



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*



Minutes

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

Version 1.0

Held in Budapest
Friday 3rd and Saturday 4th March 2017
at Danubius Hotel Gellert

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 2017 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked them for coming to Budapest. The President then asked people that were participating in the IGC meeting for the first time to present themselves. The President also welcomed all guests present at the meeting, in particular the FAI Secretary General Ms. Susanne Schödel who joined on the meeting on second day. Finally the President thanked the local organisers of the meeting, in particular Mr. Andras Gyöngyösi, Mrs. Diana Gyöngyösi and Mr. Gergo Cziraky 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 honor 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 32 votes were present including 5 proxies (from Ireland to UK, from Latvia to Lithuania, from New Zealand to Australia, from Switzerland to Austria and from Portugal to Spain) thus 17 votes would be required for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 21 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

Mr. Leinikki called the roll at the beginning of the second day, Saturday 4th March. There were 33 votes present including the 4 proxies, still requiring 17 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 22 votes for a 2/3rds majority. The following agenda items were affected in the given order: 8.3.7, 8.3.8, 8.3.6, 8.1.1 to 8.1.9, 8.2.1 to 8.2.3 and 8.2.5 to 8.2.14.

Mr. Leinikki called again the roll at the beginning of afternoon session, Saturday 4th March. There were 34 votes present including the 4 proxies, requiring 18 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 23 votes for a 2/3rds majority. The following proposals were affected in the given order: 9.1 to 9.3, 11.3 and 8.2.4.

Later on after completing agenda item 8.2.4, Mr. Leinikki called the roll again. There were 33 votes present including the 4 proxies, still requiring 17 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 22 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

1.3 Administrative Matters (Mr. Vladimir Foltin)

Mr. Tor Johannessen and Prof. Peter Ryder 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 all delegates, meeting participants, companions and FAI staff were invited to a dinner at a cruise boat on the Danube.

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, Luxembourg 26th and 27th February 2016 (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Luxembourg 26th and 27th February 2016 prepared by IGC Secretary Mr. Vladimir Foltin 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. He highlighted the successful 7th FAI/IGC Sailplane Grand Prix Final - 2016 South Africa in November of 2016 as well as the two FAI World Gliding Championships events, one held in Pociunai, Lithuania and another one Benalla, Australia.

Mr. Mozer also mentioned that the meeting agenda is full and there are many important items for discussion that may influence gliding sport in a longer term. 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 (Ms. Susanne Schödel)

Ms. Susanne Schödel, FAI Secretary General joined the meeting in the beginning of its second day. She thanked the delegates for the friendly reception.

Her presentation started with a reminder of the FAI strategic goals followed by information about number of FAI sanctioned events. There were 48 1st category events in 2015 held in 25 different countries and 724 category 1 and 2 events in 2016. Furthermore, Ms. Schödel reported on the main activities of the FAI during the past year which were dedicated to the development of a multi events (connecting various air sports), FAI Air Games Tour (AGT) and IT matters.

In relation to the first topic, FAI held the WAG evaluation workshop in April 2016 where various aspects of the WAG concept and WAG future were discussed. The results will be used for the improvements of the future events.

Furthermore, FAI worked on the FAI Air Games Tour (AGT), the multi event concept, where various air sports could be well connected. The concept aims at a repetitive event held in great locations, with the best athletes participating in a non-stop staged show. The staging elements of the AGT design would be Technology/Engineering/Education Programme, Iconic Locations, Fan Activities, Aeronautics Business Events, Ecology and Sustainability and Entertainment.

Regarding IT matters, Ms. Schödel mentioned the IT workshop organized at end of 2016 with IT experts from ASCs to raise synergies and to develop a standardized platform. The work on these topics will continue in 2017. Furthermore, FAI Event Management System as support for LOCs was mentioned. In this regard the FAI signed the contract with Noosphere and API programmers to develop such system that would be directed to LOCs and ASC Officials, connected with FAI SL database and implemented at World Games 2017 in Wroclaw, Poland with further roll out to be agreed afterwards.

Finally, Ms. Schödel concluded her presentation with the information about Asia Summit where FAI Air Sports were part of the discussions.

5. Finance (Mr. Dick Bradley)

The 2016 Financial statement and 2017 budget is available for download at the FAI web.

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2016 Financial Statement

The IGC Treasurer Mr. Dick Bradley presented the 2016 Finance Report and the 2017 budget.

The 2016 report showed an income of 36,331€. The expenditure was 41,121€. The reserves were reduced with 4,790 € to 74,286 €. Budgeted income was significantly lower due to lower collection of sanction fees in 2016 due to move of the WGC to January 2017 and less entries than anticipated. Overall expenses were higher due to increase of meeting costs, but this cost was slightly compensated by significantly lower travel expenses for officials.

The Financial Report was unanimously accepted by the meeting.

5.2 2017 Budget

The 2017 budget showed expected income of 58,500 € and expenditure of 64,004 €. The budgeted expense level was notably higher than in 2016, but similar to previous years, mainly due to higher number of Championships and slightly increased Capital and Miscellaneous Expenditures. Therefore the income was budgeted at a higher level as for 2016, but it is still 5,504 € below the expenditure.

The following short discussion followed on the budget.

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers (NEL) 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 2017 that will cover such expenditures.

The Budget for 2017 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 briefly reported on the very successful OSTIV congress which has taken place in Australia in January 2017 during the WGC. The congress was well supported by the local organizers and attendance was higher than in the past. Many interesting topics were discussed, but Dr. Radespiel highlighted the discussion about future of the open class, which was concluded by the will to explore long competition tasks in this class.

6.2 Standing Committees

6.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3D Report (Mr. Alexander Georgas)

Mr. Georgas referred to the written report and mentioned the proposals that have been tabled for the discussion by the Plenary.

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 presented paper on 'Determination of new handicaps for evaluation of Gliders in Club Class'. The analysis will be published on FAI web page for information to delegates and national experts.

6.2.3 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex D (Mr. Reno Filla)

Mr. Reno Filla referred to the written report and indicated that he has nothing to add to what is in the report.

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

Mr. Rick Sheppe forwarded greetings to all delegates from Mr. Bernald Smith (former chairman of the committee). Mr. Sheppe expressed gratitude to Mr. Smith for his work on High Altitude Flight Recorder (HAFR).

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

Mr. Strachan provided delegates with presentation of the GFAC activities, where he mentioned that there are now 58 types of IGC-approved FR from 20 different manufacturers and that there were several new GNSS FR approvals in 2016. In that regard he in particular highlighted the work on the HAFR and on the dual frequency Mean of Propulsion (MoP) sensor for detecting jet engine noise.

6.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen briefly presented activities of the committee, which were related to the review of feedback received from the stewards. The essential part of this feedback referred to safety issues observed during the recent championships, which the committee analyzed and discussed, including possible solutions that could be implemented at the future IGC events. In that regard Mr. Mogens Hansen (DEN) asked about availability of IGC safety videos online. Mr. Brian Spreckley (UK) responded that most of the videos are available on YouTube online channel.

6.3 Working Groups

6.3.1 Championship Structure (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen briefly reported on the activities of the working group. The group conducted analysis of the current situation at IGC championships and presented a possible way forward to the Bureau, which developed them further and presents them in the form of proposals at this meeting. As some of the proposals were developed only at the Bureau meeting just prior to the IGC Plenary meeting, the Secretary advised the delegates to check the meeting webpage for the latest version of the Agenda and proposals.

6.3.2 Safety (Mr. Rene Vidal)

Mr. Vidal introduced the written report on group past activities. The report contained statistics and analysis of IGC safety data. 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 were briefed on the discussions that occurred at the separate meeting on Flam organized just prior to the IGC Plenary meeting.

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Bjornevik emphasized that reporting is crucial and unfortunately we do not get reports on all safety incidents that occur at IGC championships. Mrs. Kuijpers expanded on that and offered use of the specific SW, developed in the Netherlands for reporting of safety occurrences in general aviation, for testing at the FAI Women WGC's this summer. Mr. Vidal commented that there is a need to encourage pilots to share their knowledge about unsafe events without pointing them out. Mr. Spreckley suggested that IGC also needs to clarify it in the rules similarly to accidents, which are addressed quite clearly. Mr. Hansen supported previous speakers and expressed that there hopefully won't be any accidents this year. Mr. Bjornevik in response to Mr. Spreckley mentioned that rules without penalties won't work because pilots may not follow them. Mr. Mozer asked for more clarity in the statistics e.g. inflight vs ground incidents/accidents etc. and invited delegate and experts to come up with good ideas for improvements so the statistics could support IGC decisions on safety matters. Mr. Vidal referred back to analysis SW used during the recent WGCs in Benalla and invited the Australian delegate Mr. Terry Cubley to provide more details. Mr. Artur Rutkowski (POL) mentioned that we seem to miss a lot of safety information (27 accidents vs only 54 incidents) because typically the incidents vs accidents ratio is much higher. He emphasized again that IGC should be careful and avoid punishments so more safety events are reported by the pilots.

6.3.3 Scoring Software (Mr. Angel Casado)

Mr. Casado referred to the written report and indicated that he has nothing to add to what is in the report.

6.3.4 History Committee (Mr. Tor Johannessen)

Mr. Johannessen introduced Mr. Peter Selinger who will be his successor and will lead the committee. He invited delegates and experts to support Mr. Selinger in his work on IGC history. Mr. Mozer expressed his personal thanks and appreciation of the work Mr. Johannessen spent on IGC history over many years. The delegates and experts joined and applauded Mr. Johannessen for his efforts on IGC history. Following that Mr. Mozer welcomed Mr. Selinger in the new role and offered him all IGC support he would need for in the committee to continue its work.

6.3.5 Country Development (Mr. Alexander Georgas)

Mr. Georgas apologized for not producing written report to the Plenary and briefly reported on a few activities of the group over the last months. He asked for a replacement in his chairman role because his other commitments within the IGC, namely SGP and the Bureau, do not allow him to dedicate sufficient time to this important activity. The Bureau will look for candidates that could eventually take up that role in the future.

6.3.6 IGC Media (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley briefly introduced this new group and mentioned that further information will be presented under the item 7.4 related to the FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships, as the most of the media activities took place along the SGPs.

6.3.7 13.5 Meter Class (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley briefly reported on the activities and suggested that the relevant discussion takes place along discussion on the specific proposals (see items 8.1.3 and 8.3.7 later)

6.4 IGC Representatives

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

Mrs. Marina Vigorito, the IGC representative to CASI, informed the delegates about the recent activities of CASI. Furthermore, she clarified her role within CASI which is mostly to respond to questions, provide a guidance or an approval on gliding related matters. She is also a member of the CASI bureau and the two WGs (one on the definition of a multisport events and one other one on amending the jury handbook). As the IGC Bureau member she regularly reports on CASI matter to IGC.

