



# Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

## **FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)**

held in Freudenstadt

Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> and Saturday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2018

at Conference Center - Kurhaus

Ver. 1.3

## 1. Opening and Welcome (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President welcomed the delegates to the 2018 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked them for coming to Freudenstadt. The President also welcomed all guests present at the meeting, in particular Mr. Julian Osswald, the Mayor of Freudenstadt and Ms Sigrid Berner, the Vice-President of DAeC, who gave their opening remarks and also welcomed the meeting participants and guests in Freudenstadt. The President then asked people that were participating in the IGC meeting for the first time to present themselves. Finally the President thanked the local organisers of the meeting, in particular Mr. Axel Reich and Mr. Christof Geissler for their support which allowed the meeting to be well prepared.

### 1.1 Absent friends (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The President then 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 Call (Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki)

Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki, FAI IT Manager, called the roll. It was determined that 36 votes were present including 5 proxies (from Ireland to UK, from Ukraine to Lithuania, from New Zealand to Australia, from Estonia to Latvia and from Portugal to Spain). Thus 19 votes would be required for an absolute majority on any ballot, 24 votes for a 2/3rds majority and 21 vote for a 2/3rds majority for any late agenda items.

Mr. Leinikki called the roll at the beginning of the second day, Saturday 3<sup>th</sup> March. The quorum was the same as on the first day.

Mr. Leinikki called again the roll before agenda item 8.4. There were 31 votes present including the 5 proxies, requiring 16 votes for an absolute majority on any ballot, and 21 votes for a 2/3rds majority. The following agenda items were affected: 8.2.14, 8.3.6, late proposal from Finland and Lithuania as well as items 9 – 10.

### 1.3 Administrative matters (Vladimir Foltin)

- The IGC Plenary appointed monitors to oversee the counting of ballots during the meeting.
- The IGC Secretary Vladimir Foltin briefed the meeting about the administrative matters and practicalities for the IGC social event on Friday evening, where all delegates, meeting participants, companions and FAI staff were invited.

### 1.4 Declaration of Conflicts 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, Budapest 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> March 2017 (Eric Mozer/Vladimir Foltin)

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Budapest 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> March 2017 prepared by IGC Secretary Mr. Vladimir Foltin and called the delegates for their approval. The minutes were unanimously approved.

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

The IGC President referred to the written report circulated before the meeting. He highlighted the successful 8<sup>th</sup> FAI/IGC Sailplane Grand Prix Final 2018 held recently in Vitacura, Chile as well as five FAI Gliding Championships held in 2017 – the 9<sup>th</sup> FAI Women WGC in Zbraslavice (Czech Republic), the 2<sup>nd</sup> FAI 13.5 meter WGC in Szatymaz (Hungary), the 10<sup>th</sup> FAI Junior WGC in Pociunai (Lithuania) and the two 19<sup>th</sup> FAI EGCs, one in Lasham (UK) and another one in Moravská Třebová (Czech Republic). He also expressed his appreciation of all the work of the Bureau, committee chairs and their members as well as all the specialists contributing to various IGC activities and events. He also welcomed all new participants to the IGC Plenary meeting.

Mr. Mozer then briefed the meeting participants about the recent FAI decision to hold the FAI 2020 World Air Games in Turkey and outlined next possible steps to ensure success of the gliding events to be competed there. He noted that the organizers had requested a Sailplane Grand Prix type event and a Match race similar to that held in Dubai.

Finally, Mr. Mozer concluded that the meeting agenda is full and there are many important items for discussion therefore, he asked all the delegates to contribute to these discussions.

### 4. FAI Matters (Visa-Matti Leinikki)

#### 4.1 FAI's report to the IGC Plenary

The report was presented by Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki on behalf of Ms. Susanne Schödel, FAI Secretary General. The verbal report covered in particular the preparations of World Air Games (WAG) 2020 where Organizers Agreement (OA) was signed and negotiations with organizers on technical details were ongoing. The Air Sport Commissions (ASC) will be fully engaged thus will be a vital part of the project. Inonu site was selected for gliding event. Another important event for FAI will be 1<sup>st</sup> Drone World Championships in China.

The IGC President welcomed plans of early involvement of ASCs and committed to nominate IGC liaisons for the WAG 2020 soon.

### 5. Finance (Mr. Dick Bradley)

Note: The 2017 Financial statement and 2018 budget is available for download at the FAI web.

