The Pirat Gehriger diploma was awarded to Mr. Roland Stuck, France.

10.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal

The Pelagia Majewska Medal was awarded to Mrs. Margherita Acquaderni, Italy.

11. 2017 IGC Plenary Meeting (Mr. Eric Mozer)

12.1 Vote on the proposal to host the IGC Plenary Meeting in 2017 at Budapest, Hungary, Aquaworld Resort Hotel, Spa and Conference Centre

The Bureau was authorized to decide the venue for IGC Plenary 2017 taking into consideration the offer presented by Hungary.

Unanimously accepted.

12.2 Announcement of the dates of the IGC Plenary meeting 2017

The next annual meeting of the FAI International Gliding Commissions will be held on Friday 3rd and Saturday 4th March 2017. The venue will be confirmed as soon as possible (see also 12.1 above).

12.2 Useful dates and other practical information (Mr. Vladimir Foltin)

Notification of proposals must reach the Bureau by Friday 30th September 2016;

Bids must reach the Bid Specialist by Friday 30th September 2016;

Proposals, nominations and reports must be finalised and delivered to the secretary on the 31st December 2016.

All material will be made available for delegates 45 days before the meeting, Thursday 12th January 2017.

AOB

- The proposal concerning the 2nd FAI World 13.5m Class World Gliding Championship:

Due to the withdrawal received from Poland, the IGC Plenary authorized the IGC Bureau to relaunch the bid procedure for the 2nd FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championships in 2017 and to select a new organizer after the previous organiser's resignation. All NACs will be invited to bid for the event until the 30th April 2016 and the Bureau will nominate the new organizer not later than the 31st May 2016. If no acceptable bids will be received, the IGC Bureau will cancel the event.

Vote for proposal: 27, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The proposal has been accepted.

- SGP results in IGC Ranking List, Annex D (Chile) – Late Year 1 proposal

Mr. Vidal put forward late proposal that was the same as amended French proposal listed under agenda item 8.1.5 (withdrawn by France). The proposal to read as follows was accepted for discussion by 27 votes for:

The SGP calculation in the IGC ranking list should be defined as follows.

7.2 Pilots rating score.

Only the top ten Pilots receive a Pilot Rating Score.

Pilots Rating Score = 300 x (point score / max point score) + 700

This proposal is in support of the year one proposal that was approved in 2015.

Mr. Geissler asked for clarification what is going to be discussed and that has been clarified by the IGC Secretary. Mr. Cubley then highlighted that the last sentence from the original French proposal on applicability up to 10 places is missing here. Mr. Spreckley confirmed that.

Vote for proposal: 27, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The proposal has been accepted.

13. Closure (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President 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.

Vladimir Foltin, IGC Secretary

Appendix A IGC Committees and Working Groups, Representatives and Specialists

March 2016

Committee	Chair
ANDS:	Rick Sheppe
Championship Management:	Peter Eriksen
GFAC:	Ian Strachan
Sporting Code Section 3D	
Main Section & Annex C:	Ross Macintyre
Annex A:	Rick Sheppe
Annex A: Handicap Subcommittee	Christof Geissler
Annex B:	Bernald Smith/ Ian Strachan
Annex D:	Brian Spreckley/Reno Filla
Working Group Chairs:	Chair

Country Development:	Alexander Georgas
History:	Tor Johannessen
13.5 meter class	Brian Spreckley
Championship Structure	Peter Eriksen
Safety	Rene Vidal
IGC media	Brian Spreckley
Stewards	Terry Cubley
Juries	Marina Vigorito
Scoring Software	Angel Casado
IGC Representatives	
CASI:	Marina Vigorito
EGU:	Patrick Pauwels
Environmental Comm.:	Bernald Smith
Medical Comm.:	Jürgen Knüppel
OLC:	Christof Geissler
Specialist Officers	
IGC Treasurer	Dick Bradley
Sailplane Grand Prix:	Brian Spreckley
Simulated Gliding:	Roland Stuck
Webmaster, social media	Rick Sheppe
Trophy Management:	Gisela Weinreich