6.4.2 EGU/EASA (Mr. Patrick Pauwels)

Mr. Pauwels invited delegates to read the full report. The EGU annual conference was held in Heathrow, UK prior to the IGC Plenary meeting. Mostly European regulatory issues were discussed there. The General Aviation roadmap initiative of the European Commission launched two years ago has not been concluded yet. The EGU worked closely with EASA and other stakeholders on gliding operations rules which are now pending endorsement by the European legislators/regulators and

EASA. Work on licensing rules on gliding will start in October with the aim to propose as simple a set of rules as possible. The first results on simpler gliding operations rules are expected in 2018 and on licensing in 2019. Therefore, a solution for a 2 year gap between applicability of the currently published rules and the new ones would need to be addressed. Although, Hungary recently joined the EGU, there is still a need for more support from other European nations that are not yet members.

In the following discussion Mr. Johannessen echoed the need to support work of the EGU, all countries that benefit from it should join and contribute. Mr. Foltin then asked about the recent developments on 8.33 retrofits funding. Mr. Pauwels replied that EGU is not directly involved in this initiative and the EU funding is not yet secured. Also the administrative costs are not yet clear.

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 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.

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)

Dr. Knüppel, IGC representative to CIMP, delivered presentation on aircrew medical related matters. Among other topics he included information about International Federation of Sports Medicine (www.fims.org) including its role vis-à-vis air-sport pilots. The FAI and CIMP in particular closely follows and cooperates with FIMS. Dr. Knüppel offered his support to IGC on medical issues if necessary.

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

Mr. Geissler provided short verbal report on OLC activities and referred to the OLC web page (www.onlinecontest.org), where the delegates could find more information on various contests including the OLC statistics.

6.5 IGC Specialists

6.5.1 Trophy Management (Mrs. Gisela Weinreich)

Mrs. Weinreich invited delegates to read the full report verbally. In addition she mentioned example of the IGC trophies from WGCs recently presented at the Wasserkuppe museum, which could be seen as an option to promote IGC trophies among our community and also towards public.

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

There were no remarks.

7.1.2 34th FAI World Gliding Championships 2016, Benalla, Australia (15m. 18m. Open)

Mr. Cubley reported that the stewards report was still to come, but its draft version has been shared with the steward group at the meeting just prior the IGC Plenary. The Championships were successful with 115 entries, 8 contest days, 3 practice days despite the challenging weather. The media was a big priority for the organizers who put a lot of effort in it, which resulted in a lot of coverage. The major issues were safety related. The blue thermals which were not high on several days caused very large gaggles. This style of flying triggered a number of complaints about behavior of some pilots. Pilots kept flying in the gaggles despite the organisers attempt to break them to smaller groups. Perhaps it is a cultural issue, which may require IGC to look at the current scoring. It was hard to identify troublemakers

from reports. Therefore organizers tried a private feedback. They have spoken to a number of pilots following up the complaints. John Warrington did IGC files analysis of all up to date flights. The three slides showing a relative behavior of flying in a proximity of other gliders (showing all three competition classes) were then presented to the delegates. The analysis could be used for this year's EGCs and its results could be sent to the organizers every day.

7.2 Reports about Future Championships

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

Mr. Eriksen reminded all Championship organisers that changes to the bids should be announced to the IGC. He then mentioned that there is ongoing work at the FAI level on the new organizer agreements, where the long term plan is that organisers will sign the agreement before presenting the bid. There may be also other rather small changes to the organizer agreement, in particular on insurance of the FAI officials etc. Those organisers that will be awarded to organize the IGC Championships tomorrow will be invited to sign the organizer agreements within 30 days. Mr. Mozer expressed his hope that in the future the IGC will be able to send it to all applicants in advance so there will not be any reservations from the bidders. The intention is to sign the agreements at the IGC Plenary meeting at a small ceremony following the IGC decision on Championship organizers.

7.2.1 2nd FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2017, Szatymaz, Hungary

7.2.2 9th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2017, Zbraslavice, Czech Republic

7.2.3 10th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2017, Pociunai, Lithuania

There were no remarks to any of the above competitions under (agenda items 7.2.1 – 7.2.3).

7.2.4 35th FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Pribram, Czech Republic (18m, 20m, Open)

Mr. Jiří Cihlár informed the delegates that the Czech Republic national gliding championships will be open to international participants which are invited to take part. The territory and terrain characteristics will be the same as for the next WGC in 2018.

7.2.5 35th FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Ostrow Michalkow, Poland (Club, Std., 15m)

Mr. Rutkowski, the Polish delegate informed that the administrative issues with the FAI office have been resolved and the pilots warmly invited to participate.

7.2.6 3rd FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2019 Pavullo, Italy

Mrs. Vigorito mentioned that the test event that will be organized in 2018 will in line with the expected evolution in 13.5m class, the facilities already in place.

7.2.7 11th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019, Szeged, Hungary

7.2.8 10th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2019, Lakekeepit, Australia

7.2.9 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Moravska Trebova, Czech Republic (Club, Std., 20m)

7.2.10 19th FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Lasham, UK (15m, 18m, Open)

There were no remarks to any of the above competitions under (agenda items 7.2.7 – 7.2.10).

7.2.11 2nd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2017, Santa Rosa de Conlara, Argentina (15m and Standard, both using monotype)

Mr. Eduardo Toselli informed that the bulletin one for this Championships to be published soon and the pilots from around the world are invited to participate.

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.) to save costs.

7.3.1 Approval of Officials for 2017 Competitions

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

a. 2nd FAI 13.5m Class World Gliding Championship, Szatymaz, Hungary

Chief Steward: Brian Spreckley (GBR)
remote Chief Steward due to the number of participants
Jury President: Bob Bickers (GBR)
Jury Members: Marina Vigorito (ITA)
Peter Eriksen (DEN) *both remote*

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)
Jury Members: Jaroslav Vach (CZE)
Angel Casado (ESP) *both remote*

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

Chief Steward: Christof Geissler (DEU)
Steward: Wojciech Scigala (POL)
Jury President: Juha Silvennoinen (FIN)
Jury Members: Frouwke Kuijpers (NED)
Brian Spreckley (GBR) *both remote*

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

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels (BEL)
Steward: Lasse Virtanen (FIN) *tbc*
Jury President: Peter Ryder (DEU)
Jury Members: Angel Casado (ESP)
Jaroslav Vach (CZE) *both remote*

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

Chief Steward: Dick Bradley (RSA)
Steward: Lasse Virtanen (FIN)
Jury President: Robert Danewid (SWE)
Jury Members: Peter Eriksen (DEN)
Marina Vigorito (ITA) *both remote*

f. 2nd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2017, Santa Rosa de Conlara, Argentina (15m and Standard, both using monotype)

Chief Steward: Angel Casado (ESP)
only Chief Steward due to the number of participants

7.3.2 Approval of Chief Stewards for 2018 and 2019 Competitions

The following FAI/IGC officials were approved for competitions in 2018 and 2019:

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

Chief Steward: Brian Spreckley (GBR)
Jury President: Rick Sheppe (USA)

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

Chief Steward: Robert Danewid (SWE)
Steward: Lasse Virtanen (FIN)
Jury President: Marina Vigorito (ITA)
Jury Member: Juha Silvennoinen (FIN)
tbd, both remote

c. 3rd FAI 13.5m Class World Gliding Championships 2019, Pavullo, Italy

Chief Steward: Brian Spreckley (GBR)
only Chief Steward due to the number of participants

d. 11th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019, Szeged, Hungary

Focal Point: Brian Spreckley (GBR)

e. 10th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2019, Lakekeepit, Australia

Focal Point: Brian Spreckley (GBR)

f. 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019, Turbia - near Stolowa Wola, Poland (18m, 20m, Open)

Focal Point: Terry Cubley (AUS)

g. 20th FAI European Gliding Championships 2019, Prievidza, Slovakia (Club, Std., 15m)

Focal Point: Terry Cubley (AUS)

Guest speaker: Mr. Angel Casado - about the Open Glider Network (OGN)

Mr. Casado started his presentation with introduction and brief overview of Open Glider Network (OGN) Flarm Live Tracking system. The system is based on servers receiving signals from number of receivers, which is then processed and distributed to front-end applications like OGN, SAR, flightradar24 or other. As the cost of investment and installation of the receiver is affordable their number increased significantly over the last two years (from ~400 to ~600) and allows for coverage of all important gliding locations in the world. Following that Mr. Casado presented the benefits of OGN to clubs and gliding in general namely, tracking allowing for promotion of the gliding activity online, automated flight logging of all equipped aircraft including tugs, localization services in case of SAR and other emergency situations and finally, providing better gliding activity situational awareness to others (incl. to other general aviation pilots and ATC). It also helps to analyze the signal strength of individual glider/aircraft so it could be improved. Nevertheless, there are still some issues to be resolved, e.g. privacy handling (stealth gliders not shown, random identifier for non-registered users otherwise registration and contest number is shown) and relationship with Flarm (OGN is independent of Flarm Technology GmbH). Finally, he encouraged all delegates to promote receiver installations in their countries, which would improve overall coverage (including at low levels) and provide for more redundancy and accuracy (to avoid ambiguity problems). Interested delegates should contact Mr. Casado or directly OGN via <http://wiki.glidernet.org>

Following the presentation the delegates were interested in the status of ongoing discussions with Flarm. Mr. Casado responded that these progress now quite well despite initial hesitation. Mr. Guerin from France stated that FFVV strongly supports OGN mainly for its safety and SAR related features. Mr. Cubley informed that there are only couple of stations in Australia and that this is area for improvement. Then he asked whether it is possible to see other glider in flight (e.g. via mobile phone) and, whether pilot can influence or restrict his track to be shown. Mr. Casado responded that the answer to both questions is yes. Mr. Bjornevik from Norway then informed that there are two layers within the OGN where it is possible to stop tracking. Mr. Vidal informed that there is a lot of pressure from their CAA to install transponders in gliders and that the OGN can help in mitigate such a pressure and eventually save money to the clubs. Mr. Mozer asked about the competitions and whether it is possible to see them in real time. Mr. Casado answered that it is possible and that the delay could be modified from technical (around 2 mins) to whatever value. Mr. Bjornevik then commented that the relay function (glider to glider) is relevant only to OGN trackers not the Flarm. Mr. Roine from Finland then asked whether it is possible to install tracking solution for contests if the organizer distributes OGN trackers. Mr. Casado responded that a basic station, which can cover up until 100 km, would be needed as the small glider antennas can cover around 20km.

7.4 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley delivered one presentation covering all SGP matters as well as IGC media. Related aspects are mentioned under the relevant agenda items below.

After the presentation, the new SGP promotional video had been presented to the delegates. Its primarily purpose should be to help the SGP pilots to attract sponsorship and in addition to help SGP Team to find a partner who could sponsor a person that could work full time for the SGP project. Mr. Spreckley informed that the video will also be sent to all local SGP organisers to help them to attract the local sponsorship. Following that Mr. Mozer asked whether the SGP Team had engaged any professional to develop what a potential partner would receive and whether it had considered possibility to offer a share of the profit as a financing option. Mr. Spreckley answered positively on the first query, with a remark that a coordination with the FAI office would be necessary. Regarding the latter he replied that the proposed model is as such.