#### 5.1 Treasurers Report and 2017 Financial Statement

The IGC Treasurer Mr. Dick Bradley presented the 2017 Finance Report and the 2018 budget based on very recent data from FAI.

The 2017 report showed an income of 44,177€. The expenditure was 36,971€. The reserves increased by 7,206 € to 78,251 €. Budgeted income from sanction fees was overestimated, there was lower number of pilots participating in IGC sanctioned championships. However, this was compensated by lower travel expenses of IGC officials and the cost of IGC meetings. The collection of fees from the Ranking List and web advertising was similar as budgeted.

The Financial Report was accepted by the IGC Plenary with a caveat that the figures are still provisional and small adjustments could be made following the final review.

#### 5.2 2018 Budget

The 2018 budget showed expected income of 42,275 € and expenditure of 40,840 €. The budgeted capital expenditure (RL upgrade and soaring web portal) is 6,500 €.

The following short discussion followed on the budget.

Mr Artur Rutkowski (POL) asked about meaning of item 'Incorporation of Sports Marketing Co.' The treasurer replied that is it a redundant line from the past, which should be removed. Mr. Mogens Hansen (DEN) invited the IGC Bureau to discuss and make position on the level of IGC funds and announce it to the Delegates. The treasurer commented that the IGC yearly expenses can be in certain circumstances as high as 60,000 € and IGC needs to be able to finance it. He as a conservative treasurer and recommended to keep IGC reserves as it is.

The Budget for 2018 was accepted by the IGC Plenary.

## 6. Reports not requiring voting

Note: All received reports are available for download on the FAI web-site.

### 6.1 OSTIV report (Dr. Rolf Radespiel)

Dr Radespiel reported on OSTIV activities since the last IGC Plenary as presented in the written report. In particular he highlighted work on micro-light glider standards containing proposal for self-declaration. He invited the delegates to the OSTIV congress 2018 taking in in Příbram<sup>1</sup>, Czech Republic.

### 6.2 Standing Committees

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

Mr. Georgas reported that the Committee concentrated last year on introducing a number of proposals clarifying existing rules of the Sporting Code. This year, the efforts will focus on simplifications of the rulebook that can be achieved by small changes to the code. The Committee also brings forward some new proposals with ambition to generate debate within the IGC that can guide the future work.

#### 6.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A (Mr. Rick Sheppe)

Mr. Sheppe referred to a written report that lists all changes incorporated in the Code during 2016 and also a Year-2 proposal (unchanged from Y-1) tabled for the discussion by the Plenary.

#### Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A Handicaps (Mr. Christof Geissler)

Mr. Geissler had nothing to add to the written report.

Mr. Pauwels from Belgium mentioned concerns of pilots about the recently published list and suggested that in the future it must be 100 percent correct before publishing.

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

Mr. Reno Filla presented the Ranking List (RL) statistics which showed noteworthy increase in competition classes since 2010 while the increase of pilots and competitions remains similar as before. He also asked for support of IGC delegates in resolving a number of duplicated pilot IDs in the RL. He concluded by thanking to Mr. Bjørnevik from Norway for his help with the RL improvements.

Mr. Guerin from France commented that they pay a lot of sanction fees for competitions included in the RL but is not getting back expected support.

---

<sup>1</sup> Post meeting note: The OSTIV Conference 2018 has been moved to Hosin, Czech Republic following the change of venue of the FAI World Championships 2018.

Mr. Fila confirmed that there are a lot of problems with the RL and also resources. There is only one volunteer available for RL support during July and August. He apologized for the problems and mentioned that the last year was exceptional and that the RL administrators took measures e.g. involving more volunteers.

Mr. Spreckley (UK) recalled that 2 years ago IGC asked Mr. Reno Fila to take over the RL and promised him that it would be rather easy. Unfortunately, the system was designed as a PhD. project some 20 years ago and runs on an outdated technology therefore there are problems. He concluded that IGC is lucky that Mr. Fila is sorting them out.

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

Mr. Sheppe referred to the written report and mentioned in particular the progress on specification of standard for a machine-readable task format which should be revealed soon.

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

Mr. Strachan presented recent GFAC activities, like the work and solutions regarding problems with engine recording. He also mentioned that number of approved FR is now 59 from 20 different manufacturers and concluded that GFAC needs new members with some expertise of different Flight Recorders (FR). Mr. Casado commented that the weakest part of older designs is security and that it needs to be revisited.