7.4.1 Report on 7th series

Mr. Spreckley presented that the main milestones achieved during this series were finalization of the OGN tracking capability, establishment of the SGP team and the development and release of SGP highlight videos. 182 pilots competed in 9 national SGPO event in order to try to qualify for the World SGP Final.

7.4.2 SGP Final 2016, Potchefstroom, South Africa

On the SGP final Mr. Spreckley presented web audience statistics with Facebook being the most effective way to reach the audience (outreach 83.000), followed by YouTube (42.200 viewers) and Twitter (47.300 impressions). For comparison, the overall audience statistics for 7th series was 143.000 (outreach) on Facebook, 182.352 (viewers) on YouTube and 153.000 (impressions) on Twitter.

7.4.3 Progress for 8th series

The preparation for the 8th series are well underway. 9 national events (in AUS, USA, RSA, ESP, POL, ITA, FRA, SVK and SVN) plus the World Final in Vitacura (CHI) are planned. Last, but not least, the organizers of the World Final offer a free transportation of sailplanes from Europe to Chile for all qualified pilots.

7.4.4 SGP Management (including IGC media)

The SGP is about to launch the bidding process for 9th series for 2018. The deadline for bids is 30th March 2017 and the guidance for bidders is available on SGP web page. The objective of the 9th series are to the series partner and live scoring. The relations with partners and branding are the most important activities to be worked on in the near future. The intention is to establish a stable relationship with the partners and to develop promotional material and guidance to support the national FAI/SGP event organizers.

Regarding wider IGC media matters, Mr. Spreckley presented that the main objective is to increase the publicity value of our events. The SGP events are very good vehicles to facilitate that e.g. through the use of the dedicated web page www.sgp.aero, which is now interlinked with the FAI and IGC web pages. This setup allows better overall IGC media management and also better outreach to pilots, delegates, event organisers and general audience.

In the subsequent discussion the delegates asked about the cooperation with Soaring Spot vis-à-vis own results web space. Mr. Spreckley informed that the cooperation with Soaring Spot is good, but IGC intention is to go for a dedicated IGC web page for competition results. Mr. Mozer asked about timing of the bidding process for 9th series, in particular whether it would be completed soon. Mr. Spreckley confirmed it and indicated that for the time being there are only 5 bids. Mr. Vidal pointed out that many clubs like the SGP concept, but struggle to get sufficient number of competitive gliders available in the vicinity. In that regard he suggested use of handicaps for the contest. Mr. Spreckley replied that handicapping is possible to do e.g. through turn point areas (reduced or longer distance to fly based on the handicap). He acknowledged that it could be a good option for large countries where pilots sometime have to drive a long distance to compete (it would allow glider rentals close to the venue).

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

The bids were in agreement with bidders presented in the following sequence: bids under the item 7.6.2 followed by bids under item 7.6.1 and finally bid under the item 7.6.3.

7.6.1 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020 (Club, Std., 15m)

- Matkópuszta, Hungary
- Châlons-en-Champagne, France

7.6.2 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020 (18m, 20m, Open)

- Stendal-Borstel, Germany
- Matkópuszta, Hungary

7.6.3 3rd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2019 (18m handicapped)

- SW Ontario, Canada

7.7 Question to all bid presenters

The OSTIV President, Dr. Radespiel asked the bidders about the OSTIV congress logistics and facilities as he could not find it in the bid documents. Mr. Andras Gyöngyösi from, Hungary replied that

there is only one briefing room at the airfield and that the best venue would be Kecskemet which is approximately 15 km away from the airfield. He confirmed that there are sufficient facilities for the congress. Mr. Geissler from Germany replied that the congress room for OSTIV is approximately 6 to 7 minutes from the airfield and that the hangar at the airport could be organized for that purpose too in case OSTIV conference participants would prefer a venue at the airport. Mr. Cubley asked about the cost of competition as the Australian pilots are required to hold German licence in case they fly German registered gliders and that the administrative cost is 100 EUR. In addition the pilots are required to communicate in German which creates another problem in getting it sorted. Mr. Geissler responded that the situation should be the same as it is now. Following that Mr. Foltin commented on it and briefly explained the EU glider pilot licensing system including a possibility for an administrative validation of foreign licence. Mrs. Vigorito then asked about impact of Brexit on UK licences. Mr. Foltin responded that this would be clear only after the negotiations between the EU and the UK and that one of the options is a similar as it is in case of Switzerland and Norway.

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 2017

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

Proposal on Annex A, affecting para. 4.1.2., to allow microlight motorgliders with national registrations to compete without CofA or Permit to Fly as follows:

4.1.2 Each competing sailplane

a. Must have a valid Certificate of Airworthiness or Permit to Fly not excluding competitions OR a valid registration in the UL, ULM, or Light Sport Category that includes the maximum gross weight OR a valid registration in the UL, ULM or Light Sport Category and an approved weight-and-balance certificate that indicates the manufacturer-approved maximum gross weight.

Mr. Sheppe briefly introduced the proposal.

Votes for: 32, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The proposal was adopted.

8.1.2 Airframe parachute (Annex A Committee)

Proposal on Annex A, affecting para. 4.1.1., to allow certified airframe parachute systems in place of personal parachutes as follows:

4.1.1 b Each occupant of a competing sailplane shall use seat belt and shoulder harness. Each occupant must wear a serviceable parachute on each competition flight, unless the glider is equipped with an approved airframe recovery parachute system and the use of such a system is allowed by local regulations.

Mr. Sheppe briefly introduced the proposal.

Votes for: 33, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal was adopted.

8.1.3 Definition of 13.5 meter class (13.5 meter class WG) - proposal changed to the Year-1 proposal (see also 8.2)

The proposal of the WG as amended by the Bureau (including change to the Year-1 proposal) affects Annex A, Part 4 as follows:

The 13.5m class requirement in Annex A be changed to require a self-launching capability.

Mr. Spreckley briefly introduced the original WG proposal and its amended version by the Bureau including change from the Year-2 to the Year-1 proposal. He referred to the IGC decision last year and mentioned there has been considerable discussion about the future of the class and the WGC in this class. He stressed that it has become evident that IGC needs to make a clear statement of the objectives for this class to become a lightweight self-launching class that will provide a competitive environment for Microlight gliders. Without such a statement there is a significant risk of the class developing as a truncated 15m class. If IGC does not specify the requirement for self-launching whilst

maintaining the wing loading limit, versions of the current 15m gliders could dominate the class competitively. The 2016 decision was a stop gap to allow time to evaluate any changes in EASA legislation and recommendations from the CWG. It would appear that there is little chance of changes in regulation that would prevent us from developing the class as a self-launching class. He concluded that there is a new potential in this class including electric power and that the change as proposed does not require change of the class definition in the Sporting Code.

Mr. Guerin proposed the following amendment which was seconded by other delegates:

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

That the FAI WGC in 2019 in the 13.5m class will be held using rules developed to take advantage the electric MOP.

These rules to be approved at the 2018 Plenum and used in a test championships in 2018 and will contain basic requirements to ensure safety and fairness of the competition.

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Sheppe objected the last sentence, which would effectively mean the change of the competition format and would not allow use of tow-planes. Mr. Geissler questioned whether the proposal would affect the current wing loading limit. Mr. Mozer confirmed that it does not. Following that Mr. Sheppe suggested deletion of the last sentence. Mr. Georgas stated that his understanding is that IGC is moving towards an energy management concept. Mr. Guerin in response to the proposal by Mr. Sheppe confirmed that the substance from the last sentence of the proposal is actually included in the first paragraph. Mr. Mozer clarified that and stated that it is not as such because the last sentence actually mandates use of electric self-launch method. Based on that Mr. Rutkowski concluded that in his opinion this affects the class definition. Finally, Mr. Vidal suggested that use of combustion engines should be considered.

Based on the discussion Mr. Spreckley suggested additional amendment in order to move the issue forward. Therefore, he proposed on behalf of the UK the following amendment based on the amended proposal by France:

That the FAI WGC in 2019 in the 13.5m class will be ~~restricted to gliders / microlight gliders with an~~ held using rules developed to take advantage the electric Means of Propulsion.

That the FAI WGC in 2019 in the 13.5m class will be held using rules developed to take advantage the electric MOP.

These rules to be approved at the 2018 Plenum and used in a test championships in 2018 and will contain basic requirements to ensure safety and fairness of the competition.

After this amendment was seconded by others, the delegates decided to vote.

Votes for the originally amended proposal: 24, against: 6, abstentions: 3

Votes for the amendment as proposed by France: 26, against: 1, abstentions: 6

Votes for the amended French proposal as further amended by the UK: 24, against: 3, abstentions: 6

Mr. Geissler asked for clarification whether there would be a complete definition of the class in Annex A. Mr. Sheppe on behalf of Annex A Committee clarified it by answering negatively. Following that Mr. Bjornevik said that change of wing loading limit is not enough as it would exclude new types of glider and that would kill the class. Mr. Sheppe asked about the further steps, in particular who will be responsible for development of the rules. Mr. Spreckley answered that the 13.5m class WG will develop them in close cooperation with the Annex A Committee. Mr. Sheppe responded that the wing loading limit is part of Annex A and its change requires following of the 2 year process.

Subsequently Mr. Geissler proposed the next amendment in particular to delete the wing loading limit in Annex A, which was seconded by others. In response to that proposal Mr. Foltin warned that in such a case there will be no limit at all, which was confirmed by Mr. Geissler as the intention. Mr. Sheppe then suggested that it is not important to propose it now as the Year-2 proposal would address it anyway, which was also echoed by Mr. Roine. After that Mr. Spreckley concluded that the next amendment as proposed by Germany is irrelevant, because the intention is to develop a set of rules that may or may not include the wing loading limit and anyway all will be voted by the Plenary in the end.

Ms. Susanne Schödel, FAI Secretary General joined this interesting discussion and proposed, based on the experience in sailing, that the IGC might want to consider a licensing fee for the access of these

gliders to the IGC sanctioned competitions, where e.g. a basic safety and performance requirements set by the IGC would need to be checked.

Finally Mr. Vidal suggested that the second paragraph of the amended proposal as voted for until now does not really match the rest and therefore he suggested its deletion as follows:

That the FAI WGC in 2019 in the 13.5m class will be ~~restricted to gliders / microlight gliders with an~~ held using rules developed to take advantage of the electric Means of Propulsion.

~~That the FAI WGC in 2019 in the 13.5m class will be held using rules developed to take advantage of the electric MOP.~~

These rules to be approved at the 2018 Plenum and used in a test championships in 2018 and will contain basic requirements to ensure safety and fairness of the competition.

Following that the delegates moved to the final vote.

Votes for the proposal as amended by France, the UK and Chile: 22, against: 2, abstentions: 9

The amended proposal by the bureau, as further amended by France, the UK and Chile was adopted.

8.1.4 Loss of Height on the Silver/Gold duration flight (SC3 Committee)

Proposal to delete the requirement for a maximum 1000m Loss of Height (LoH) on the Silver/Gold duration flight. The proposal affects SC3, para. 2.4.4.(deletion), 2.2.1b and 2.2.2b (delete reference to Loss of Height in the Silver/Gold duration definitions) and 2.4.1 (modification).

Mr. Georgas briefly introduced the proposal and added that the remaining and the only control of the duration flights would be the control of timing.

Votes for: 31, against: 2, abstentions: 0

The proposal was adopted.

8.1.5 To adjust the scoring of competition days where almost no gliders come back (the Netherlands)

The proposal to change present Annex A to devalue competition days in which few pilots finish the Task, the Netherlands offers the following implementation as Year 2 proposal:

Define the "completion ratio" as the number of speed finishers divided by the number pilots who attempted the task. Completion ratio (CR) = n_2/n_1

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 introduced the rationale behind proposal, which is to eliminate the difference in points on distance days. As a consequence one distance day can devalue the results of all the other competition days which is not fair. The contribution to the overall results of a distance day should be reduced and should be in balance with the other competition days. Then Mrs. Kuijpers asked Mr. Fila from Sweden to visualize the proposed formula in a graphical form for better comprehension (see published presentation paper).

In the discussion Mr. Guerin expressed the concern over the fact that the performance values given to the winner are given to all competitors. Consequence of that is that if one competitor would perform well he will not know his result until everyone gets home and that is unfair. Mr. Fila clarified that the 1000 point scoring system already works like that through the day factor. Mr. Hermann Trimmel (AUT) said that he could agree with the proposal and considers it as a very nice face-lifting. However, as the physician he has to stress that it is not correct to compare pilot's performances as we do it now. Prof. Ryder stated that the analysis conducted in the USA on the deficiencies of our 1000 point scoring system has not been tackled in the proposal and that instead it further adjusts the 2/3 rule. Mr. Joerg Stieber (CAN) suggested that the proposal should be discussed together with the USA proposal. Mr. Sheppe responded that it would make sense, but this Year-2 proposal has been already delayed by one year and the USA proposal is a Year-1 proposal therefore we should not mix them. Mr. Vytautas Sabeckis (LIT) asked for explanation of term 'attempted to achieved tasks' used in the introduction of the proposal. Mr. Fila clarified that it should be understood as 'how many pilots have achieved (have flown) 100km.

Votes for: 21, against: 5, abstentions: 7

The proposal was adopted.

8.1.6 Use of WGS84 and OpenAir (Spain)

The proposal amending Annex A has been, in agreement with Spain, presented with the amendment (new part B) proposed by the USA as follows:

A) That a set of definitions and mathematical methods be specified for the calculation of performances in gliding, as outlined in the proposal.

~~*B) That these methods and definitions will be published in a new Annex to SC3 to be management and maintenance by the Software Scoring Working Group under the supervision of the IGC Bureau, which will review and approve any proposed changes. The scope of the SSWG's work under these terms will be limited to the mathematical methods and definitions needed for evaluating gliding performances. The changes will be finalized for publication at the Plenary each year and will come into effect in October of each year.*~~

B) That these methods and definitions will be included in a new IGC publication entitled "FAI Approved Mathematical Methods," (or similar), which will be maintained by the Scoring Software Working Group, and referenced by Sporting Code Section 3, with the eventual goal of creating a standard reference document for all FAI Air Sports.

Following that the proposal was put for the vote.

Votes for amendment: 32, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The amended proposal was accepted.

8.1.7 Participation of World Champions at WGCs (Denmark)

Mr. Frank introduced the proposal which amends para 3.4.3.b and 3.4.3.c of Annex A as follows:

3.4.3b 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 proviso that the maximum number of entries per class shall be 50.

3.4.3c The Current Champions of the FAI Women WGC and the current Champions of the FAI Junior WGC may compete as additional members of their team in their relevant classes, even in excess of the 50 per class limit.

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Georgas asked for clarification whether the new rule would allow participation of a World Champion other than in junior or women category as the additional team member. Following that Mr. Roine also asked for clarification whether the proposal would allow inclusion of the World Champions if number of entries will be under 50. Mr. Geissler expressed that having 3 pilots per class is not an advantage for the country concerned and that the additional participation was seen as an award. Mr. Kuijpers supported Mr. Geissler and added that the current champions may not be always selected by their NAC. Mr. Foltin responded to Mr. Geissler that the additional pilot(s) could support the other team members on task e.g. by supplying weather or other information. Furthermore, in response to Mrs. Kuijpers he confirmed that it is right for the NAC to nominate their team and the IGC has to respect that. Mr. Guerin suggested that additional pilots should be in the following priority order – unrestricted, women and junior World Champions. Mr. Cubley clarified that the proposal ensures the junior and women Champions will compete in the relevant class (the one in which they have won the World Championships).

Vote for the proposal: 18, against: 14, abstentions: 1

The proposal has been accepted.

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

Mr. Guerin introduced the first and the second part of the proposal as follows:

Proposal 1

Results of contests using IGC 20m class team rules will be scored according to 5.6 of Annex D

The Pilot Rating Score for two seater entries and entries shared by more than one pilot will be awarded to the pilot with the highest Ranking at the start of the competition. If neither pilot has a current Ranking it is the pilot nominated as first pilot or P1.

Proposal to have affect from March 31st 2017 if passed.

Proposal 2

The current 20m class team ranking list should be discontinued.

Affects the presentation of the IGC ranking list, does not affect Annex D as there is no rule to require display of 20m class results.

Mr. Fila on behalf of Annex D Sub-Committee reminded the delegates that this specific section was designed for the specific pilots, but it was never used as intended, so now it is irrelevant.

Vote for the proposal 1: 25, against: 3, abstentions: 5

Vote for the proposal 2: 32, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The proposal has been accepted.

8.1.9 SGP results in IGC Ranking List (Chile)

Mr. Vidal from Chile introduced the proposal amending para. 7.2 of Annex D as follows:

7.2 Pilots Rating score.

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

Mr. Guerin presented a graphs and explained that the proposal from Chile does not do a proper job as it does not award enough points for the 10th place. Mr. Vidal confirmed that it is true, but the proposal still well reflects the performance of the pilot. Mr. Fila reminded that the IGC agreed on it the last year. Mr. Vidal further added that 400 and 600 values are in the current rule and that France came up with the formula reflecting on the first and the last SGP pilot. He believes that increasing the value by 100 points (to 700) will further support the SGP results in the Ranking List. Mr. Georgas added that it is not appropriate to directly compare the SGP and 1000 point system results like it was proposed by France.

(One delegate left the meeting before the vote on the proposal 8.1.9 – 33 votes again, 8.3.6, 8.3.7 and 8.3.8 were already voted)

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

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2 Year-1 proposals

Mr. Leinikki again called the roll following departure of some delegates. There were again 33 votes present including the 4 proxies, requiring 17 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 22 votes for a 2/3rds majority.

The proposal on the definition of 13.5 meter class (initiated by the 13.5 meter class WG) and later amended by the Bureau including change from the Year-2 to the Year-1 proposal is reflected under agenda item 8.1.3.

8.2.1 Change of the 1000 Point Distance Requirement (Annex A Committee)

Mr. Sheppe on behalf of the Annex A Committee introduced the proposal affecting Annex A para. 8.4.1a and 8.4.2a. Following that Mrs. Kuijpers from the Netherlands introduced the amendment as follows:

To change the distance required for 1000 points to:

<i>13.5 Metre and Club class</i>	<i>250 km</i>
<i>Standard, 15 Metre, and 20 Metre Two-seat classes</i>	<i>300 km</i>
<i>18 Metre and Open classes</i>	<i>350 km</i>

In addition, analogous to the change of the minimum distance for a 1000 points day, the minimum distance of 100 km (Dm) should change into:

<u><i>13.5 Metre and Club class</i></u>	<u><i>100 km</i></u>
---	----------------------

<u>Standard, 15 Metre, and 20 Metre Two-seat classes</u>	<u>120 km</u>
<u>18 Metre and Open classes</u>	<u>140 km</u>

Mr. Sheppe, as the delegate, stated that the USA is neutral about the amendment because there is no real argument presented. Mrs. Kuijpers responded that the amendment by the Netherlands has been presented because the original proposal was not complete and the change on one element should be done also on the other element. Mr. Cubley agreed with Mrs. Kuijpers and commented that the original part refers to the 1000 points system and the second to number of kilometers to have a valid championship day. He stressed that the current 100 km value e.g. for open class is a bit silly and incomparable with the same value for the club class. Mr. Guerin from France supported Mr. Cubley. Mr. Hansen noted that the presentation of the proposal is a bit confusing. Mr. Foltin clarified that the proposal from the Netherlands is in addition to original proposal.

Votes for amendment: 22, against: 4, abstentions: 7

Mr. Bjornevik from Norway suggested to group 20 Metre Two-seat classes together with 18m and open classes. Mr. Roine added that although the projected performance of the 13.5 Metre class is close to 15 Metre class he will support the proposal. Nevertheless, the division of classes is in his opinion not completely logical. Mr. Sheppe as the USA delegate stated that he does not fully understand the amendment as the proposal is about the completion of the task to have the 1000 point day and that the amendment is about minimum distance for a valid championship day which could be managed by the task setter by setting a longer task and suggested to include it in the guidelines for task setters rather than in to change the rule. Following that Mr. Trimmel added that this is not making rules simpler.

Vote for the amended proposal: 24, against: 5, abstentions: 4

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.2.2 Calculation of speed points and distance points (USA)

Mr. Sheppe on behalf of the USA introduced the proposal as follows:

To change the calculation of speed points and distance points.

Mr. Sheppe followed with introduction of the detailed analysis and the reasons behind the proposal which should address the flaws in the current system that encourage gagging and late starts and produce strange incentives for the pilots.

He mentioned some common sense principles that should be true, that most people assume to be true, but are in fact not true:

- Taking a sporting risk and being successful is always beneficial.
- Flying faster always gives you a greater margin over the slower pilots.
- Finishing is always better than not finishing.

On the flaws he added that these are due to the fact that each competitor's performance is evaluated with respect to the best performance and the average performance of the group. He suggested to preserve the former and abandon the latter. Rather than belonging to the majority, the points should be equally accessible by everyone. The proposed system eliminates the disadvantages of the current system. It is much simpler, easier to understand, easier for spectators and pilots to understand where their points come from, and it provides no opportunity for tactical exploitation of a flawed formula. Instead it should encourage the pilots to leave the gaggle, to complete the task. This new philosophy should be to credit for speed OR distance. The combination creates a various results which do not depend on the race that day.