#### 6.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen reported that he received eleven bids for IGC Championships, which could be considered as a good offer for the IGC delegates. However, he also mentioned a disappointment with some bidders because some bids were not fully completed or contained only a brief notification or were delivered only a few hours before deadline. Therefore new deadline (30 November) will be proposed to the Bureau to be used from this year onwards. The IGC President commented that tabled proposals may have an influence on overall management of the championships. Mr. Terry Cubley (Australia) reported that the stewards working group is following closely all issues identified at the championships and even issues which may have gone public. E.g. there will a proposal put forward during this meeting to have a specific rule in Annex A to cover issue of abusive behavior of a pilot at competition. Also, real time tracking is becoming an issue and has effect on competitive aspect of our sport. Therefore, the IGC will have a discussion on this matter later during this meeting. He concluded that there is a need to get more stewards available for our championships, as the group struggled to find a good number for this year's competitions. The IGC President added that he intends to draft a strong letter on a pilot behavior that happened during SGP Final in Chile. All organizers are volunteers and he has very little tolerance on abusing these people which give their free time to support our sport. He concluded that IGC will look at possibilities to strengthen its capability to protect the organizers.

### 6.3 Working Groups

#### 6.3.1 Championship Structure (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen briefly recalled past activities. The working group spent a lot of time in 2016 discussing various options but did not reach an agreement. Therefore, he asked the Bureau for guidance. Following the Bureau discussion, the group had only a limited activity. The IGC President added that this group was considered as a temporary structure and its purpose was to have a look where we have been, where we are now, and where we go with our



primary product...World Gliding Championships and classes. The work has generated some proposals thus, the work of the group has concluded.

### 6.3.2 Safety (Mr. René Vidal)

Mr. Vidal referred to the written report on group past activities and presented statistics and analysis of the IGC safety data, now containing all accidents at major IGC events (35 in total). All of them were classified in accordance with a common classification scale. The main issues (represent 60% of ALL accident/incidents) are:

- Hard landings (outlandings and field landings): 32 %
- Final stage (final glide, approaching etc.): 14%
- Flying gaggles + mid-air collision: 14%

There is a 60% decrease in the average number of accidents and incidents since 2012, which means a reduction of 73%. The WGC, Junior WGC and EGC are the highest rated in terms of accidents/incidents in contrast to SGP Final, Women WGC and Pan-American Championships are the lowest rated. All three fatal accidents (8 years, 35 major championships) happened in mountain regions. The group recommends continuing gathering information from reports and flight analysis, to establish strategies to reduce incidents and accidents, focused on most relevant issues (flying gaggles, mid-air collision, hard landings), to share statistics and proximity analysis with pilots and, to continue developing behavior's survey during briefings at the competitions. He concluded that reduction of accidents/incidents and the behavior change shows that the main goal of moving to a Safety Culture is on its way.

Mr. Bjørnevik (Norway) commented that statistics with accident per competition does not always work, because e.g. SGP has approximately 1/5 the number of pilots compared to WGC or EGC. He suggested to consider number of flight hours. Mr. Georgas responded that SGP is a series with ~150 pilots per year. Mr. Rutkowski proposed that only international competitions be counted in the statistics, with a rationale that if QSGP would be included then also national championships should be included. The IGC President responded that statistics is about IGC competitions and that IGC has no resources to get data from outside. Mr. Rutkowski clarified that including Qualifying SGP event is misleading, because there is a difference between the final and qualifying SGP events, and therefore these data should not be compared with other conventional competitions. Mr. Spreckley concluded that the group will try to work on causes of accidents in order to try to address them.

### 6.3.3 Scoring Software (Mr. Angel Casado)

Mr. Casado reported that all information is included in the written report and mentioned two proposals as outcomes that are presented to the IGC Plenary, one from Spain and from the Working Group.

### 6.3.4 History Committee (Mr. Peter Selinger)

Mr. Selinger referred to the written report and asked the Delegates for help with history data for three documents as in the report. The missing information will help to understand history of the IGC or its predecessor called CIVV (Commission Internationale de Vol à Voile) or CVSM (Commission de Vol Sans Moteur). The IGC President urged the IGC Delegates to help in getting the missing information if it is available.

### 6.3.5 Country Development (Mr. Alexander Georgas)

Mr. Georgas mentioned that there was no written report this year because of his engagement with the Sporting Code Committee.