In the following discussion Mr. Bjornevik expressed that it is a good start and that IGC needs to start to discuss it. He urged the delegates to vote for the proposal. Than Mr. Roine presented the software developed for comparisons between the current and the newly proposed system. The web based program written by Mr. Hannu Niemi from Finland that recalculates the competition results could be found on the following internet address <http://apps.nil.fi/new-scoring/> and its use is quite simple, i.e. copying internet address of any competition results page from www.SoaringSpot.com to the specific field of the webpage. Mr. Roine invited the delegates to use the software to understand the impact of the proposal on scoring. He also stated that the current system allows competitions to be decided in a

flight on one single day and that is not right. Therefore, he supports the proposal and wants to see how it develops. Mr. Fila welcomed the discussion and mentioned that objectives will change as pilots would need to change their behavior to adapt to the new scoring so it is not a simple recalculation of the old scoring. Mr. Roine responded that the formula will not change the behavior and objectives. Mr. Spreckley echoed Mr. Fila, but feels this is an interesting proposal. He also thinks that there could be damage as was mentioned by Sweden. Then Mr. Vidal reminded that this is the Year-1 proposal and suggested that the IGC should consider using a similar scoring to the SGP in the future, but with 1000 points. Mrs. Vigorito expressed that she is not sure whether the pilots would like it at all. Following that Mr. Georgas responded that our pilots do not understand the current formula because it is too complex and that is a serious problem. Then he provided an example from one national championships and suggested the IGC should go for a solution that would allow pilots and spectators to understand the formula. Mr. Spreckley on behalf of the UK appreciated the discussion and mentioned that there is a problem in the paper that could not be solved in a single move and that IGC should look at it from the overall perspective. Mr. Sheppe confirmed that the proposal is not a complete system, but rather a philosophy and that he would expect the Year-2 proposal to come up with a complete system. Mrs. Kuijpers suggested to make it broader and look at it from a wider perspective to include also other considerations as were proposed by the UK. Mrs. Vigorito supported it and reminded the delegates about the discussion on reaching the turn point some time ago. She added that the IGC after 25 years of using the current scoring should not be ignorant to a better way how to select the best pilots.

Mr. Mozer then concluded that this is the Year-1 proposal and it should mean that we should discuss it in order to come up with a concrete Year-2 proposal next year.

Vote for proposal: 29, against: 0, abstentions: 4

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.3 Definition of Silver distance (Sweden)

Mr. Fila introduced the proposal affecting SC3, the definition of Silver Distance in 2.2.1.a:

It is proposed to change the wording from "a straight distance flight of at least 50 km from the release point" to "a course with the flight track including at least one fix with a distance of at least 50km to the landing point".

In the following presentation Mr. Fila explained that the distance would be calculated from landing (no matter whether virtual or physical) to fix the problem unintentionally introduced to the SC3 in 2015. He provided several graphical examples of the problem and also examples of the new approach fixing problem, i.e. when a pilot has flown much longer distance than required, but could not claim the performance due to flaw in the current rule.

Mr. Georgas opened the discussion by saying that the SC3 committee cannot support this proposal because it puts emphasis in a wrong direction. The problem was well presented in one of the slides provided by Mr. Fila showing the complexity of the SC3, which is a fair point and this is where the committee will put their effort. He also pointed out that the proposal exchanges start and finish and there are problems associated with it. One, although difficult to be found in the code, is that the start from a remote point could be already now decided post flight. The second problem is that the proposal represents an entirely different system for the Silver C when compared to all other achievements. The purpose of the Silver C should be educating and introducing the other rules to pilots, which would be then incompatible. He concluded that this is the main objection of the committee not to support the proposal. Following that Mr. Spreckley the UK delegate expressed that it is no surprise that our people think the SC3 is being out of touch with reality and he added that we need very simple rules for beginners. Surprisingly, the IGC was introducing something, which restricted local clubs in making this simple achievements. Therefore, the UK fully supports the proposal and the SC3 committee should make it understandable. Mr. Fila noted that he could support almost everything that has been said and added that the SC3 should be simpler not only for pilots, but also for observers. Mr. Guerin from France, speaking also as a cross country instructor, expressed his desire to bring the SC3 requirements for the silver distance back to its origin which were the first step for a pilot to fly away from the airfield.

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

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.4 Move of FR technical requirements from SC3 (SC3 Committee)

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal affecting SC3, para. 2.5.3a, 2.5.2, 3.4.1 and 3.5.5a:

To give GFAC the sole responsibility and authority for technical specification and requirements for the use of FRs as it is the qualified party to be making such determinations.

Existing SC3 rules will be moved to a document managed by GFAC.

This proposal is limited to the technical standards and requirements that need to be satisfied by the devices, their installation and technical interpretation. Pilot and official observer procedures, as they apply to the flight preparation, flight and documentation procedures will remain a part of SC3.

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Fila asked whether e.g. the information which flight log interval should be used will be moved out from the code. Mr. Georgas responded that such information will be moved to the technical document. Mr. Fila then noted that anything that would require a pilot decision should be in the sporting code. Mr. Georgas replied that the result will be a shorter SC document with the technical requirements being moved away (e.g. issue with HAFR), which should result in simplified and flexible sporting code. Mr. Strachan, GFAC chairman, reminded that IGC already has two documents (Annex A and B) which are shared with the Annex A committee. The principle of the SC structure is that there is the main volume covering the main aspects of the sport (record, badges, competitors etc.), Annex A covering championships, Annex B covering technical requirements, Annex C as a guide for official observers and Annex D containing rules for the IGC Ranking List. Thus the Annex B already exists and the issue is that during the approval of High Altitude Flight Recorder (HAFR) the GFAC proposed a short Annex to the SC which would cater for everything that could not be in the code. However, there is no need for a separate Annex e.g. in case of use of the GPS as a definitive altitude source, which is checked by the laboratory, but not quite the same as the pressure altitude source. Then Mr. Spreckley stated that there are basically two things to be tackled, which are not against each other; observations and declarations. The code should identify clearly who is in charge. Following that Mr. Georgas added that there will be regular feedback at the IGC Plenary, but the document should be approved by the Bureau. Mr. Cubley warned about a possible confusion i.e. whether the discussion is about a new document or, as the GFAC chairman previously claimed, the document already exists. It has been clarified that it would be a new document.

Vote for proposal: 29, against: 1, abstentions: 4

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.5 Control and use of multiple FRs (SC3 Committee)

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal amending the SC3 as follows:

To establish clear principles and rules for the control and use of multiple flight recorders and position recorders for the documentation of a flight.

Then he added that there is a need to find a simple principle how to deal with more than one GNSS FRs in the cockpit and emphasized a need for a single rule for that purpose.

Vote for proposal: 33, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.6 Correct declared closed course start options (SC3 Committee, including later amendment by SC3)

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal for amendment of the SC3 including its later amendment by the SC3 committee:

To specify that the release point (or stopping the Means of Propulsion) is not an option for starting a declared closed course task.

To specify that a Goal distance declaration has to contain only a start and finish and no turn points.

Vote for proposal: 33, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.7 Triangle distance geometry planning (SC3 Committee)

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal amending the SC3 as follows:

To examine the validity of an FAI triangle flight performance based on the geometry of the planned leg lengths, as opposed to the final official distance after any possible deductions are made for Cylinder observation zones and height loss.

Mr. Cubley asked for clarification about what is addressed by the proposal. Mr. Georgas responded using the example of the pilot's performance equal to 749 kilometers, but without achieving 750 km triangle distance.

Vote for proposal: 33, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.8 Elimination of waypoint codes (SC3 Committee)

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal amending the SC3 as follows:

To remove the option of using a waypoint code published by an NAC in an electronic or paper declaration, requiring instead that all waypoints declared list the Latitude-Longitude coordinates of the position.

Following that Mr. Roine initiated the discussion where he stated that he does not understand the argument supporting the proposal, as the declaration by paper is easy and straightforward. Mr. Spreckley, the UK delegate, appreciated the desire, but there are still clubs which are using the turn point databases and the sporting code should reflect such practices for simplicity. In response Mr. Georgas confirmed that there would be no impact and the use of paper declaration would still be possible. Mr. Fila did not see a problem because of electronic declaration and the proposal could only have some impact in case someone does it old way.

Vote for proposal: 18, against: 9, abstentions: 6

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.9 World Soaring Cup (IGC Bureau)

Mr. Mozer, on behalf of the IGC Bureau, introduced the proposal proposing amendment of the Annex A para. 10.2:

1. *The WORLD SOARING CUP is to be awarded annually to the CHAMPION GLIDER PILOT OF THE YEAR.*
2. *A Qualifying Competition is any FAI/IGC sanctioned World Gliding Championship that becomes valid in a given calendar year. The CHAMPION GLIDER PILOT OF THE YEAR will be selected from the Champions in all the classes in all Qualifying Competitions. The selection will be made subsequent to the conclusion of the final Qualifying Competition of the calendar year.*
3. *In each class in each Qualifying Competition,*
 - a. *The World Champion's Final Score (FS) is the final score of the World Champion;*
 - b. *The Maximum Possible Score (MPS) is the sum of the winning scores of every valid competition day.*
 - c. *The World Champion's Cup Score (CS) is: $FS/MPS \times 100 = CS$*
4. *Each year, the World Champion with the highest Cup Score (CS) will be given the title of the CHAMPION GLIDER PILOT OF THE YEAR and awarded the WORLD SOARING CUP. Ties will result in Co-Champions.*
5. *The current CHAMPION GLIDER PILOT OF THE YEAR will surrender the WORLD SOARING CUP to FAI before the end of the final Qualifying Competition of the subsequent year. The WORLD SOARING CUP will be awarded to the new CHAMPION GLIDER PILOT OF THE YEAR at the earliest opportunity.*
6. *A historical record of the WORLD SOARING CUP will be kept in the FAI archives and every current and former CHAMPION GLIDER PILOT OF THE YEAR will be featured on the FAI website.*

Subsequently Mr. Mozer presented example of the application of proposal to the results of WGCs 2016.

Before the discussion Ms. Schödel, FAI Secretary General, supported this very good idea, but at the same time warned the delegates not to interfere with FAI activity on the best pilot of the world.

In the discussion Mr. Cubley stated that he does not see a reason for another cup for the world champions and believes that this award should be for a team rather than for an individual pilot. Then Mr. Roine said that this is one more example in relation to media, making it more complicated although using the argument in an opposite way. Following that Mr. Trimmel noted that it will selection of the best pilot by calculation rather than comparison. On another note Mr. Vidal suggested that the formula should be adjusted to take into account the number of championships in a year. Mr. Szabo from Hungary supported the proposal, but intends to propose another calculation formula when developing

the detailed Year-2 proposal. Finally, Mr. Fila concluded that this proposal is about the pilot who won by the highest margin, and that is in his opinion great.

Vote for proposal: 25, against: 5, abstentions: 3

The proposal has been accepted.

8.2.10 Change of the Club class (Netherlands)

The original proposal has been withdrawn by the Netherlands, but later put forward for the discussion by Australia. The proceedings are reflected below under the AOB agenda item.

8.2.11 Change of the AAT scoring formula (Poland)

Mr. Rutkowski briefly introduced the proposal amending the Annex A as follows:

To change scoring formula by attenuating effect of single best distance on all remaining scores. For this purpose it is proposed to average best distance achieved on the competition day on the basis of best quarter of competitors that day.

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

The proposal has been lost.

8.2.12 Participation of one additional disabled pilot in any Championship class with the glider with manual control (Lithuania)

Mr. Sabeckis introduced the proposal amending the Annex A para. 3.4.3.a as follows:

To include to the Annex A 3.4.3.a "a. Each NAC may enter the number of pilots approved by the IGC and specified in the Local Procedures. The limit is two entries per class and one additional disabled pilot in any class with the glider with manual control or 3 entries per class in Junior and Women Championships. In the 20 meter Multi-seat Class, only one entry (one crew) is allowed per NAC. A pilot withdrawing after the final entry deadline may be replaced by another pilot from the same country provided he/she is eligible according to the allocation procedure"

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Fila expressed a great sympathy for the idea behind the proposal, despite it is contrary to the overall motion to reduce number of pilots at IGC championships. However, he believed that it should be left to the country to select their pilots for the championships. Mr. Sabeckis replied that the disabled pilots do not always have access to the same gliders as other pilots. Mr. Spreckley noted that the UK cannot support the current wording because any NAC would be able to enter more pilots. Nevertheless, we should also look at it from a different perspective of disabled pilots.

Vote for proposal: 4, against: 25, abstentions: 4

The proposal has been lost.

8.2.13 No extra participation in 20 Meter Two Seat class (Lithuania)

Mr. Sabeckis introduced the proposal amending the Annex A para. 3.4.3.c as follows:

To delete from to the Annex A 3.4.3.c c. With the exception of the 20 meter Multi-seat Class, the current Champions of the FAI multiclass WGCs, the Current Champions of the FAI Women WGC and the current Champions of the FAI Junior WGC may compete as additional members of their team in their relevant classes, even in excess of the 50 per class limit.

He emphasized that pilots in this class should also have a possibility to defend their champion titles. In response Mr. Fila reminded the delegates that the trend is rather opposite as it was demonstrated in the Danish proposal accepted earlier.

Vote for proposal: 2, against: 26, abstentions: 5

The proposal has been lost.

8.2.14 Individual ranking list and 20 Meter Two Seat class (France)

Mr. Guerin introduced the proposal amending the Annex D as follows:

Ratings obtained from a result gained from two seater or 20m two seat class results can only be included in a Ranking list subcategory if all occupants comply with the rules for that category. IGC ranking list subcategories are Juniors and Feminine ranking lists.

In the discussion Mr. Spreckley, on behalf of the IGC Ranking List management, stated that it would be very difficult to do it at the moment because it encompasses too many changes including technical aspects. Mr. Fila added that by accepting this proposal it would be required to document every single Pilot no.2 in the Ranking List as well as crew composition (as it is done for juniors or women) and concluded there is no infrastructure for doing that. Mr. Guerin replied that he could agree with Mr. Fila on a difficulty to document second pilots in case people are changing the class, but he added that it is not allowed in the 20 Meter Two Seat class. Following that Mr. Spreckley clarified it by saying that the EGCs and WGCs are the only genuine competitions in this class, because all other competitions are handicapped and crew members are not always the same. If the proposal should mean that it would apply only to EGCs and WGCs in this class it needs to be clearly specified.

Vote for proposal: 3, against: 21, abstentions: 9

The proposal has been lost.

8.3 Other proposals

The IGC Bureau introduced three late proposals under the agenda items 8.3.7, 8.3.8 and 8.3.6 in the given order. These proposals have been initially discussed together as the group of proposals during the end of the first day of the meeting. Then, in the beginning of the second day, they were processed in the following order 8.3.7, 8.3.8 and 8.3.6, yet before all Year-1 (item 8.1) and Year-2 (item 8.2) and remaining Other Proposals (items 8.3.1 to 8.3.5). The introduction and also the initial discussion on all three of them that took place during the first day of the IGC Plenary on Friday afternoon and is reflected under this agenda item. However, the specific discussion on each of them that took place just before the vote on Saturday morning is reflected under the relevant agenda items later (see 8.3.6, 8.3.7 and 8.3.8).

Discussion on the groups of proposals 8.3.6, 8.3.7 and 8.3.8 (IGC Bureau) – Late proposals

The IGC President Mr. Mozer, on behalf of the IGC Bureau, introduced the three above mentioned late proposals. He suggested to discuss them initially as a group of proposals because of their close interaction and links and this was accepted by the delegates.

The discussion was initiated by two questions from Mr. Geissler. One whether the proposals would result in maximum two entries per class and the second on the reigning champions and how they would be treated. Mr. Eriksen answered positively on the first one. Regarding the second one he noted that there is another proposal on reigning World Champions (see item 8.1.7) and added that the IGC does not solicit Continental Gliding Championships (CGC) for already some time what is represented by not inviting for such bids, yet the IGC is not rejecting them, if the bids are deemed appropriate.

Following that Mr. Roine noted that the proposals should have been announced earlier to allow the delegates to get some input from home. In addition he asked why the proposal suggests one pilot per class in the most popular classes, with a remark that Finland do not have a single open class glider, but have many gliders in standard and club classes. Mr. Mozer replied that safety, compatibility and size were the most important aspects which taken into consideration and the result is that these are the proper classes in the opinion of the Bureau. He also confirmed that he is also very concerned about inability to make the proposals earlier, but these were finalized only at the Bureau meeting taking place just prior this IGC Plenary meeting. Furthermore, Mr. Mozer made a plea to the delegates to take a decision because the time is running and IGC should avoid any further delays.

Furthermore, Mr. Bjornevik contributed that although one argument is safety we will end up with 120 pilots together. Mr. Mozer replied that the point is that the classes will be smaller with 25-30 pilots thus the overall number should be lower. Mr. Georgas commented that the Bureau came up with these proposals because there were voices for a change. We have to start somewhere and this should be seen as the first step in a direction. He confirmed that safety was the paramount reason, followed by the value of media exposure and visibility. Although these proposals do not sort everything it is the first step. Mr. Georgas concluded that there is a possibility to adjust based on the future experience.

In the following discussion Mrs. Kuijpers expressed that it is a good proposal and IGC should do something. The only comment she had was on the combination of Junior and Women WGCs. Her first impression is that these two events are too different in culture and she proposed that if we keep them separate we could have one of these events per year. The second effect would be that these events will be smaller which will be good for a smaller organisations and airports. She concluded that the cost is not the biggest issue as the only savings will be on cost of officials and team captains. In response Mr. Eriksen confirmed that the working group and the Bureau had the same discussions. He also noted

that there is also one additional effect i.e. less pilots to be sent out (2 per class) and he added that the combined event will be right in size and will offer the opportunity for smaller sites. On the culture he concluded that the intention is to change it in a positive way.

After that Mr. Vidal contributed on a slightly different matter by saying that the combination of 13.5 Meter class with other classes at one event could create some benefits for this class as more people might be attracted in it. Then Mr. Johannessen added that as long as he remembers in IGC, the NACs always complained about the costs. He also reminded the delegates that IGC initially started with 3 classes, but whenever there was a new class proposal, the delegates voted for it. He also mentioned one example where the two pilots have done a team flying at the WGC and following that it has been proposed to organize team class because some delegates have seen a potential for gliding using that style of flying. Mr. Mozer added that many aspects were considered including team flying. Therefore, 18m and open classes are proposed to have up to two pilots per class, while the 20 Meter Two Seat class has been seen as the class for the team in a glider. He concluded that introduction of a new class was not an option and that when the delegates would accept the changes, the gliding sport will be more understandable than it is now.

In relation to the previous discussion Mr. Casado from Spain expressed support to the Netherlands (separate Championships for juniors and women) with the reason that a smaller countries do not have the capacity to organize big events. Mr. Mozer reassured him that the expected number of participants in this combined event is 50-70. Then Mr. Guerin stated that while he understands proposal for one pilot per class, he does not understand why it is proposed for the most expensive classes. Mr. Mozer replied that the proposal is not specifically targeting the cost associated with the class, but overall costs and savings from coherence.

Following that Mr. Guerin made a proposal for one WGC per year. He expressed that the proposals came very late and it is difficult for him to take position. He proposed to focus on the main argument which is one WGC per year. Then Mr. Hansen said that there is only one class, which the IGC decided to introduced, i.e. 13.5 Meter class. The proposals for all other classes were primarily driven by the glider manufacturers, not the IGC. Therefore, he appreciated the Bureau work, which in his opinion is trying to steer it out. Nevertheless, he already have seen that there will be many opinions.

Regarding the argument about media coverage Mr. Roine expressed that exactly the same argument could be used in the opposite way when suggesting introduction of championships. He also added that the reigning champions should not be allowed in case of one pilot per class limitation. He concluded that small countries will have smaller number of pilots participating because they normally fly both events. Mr. Mozer reminded the delegates that it is the NAC responsibility to select their teams.

Subsequently, Mr. Rutkowski noted that he is uncomfortable with the proposal for two WGCs per year and therefore he expects that there will not be a big savings. Also, he believes that the combination of Junior and Women WGCs will not work as it is expected by the Bureau and that there is an argument of smaller competition organisers on the other hand. His conclusion on this is that there should be a reduction of bids and organisers. He added that the limitation to one pilot per class would require a courage to be approves and therefore he suggested to have more flexibility on the number of pilots per class based on the actual site. Finally, he referred to the European Gliding Championships and the related problem to accommodate all classes, where he would expect class reduction as not all of them are flown globally.

During the discussion Mr. Trimmel from Austria asked for opportunity to present his views on the subject matter. In his presentation he reminded the overall objectives of our sport mentioned in the Annex A, emphasized safety reasons in relation to proposal for one pilot per class and mentioned also some other ideas. He concluded with the vision for our championships that encompassed only 3 WGC classes, different goals for each of them and only three World Gliding Champions in unrestricted category.

On the argument about size of the events Mr. Georgas responded that a smaller airfields should embark to the SGP competitions, which are organized up to the WGC level. Following that Mr. Guerin mentioned that he remembers 18 meter class initially as one pilot per NAC and asked the delegates if anyone can remember why it was like that and why it was changed. Mr. Casado replied that the first WGC in 18 meter class were in Lillo, Spain in 2001 and that there were two pilots per class.

Mr. Spreckley from the UK joined the discussion said that IGC comes closer to the change on this every year, but postpones decision when it becomes difficult. Even the CSWG found it difficult to conclude on their proposal. Therefore IGC has not done anything yet but it is obvious that there is a need to do

something. There are 3 different proposals from the NACs on the table and this clearly indicates that IGC cannot carry on like it did up to now and he urged the delegates to do something. Following that Mr. Trimmel added in relation to his presentation that the intention was to share some ideas and trigger discussion.

Then Mr. Pauwels from Belgium asked whether the cost is really a factor, because no one stepped down from the WGC because of remote locations despite the pilots pay the transportation. He concluded that the proposals could bring some savings for the IGC on cost of officials. Mr. Mozer said that he can hear the argument that the cost is too high and that the economic environment in the world makes it difficult.

Furthermore, Mr. Cubley mentioned that when talking to the pilots over the last few years he has heard requests to increase safety and reduce costs. Also the team captains keep saying the same and added that also the media struggle. He noted that here are options so IGC needs to be serious to make changes. At least one of the proposal can deliver improvements and he urged the delegates to do something.