#### 6.3.6 IGC Media (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley mentioned that there are two proposals that will be discussed later during the meeting.

### 6.4 IGC Representatives

#### 6.4.1 CASI Report (FAI Air Sport General Commission) (Mrs. Marina Vigorito)

Mrs. Vigoritto referred to the written report on CASI activities and highlighted the work of the role of Jury President, where conclusion was that he/she cannot cancel the competition because the contractual agreement is between FAI and the organizers. As a consequence, Annex A needs to be corrected. Mr. Leinikki, representing FAI however clarified that Jury President can remove the sanction and clarified in reply to question from Mr. Cubley that it means that if the organizer decides to continue, the event will not be official event of FAI. The IGC President expressed gratitude to work of Mrs. Vigoritto for her work at CASI on behalf of IGC.

#### 6.4.2 EGU/EASA (Mr. Patrick Pauwels)

Mr. Pauwels provided update to the written report, in which he mentioned EGU recent activities like successful EGU Congress 2018 and status of ongoing European regulatory activities. In particular he mentioned that that Part DTO (Declared Training Organization) will allow for extra opt-out for gliding until 2020, Part-OPS (Operations) and Part-FCL (Flight Crew Licensing) are being developed by EGU and, that there is an upcoming opportunity for gliding federations to become qualified entities to conduct regulatory activities on behalf of the authorities. Finally, he appealed that EGU needs more members to cover the workload and welcomed Hungary as their most recent member.

#### 6.4.3 Environmental Commission Report (Mr. Bernald Smith)

Mr. Sheppe conveyed apologies and message from Mr. Smith for not being able to attend the IGC Plenary meeting. Mr. Smith believes that the Environmental Commission is doing important work and that IGC should be searching someone who can carry this work further.

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

Dr. Knüppel distributed a written report which mentioned contribution on medical matters to OSTIV safety panel and cooperation with Perlan project (one representative). He added that whenever there is work on safety, the old OSTIV medical papers are valid and are still available at the OSTIV web page. He concluded by a plea for delegates to ensure the athletes have a good insurance when traveling, covering at least the local medical care and repatriation as those may cost a fortune. He suggested they visit the Olympics page on how athletes are covered. The IGC President added that IGC needs to ensure that officials are well covered and thanked to Dr. Knüppel for highlighting it.

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

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

## 6.5 IGC Specialists

### 6.5.1 Trophy Management (Mrs. Gisela Weinreich)

Mrs. Weinreich referred to the written report and its Annexes containing set of information and rules of IGC – FAI Challenge Cups. The IGC President expressed his gratitude to Mrs. Weinreich for her work on collecting information about the IGC Trophies.

## 7. Championships (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

### 7.1 Reports from Past Championships

Mr. Eriksen provided a brief introduction and review. He reminded that 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. There were no remarks from the Plenary. There were no remarks to any of the below listed competitions under (agenda items 7.2.1 – 7.2.5).

- 7.1.1 2<sup>nd</sup> FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2017 Szatymaz, Hungary
- 7.1.2 9<sup>th</sup> FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2017, Zbraslavice, Czech Republic
- 7.1.3 10<sup>th</sup> FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2017, Pociunai, Lithuania
- 7.1.4 19<sup>th</sup> FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Moravská Třebová, Czech Republic (Club, Std., 20m)
- 7.1.5 19<sup>th</sup> FAI European Gliding Championships 2017, Lasham, UK (15m, 18m, Open) (Standard and 15-Meter Class with handicaps)

### 7.2 Reports about Future Championships

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

#### 7.2.1 35<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Příbram<sup>2</sup>, Czech Republic (18m, 20m, Open)

Mr. Kluger from the Czech Republic invited all teams to participate at the Championships. He mentioned that unfortunately Annex A does not allow two 20m Two-seat class gliders from one nation at the WGC and urged IGC to consider it in the future (there could have been 10 more participating gliders at the event). The IGC president responded that such proposal could be considered in the future. Mr. Foltin from Slovakia added that the current rules allow two entries in the 20m two-seat class at the continental championships.

#### 7.2.2 35<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Ostrow Michalkow, Poland (Club, Std., 15m)

---

<sup>2</sup> Post meeting note: The FAI World Championships 2018 have been moved to Hosin, Czech Republic.



Mr. Rutkowski reported that all preparations are according to schedule.