In response to Mr. Pauwels, Mr. Rutkowski said that the cost is important no matter if it is covers by the pilot or NAC. He expressed that there should be more competition in bidding also from the developing countries and concluded that the level of fairness is important. Then Mrs. Kuijpers added on the same subject that she is always surprised by the high entry fee at WGCs compared to e.g. the national championships and suggested that the IGC should have a look at it. Also, the aero tow fee started to go sky high during the economic crisis, and it never got back so the IGC needs to look at it. Mr. Mozer remarked that although the argument is valid, it is not appropriate to be discussed at that level of details in this discussion. There is a market and anyway the delegates finally decide whether to accept the bid or not. In relation to that Mr. Eriksen offered that he can share the figures from Women WGC in Arnborg, which would demonstrate that it is a lot more expensive to run WGC than national championships. He added that it is in the interest of IGC to ensure high quality events and that there are certain cost associated with it which could not be reduced e.g. cost of stewards.

Then Mr. Rutkowski had one more comment on the quality and cost, i.e. that both could be improved e.g. by reducing number of events or facilitating more bids per event. Mr. Mozer responded that if there is one bid and many NACs want it they are able to cut the costs and he referred to a similar discussion in the past. He added that these proposals try to address the issue in a logical way and he would rely on wisdom of the IGC Plenary to make them even more logical. The logical outcome of less opportunities to bid is that more countries will be bidding per event.

At the end of discussion Mr. Geissler asked one administrative question on the nature of the proposals whether the IGC Plenary will vote on them as Year-1 or Year-2. Mr. Mozer replied that it will be a straightforward vote as on all other proposals.

Finally, Mr. Spreckley appreciated a very good value of the discussion, but reminded that the proposals came late and a consequence is the missing consultation with NACs. Therefore he asked if there is a softer way to introduce them. Also, Mr. Sabeckis commented in the same direction and highlighted the fact that response from Mr. Mozer is not completely right, because the number of pilots per class is regulated in the Annex A. Mr. Mozer replied that the Bureau will look at it and that it might be that the Annex refers to the maximum number of competitors per class. Then he closed the discussion.

Note: The proposals 8.3.6 and 8.3.7 have been later, due to their impact on the sporting code, changed by the Bureau to Year-1 proposals.

8.3.1 IGC internal procedures (IGC Bureau)

Mr. Mozer, on behalf of the IGC Bureau, introduced the proposal in its latest version 0.8 dated 2 March 2018.

Note: There were further editorial changes after the IGC Plenary meeting based on comments received from the FAI office.

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

The proposal has been accepted.

8.3.2 Inclusion of all known costs in the bids for Championships (Norway)

Mr. Bjornevik from Norway briefly introduced the proposal:

*It is proposed that bidders for World and Continental Championships must include with the Entry Fee quote all known fixed costs, including license fees, local memberships, etc.
This is a proposal for a change to the bid process, therefore it should be enacted immediately, with no need for a Year 2 vote.*

Ms. Schödel, FAI Secretary General, suggested to link it with the current work of the FAI Office on the Organisers Agreements and the bidding process.

Vote for proposal: 33, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal has been accepted.

8.3.3 Structure of the Championships (France)

Mr. Guerin from France presented the proposal on the Championships structure as follows:

In parallel with the work of the working group, France propose the following structure:

Length of the current championships:

WGC: 3 weeks (including one-day trip and training) → last competition day is Friday

CGC: 2 weeks (including one-day trip and training) → last competition day is Friday

Distribution of the current championships:

<i>Year N</i>	<i>Year N+1</i>
<i>WGC: Group A of 3 classes</i>	<i>WGC: Group B of 3 classes</i>
<i>CGC: Group B of 3 classes</i>	<i>CGC: Group A of 3 classes</i>
<i>Junior WGC: only 2 classes</i>	<i>Women WGC: only 2 classes</i>

Alternate Proposal:

Competition "World Tour": 2 weeks (including one-day trip and training, Friday is last competition day) replaces the CGC.

→ Between 5 and 10 competitions over the world during the 2-year cycle

- 1 maximum/country*
- bids as for CGC but possibly for 2 or 3 cycles*
- 3 classes max / competition*
- 50 pilots max / class*
- 970pts max in the Ranking List*
- rules for entries (NAC/RL/organising country): to be defined*

France still saw a merit in discussing it albeit a similar proposals from the Bureau have been already accepted by the IGC Plenary (see item 8.3).

In the discussion Mr. Georgas asked how the proposal addresses integration of the Continental Gliding Championships (CGC) schedule and suggested either to abolish them or add them to the proposal. Following that Mr. Fila reminded the delegates to look at the meeting document because it contains a lot more information than what could have been presented in the slide. In response, Mr. Guerin explained the two options regarding the CGCs schedule, i.e. either to include all CGCs or alternate the classes with the WGCs. Similar to the previous queries, Mr. Georgas asked how this proposal fits with the similar previous votes. This was seconded by Mr. Spreckley, the UK delegate, who expressed a difficulty to vote on this proposal in the light of previous votes. Furthermore, as he could not see it as the relevant proposal UK could only vote against. Then Mr. Vidal asked about whether the proposal would be applicable immediately after adoption. Following Mrs. Vigorito from Italy said that she would feel uncomfortable to vote and suggested that the Championship Structure WG (CSWG) deals with it first.

The Italian suggestion was then accepted by France and the proposal has been withdrawn with the remark that the CSWG should deal with it along with the other similar proposals.

8.3.4 Championship classes at the future WGCs (Netherlands)

As the proposal has been already incorporated in the IGC Bureau proposals (see item 8.3.8) The Netherland decided to withdraw it.

8.3.5 New definition for the rule for organizing WGC outside of Europe (France)

Mr. Guerin introduced the proposal:

If a WGC is to be organised outside of Europe the year 0, a bonus is added to the vote in favour of the bid outside of Europe the next years according to the following rule:

Y1: no bonus

Y2: XX% bonus, rounded to the next whole number

...

Yn: (n-1) XX% bonus, rounded to the next whole number

In case of tie, bid outside of Europe will be the winner

XX has to be chosen in order to keep the spirit of the rule as it is today.

He added that the current rule is a bit too rigid and that the new proposal is more continuous because of the reset of the clock once the event is organized outside Europe. Mr. Fila expressed concern that the result would be a sort of quantification instead of the IGC Plenary vote. Mr. Georgas stated that he likes the current rule and considers the French proposal as too rigid. He also asked what would be the exact bonus and whether it refers to a specific or to any WGC. In response Mr. Guerin confirmed that there is no choice between Europe or outside Europe anymore once the 8 year limit is reached. Following that Mr. Georgas noted that the IGC Plenary has always a chance not to accept a bid, even after 8 years have passed. Then he asked what would be the process if there will be two countries outside Europe bidding. Mr. Fila stated that he understands that the motivation is right and then asked what value is represented by XX in the proposal. Finally, Mr. Georgas concluded that although the proposal is well intended, the way it is presented is incomplete and suggested that the CSWG will come up with the final proposal next year.

France agreed with that suggestion and the proposal has been subsequently withdrawn.

Note: The following three proposals have been introduced and discussed during the first day of the meeting on Friday afternoon (see also 8.3).

8.3.6 Combine Junior and Women WGC from 2021 (IGC Bureau) – Late proposal

Note: This and the following two proposals have been introduced and discussed during the first day of the meeting on Friday afternoon (see also 8.3). The sequence of the proposal specific discussion and the vote was the following: 8.3.7 followed by 8.3.8 and finally 8.3.6. Therefore, the discussion all three of them is reflected in the context of this sequence.

The following proposal has been presented by Mr. Mozer on behalf of the IGC Bureau:

The Bureau proposes to combine Junior and Women WGC in a single event starting from 2021. Both WGCs with two classes and two pilots in class per NAC.

In the discussion Mrs. Kuijpers expressing that the Netherlands is not in favor of the proposal, because cultures of these two events do not fit together and both groups will be unhappy about the decision. She added that the Women WGCs were invented to give women their own environment for competition flying at global level. On the other hand junior pilots do not need oversight of senior women pilots. Furthermore, reducing the number of junior (or women) pilots from 3 to 2 per class is against the idea of introducing young (or women) pilots to the international competition flying. She suggested that Women WGC should keep their three classes, because 18 meter class gliders are more expensive. Also, omitting the standard class would mean more expenses for those women pilots flying it because they would need to buy 18 meter class gliders instead. Mrs. Kuijpers concluded that both event are smaller scaler competitions and more organisations / countries will be able to bid for one of them. In the immediate response Mr. Mozer clarified that the classes are not specified in the proposal nor are specified in the sporting code. Following that. Mrs. Vigorito expressed supports to the proposal for a different reasons. One of them was that it can help small NACs and increase fairness, because only big NACs could afford to send full teams to this events. Subsequently, Mr. Rutkowski referring back to his yesterday's remarks (see 8.3), noted that reducing the number of events means less bids, bigger facilities, which would result in a big competitions. Then Mr. Spreckley concluded that this is the step to refine IGC championships and even FAI confirmed that the combined event will have a stronger voice. Therefore, he suggested the following amendment:

The IGC will accept bids for ~~Bureau proposes to a combined Junior and Women WGC events in a single event~~ starting from 2021.

Both WGCs with two classes and two pilots in class per NAC.

Vote for the amendment: 20, against: 10, abstentions: 3

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

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.3.7 Integration of 13.5 meter class WGC from 2022 (IGC Bureau) – Late proposal

The following proposal has been presented by Mr. Mozer on behalf of the IGC Bureau:

The IGC Bureau proposes to integrate 13.5 m class WGC with the WGC in club, std. and 15m classes with limitation of one pilot per class per NAC for all four classes starting 2022.

As the result of the discussion during the first day of the meeting on Friday afternoon (see 8.3) the Bureau decided to change it to the Year-1 proposal.

Mr. Mozer explained that the limit is two entries per class per NAC in the Open and 18 Meter classes, 2 entries per class per NAC in Junior and Women Championships and 1 pilot per class per NAC in all other classes. Following that Mr. Georgas clarified that the vote for the proposal would indicate support to reduction of number of pilots in the class and that the result will also affect the bidding process next year.

In the subsequent discussion Mrs. Kuijpers suggested that Junior and Women WGCs should not be combined for a few reasons (for details see item 8.3.6 above). Then Mr. Rutkowski noted that it is unclear how this proposal could be converted into a Year-2 proposal. Mr. Mozer clarified that the Year-2 proposal could be slightly different based on the input received from the delegates. Mr. Rutkowski followed on that and asked why there is no limitation to one pilot per class in case of the 18 Meter and Open classes.

Finally. Mr. Eriksen with the consent and on behalf of Denmark suggested the following amendment:

The IGC Bureau proposes to integrate 13.5 m class WGC with the WGC in club, std. and 15m classes with limitation of ~~one pilots~~ per class per NAC ~~for all four~~ more than today in certain classes starting 2022.

Note: The term 'limitation' refers to number of pilots per class per NAC.

Vote for the amendment: 31, against: 0, abstentions: 2

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

The amended proposal has been accepted.

8.3.8 New WGC calendar from 2021 (IGC Bureau) – Late proposal

The following proposal has been presented by Mr. Mozer on behalf of the IGC Bureau:

The IGC Bureau proposes to invite for bids in September 2017 to organize two WGC event in 2021. One event will be WGC in 20m two-seat, 18m and open class. Second event will be combined Junior and Women WGC.

The IGC Bureau proposes to invite for bids in September 2018 to organize one WGC event in 2022. The event will be WGC in 13,5m, club, std., 15m classes

In the subsequent discussion Mr. Trimmel asked whether the proposal limits EGC. Mr. Mozer answered negatively.

Then Mr. Georgas proposed amendment to delete the word 'combined' from the last sentence and that was accepted.

Following that Mrs. Kuijpers repeated that the Junior and Women WGCs should be dealt with separately. In response to that Mr. Vidal suggested that the proposal should allow for enough flexibility for the Bureau to manage the bids. Mr. Mozer replied that the original intention was to combine these two restricted WGCs. Mr. Spreckley added that this proposal indicates that there will be one unrestricted multi class WGC event per year.

In response to the comments Mr. Mozer proposed another amendment i.e. to delete the last sentence of the first paragraph referring to Junior and Women WGCs as indicated below and that amendment was accepted by the delegates:

The IGC Bureau proposes to invite for bids in September 2017 to organize two WGC events in 2021. One event will be WGC in 20m two-seat, 18m and open class. ~~Second event will be combined Junior and Women WGC.~~

The IGC Bureau proposes to invite for bids in September 2018 to organize one WGC event in 2022. The event will be WGC in 13,5m, club, std., 15m classes

Then Mr. Trimmel reminded that there will be always national championships in between. Following that Mr. Sabeckis warned the delegates that it may lead to situation of single events having more than 170 pilots. In response to that Mr. Mozer confirmed that the point is taken and reassured that there is no intention to have a huge events. He concluded that the proposal may be adjusted in the future based on the input received.

Mr. Guerin then suggested to remove reference to the 13.5 Meter class in the second paragraph or to allow for a two events in 2022. This was seconded by Mr. Hansen from Denmark. After the final amendment of the proposal has been presented Mr. Georgas suggested that the delegates take a responsibility to vote. Before the vote Mr. Cubley proposed a minor editorial change that was incorporated and displayed to the delegates as follows:

The IGC Bureau proposes to invite for bids in September 2017 to organize two WGC events in 2021. One event will be WGC in 20m two-seat, 18m and open class. ~~Second event will be combined Junior and Women WGC.~~

The IGC Bureau proposes to invite for bids in September 2018 to organize ~~one~~ WGC event(s) in 2022. ~~The event will be WGC in 13,5m, club, std., 15m classes.~~

Vote for the amendment: 28, against: 4, abstentions: 1

Vote for the amended proposal: 27, against: 4, abstentions: 2

The amended proposal has been accepted.

9. Vote on bids

9.1 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020 (18m, 20m, Open)

The Championships was awarded to Stendal-Borstel, Germany with 18 votes, against 16 votes for Matkópuszta, Hungary.

9.2 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020 (Club, Std., 15m)

The Championships was awarded to Châlons-en-Champagne, France with 19 votes, against 15 votes for Matkópuszta, Hungary.

9.3 3rd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2019 (18m, handicapped)

The Championships was awarded to SW Ontario, Canada with 32 votes for and two abstentions.

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

10.1 Lilienthal Medal

The Lilienthal Medal was awarded to Mr. Patrick Pauwels, Belgium.

10.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma

Not awarded

10.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal

Not awarded.

11. Election of officers (Mr. Eric Mozer / Mr. Vladimir Foltin)

11.1 Election of President

Mr. Eric Mozer from the USA was re-elected as President of IGC for two years

11.2 Election of 1st Vice-president

Mr. Brian Spreckley, UK

11.3 Election of 5 other Vice-presidents

Mr. Terry Cubley, Australia

Mr. Alexander Georgas, Greece

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers, Netherlands

Mrs. Marina Vigorito, Italy

Mr. Rene Vidal, Chile

11.4 Election of Secretary and Treasurer

IGC Secretary - Mr. Vladimir Foltin

Treasurers – Mr. Dick Bradley

12. 2018 IGC Plenary Meeting (Mr. Eric Mozer)

12.1 Announcement of the dates and place of the IGC Plenary meeting 2018

The Bureau is authorized to decide the venue for IGC Plenary 2018 taking into consideration a potential offers received from the delegates before September 2017. The meeting will take place on 2nd and 3rd March 2018. Bureau will seek to avoid conflict with the dates of the EGU meeting.

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

Notification of proposals must reach the Bureau by Saturday 30th September 2017;

Bids must reach the Bid Specialist by Saturday 30th September 2017;

Proposals, nominations and reports must be finalized and delivered to the secretary on the 31st December 2017.

All material will be made available for delegates 45 days before the meeting, Thursday 16th January 2018.

AOB

- Change of the Club class (Netherlands)

The original Year-1 proposal has been withdrawn by the Netherlands, but later put forward by Australia (see also 8.2.10) which was accepted for the discussion by the delegates.

Vote for accepting the late proposal: 20, against: 3, abstentions: 4

Mr. Cubley reintroduced the proposal in its original form by the Netherlands as follows:

Introduce disposable ballast in the club class in one of two ways:

- *Introduce a maximum mass: A maximum which is clearly less than MTOM of Std./15M-class as this will still keep many gliders interesting for club class. For example 425kg.*
- *Introduce a maximum wing loading: A class maximum will lead to maximum masses per glider type and can be listed in the same form as the current IGC ref. mass.*

Following that Mr. Cubley explained that many gliders in the club are designed for much higher wing loading and there is a need to move club class forward. One way would be to allow water ballast or another could be the change of handicap range.

Mr. Guerin, on behalf of Mr. Geissler, the chairmen of the handicap committee, presented the analysis called '*Determination of new Handicaps for Evaluation of Gliders in Club Class*' (distributed to the delegates by email prior the meeting), which indicates in what direction the new handicap system will evolve. He underlined that there is no need to change the nature of the class. Mr. Roine stated that the reason for using similar gliders in this class is the scoring system and not the handicap range. However, he also noted that the reference weight is far too low and it is very complicated technically. Sometimes, a person would need to lose 50kg and one of the ways to overcome that could be to allow smaller amount of water. He admitted, nevertheless, that at the same time the allowed amount of water ballast should not be too high, otherwise it would disqualify some gliders. Mr. Russel Cheetham, the UK alternate delegate, noted that the paper of the handicap committee is a scientific paper and concluded that it may not be possible to fix the problem with a correction of the handicap system. Mr. Sheppe, from the US, explained that the purpose of the handicaps is to equalize all gliders and the system failed to do so therefore, there is a need to correct it. In that regard Mr. Cubley stated that if the IGC decides to take another way than to adjust handicaps, the committee will take it on board as an option in their further work.

In the following discussion Mr. Bjornevik noted that he could not see a need to adjust the handicap in the proposal. Then Mr. Sabeckis added that the handicap is influenced by weather and noted that the proposal would favor the newer gliders against the older gliders. He concluded that the proposal is not good for the club class. Furthermore, Mr. Rutkowski commented that it is not the question of the mass of glider. He added that the weather has more influence on the gaps between the gliders and suggested that the average performance of the glider would be better equalizing the performance than IGC list,

but it would be also more complicated. Following that Mr. Spreckley acknowledged that flying without water ballast is attached to the club class culture. Although, adding water may improve compatibility of the gliders, it has also many issues. He predicted that there would be a need to see a considerable improvement before it could be implemented as Year-2 proposal the next year.

After that Mr. Cheetham asked for clarification whether this is the Year-2 proposal and noted that if not, it could be implemented earlier. Mr. Sheppe responded and confirmed that this proposal is already Year-2 proposal and added that the handicap committee may however publish a new list. Following that Mr. Fila reminded that a class change requires the 4 year interval. Finally, Mr. Foltin reminded that many gliders do not have the water ballast option anymore and also it would require a new water infrastructure at the airports organizing club class competitions.

Vote for the late proposal: 6, against: 21, abstentions: 6

The amended proposal has been lost.

- **Other topics**

- Mr. Spreckley asked whether there is any specific group dealing with the development of scoring ideas. Mr. Sheppe replied that the Annex A and SSWG are the right platforms for such a discussion.
- On another topic, Mr. Sheppe asked who is responsible for further development of the Year-1 proposal into the Year-2 proposal which was accepted by the delegates. Mr. Foltin, the IGC Secretary, clarified that it is primarily the responsibility of the initiator of the Year-1 proposal, but with the support and in coordination with the respective committee or working group.
- Furthermore, on another topic, Dr. Jürgen Knüppel reminded the delegates about the risks of infections when travelling around the world to the various FAI meetings. He mentioned in particular the incident that happened during FAI General Conference in Bali, where the insurance company did not cover the patient anymore although being from a well-developed country (issue with the insurance ceiling). Dr. Knüppel urged the delegates to be properly medically insured. In that regard Mr. Vidal asked whether the stewards are considered as FAI officials, what would happen if they will get sick and how are these people covered for medical expenses. Ms. Schödel, FAI Secretary General said that for the time being it is understood that these people are sent by their respective NACs, but that a travel insurance could be considered by the FAI. Nevertheless, there were thousands of volunteers at the FAI events in the past and this was not yet questioned, but the FAI will check into it. Following that Mr. Spreckley referred to his earlier discussion with one of the FAI vice-presidents where he was told that FAI does not provide any medical cover and that if the NAC does not provide it, the IGC should reimburse it based on claims. Subsequently, Ms. Schödel, FAI Secretary General, commented that the FAI Organisers Agreement only requires insurance for the FAI/IGC officials liability and not the insurance for their medical expenses. Finally Mr. Mozer, based on the query from Mr. Bob Bickers, an IGC official, clarified that in this regard IGC and FAI have the same meaning.
- On the next topic, Mr. Sheppe from the USA asked why the definition of glider disappeared from the General Section of the Sporting Code after the 2014 edition. He stressed that the air sports normally do care about the definition that affect them. As the examples he mentioned gliders with electrically operated flaps plus boundary suction, which both require some power and concluded that IGC needs to address to this problem. Mr. Georgas responded that there could be something on this in the SC, but it may require approval. Mr. Sheppe reacted that it is still not adequate. Following that Mr. Mozer, IGC President, asked the FAI on how to proceed. Ms. Schödel, FAI Secretary General, suggested that there is the major rewrite of the General Section SC and as the first reaction IGC should forward it to CASI. Mr. Vigorito, the IGC representative to CASI, added that she will gladly facilitate discussion on any paper provided to CASI by IGC.

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 2017

Committee	Chair
ANDS:	Rick Sheppe
Championship Management:	Peter Eriksen
GFAC:	Ian Strachan
Sporting Code Section 3D	
Main Section & Annex C:	Alexander Georgas
Annex A:	Rick Sheppe
Annex A: Handicap Subcommittee	Christof Geissler
Annex B:	Ian Strachan
Annex D:	Reno Filla
Working Group Chairs:	Chair
Country Development:	To be appointed by the IGC Bureau
History:	Peter Selinger
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
Specialist Officers	
Sailplane Grand Prix:	Brian Spreckley
Trophy Management:	Gisela Weinreich
OLC:	Christof Geissler