#### 7.2.3 The 3<sup>rd</sup> FAI World 13.5m Class Gliding Championship, 2019 Pavullo, Italy

Mrs. Vigorito reported that the organizers are ready to accommodate any outcome of the discussion on future of the 13.5 meter class and asked the delegates to approve a new Competition Director Aldo Cernezzi and new dates 1-14 September 2019. Both changes were approved by the Plenary.

#### 7.2.4 11<sup>th</sup> FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019, Szeged, Hungary

Mr. Gyöngyösi asked the delegates to approve new dates 28 July – 10 August 2019 due to overlap with dates of the EGC in Prievidza. The IGC Plenary approved the change.

#### 7.2.5 10<sup>th</sup> FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2019, Lakekeepit, Australia

Mr. Cubley referred to the written update where it was proposed to change the dates to 3 – 18 January 2020. Furthermore, the organizers confirmed that they intend to run three classes, but will ask for provisional entries in late 2018 in order to ascertain numbers before making the final decision. Mrs. Kuijpers (Netherlands) commented that the pilots would like to know which classes will be held and wondered why the decision is postponed to the end of 2018. She added that there are some pilots who are not willing to fly in a class with only 10 pilots. Mr. Cubley confirmed that that the intention is to hold three classes as in the bid and if entries will be insufficient e.g. in club class the organizer will run only two classes. However, if the number of entries per class will be sufficient number according to the rules (5 NACs and 10 pilots) then organizers will hold the championships in three classes.

#### 7.2.6 36<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Stendal-Borstel, Germany (18m, 20m, Open)

Mr. Eriksen mentioned that that the current dates collide with dates of the WGC in France. Also, the dates of WAG in September are quite close. Therefore, the only option is to move the WGC in Germany one week earlier. Following that Mr. Geissler informed the delegates about preparations for the event, i.e. that WGC slogan will be '*100 years of competitions in gliding*' commemorating the first 1<sup>st</sup> competition in this format at Wasserkuppe in 1920. He reported that organizing committee is established and added that there should be training opportunities already in 2019 during the German nationals (two separate classes). On a regulatory side, the 8.33 VHF channel spacing will be required on all gliders. Furthermore, the organizers intend to assist with acceptance of non-EU glider pilot licenses already during the registration process. The IGC President asked about mixed class at the German national championships: Will it be at the same class as for the national championships? What will organizers do if there are too many foreign pilots? Mr. Geissler asked the nominated Championships Director to answer: The international pilots will fly along the national championships, but in a separate class.

#### 7.2.7 36<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Châlons-en-Champagne, France (Club, Std., 15m)

Mr. Eriksen reassured the delegates that he will speak to French organizers about the change of dates.

#### 7.2.8 20<sup>th</sup> FAI European Gliding Championships 2019, Turbia - near Stolowa Wola, Poland (18m, 20m, Open)

Mr. Rutkowski informed that preparations are working well, that office containers will be available to the teams and, that the national championships open to foreign pilots will take place at Turbia in 2018. He concluded that no problems are foreseen. Mrs. Vigorito asked whether the 8.33 radio will be mandatory. Mr. Rutkowski confirmed that it is be mandatory as in all EU and that the Polish authorities may exempt only aircraft registered in Poland. Mr. Foltin from Slovakia clarified the applicable airspace and airworthiness requirements in the European Union. Mr. Eriksen (on behalf of Denmark) suggested that there could be a possibility to assign specific 25 KHz channels for international pilots.

#### 7.2.9 20<sup>th</sup> FAI European Gliding Championships 2019, Prievidza, Slovakia (Club, Std., 15m)

Mr. Foltin from Slovakia informed about preparations, which are progressing according to plan. There will be numerous training opportunities for international pilots to fly competitions in Slovakia during 2018 - 2019 and there will be also a possibility to use other dates for individual training at the Championships venue.

#### 7.2.10 3<sup>rd</sup> FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2019, SW Ontario, Canada (18-Meter and Handicapped Classes)

Mr. Stieber from Canada informed that Pre-PAGC will be organized this year and the dates are in the report.

### 7.3 Approval of Competition Officials (Terry Cubley)

All nominations were accepted at once.

#### 7.3.1 Approval of Officials for 2018 Competitions

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

##### a. 35<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Příbram, Czech Republic (18m, 20m, Open)

Chief Steward: Robert Danewid (SWE)  
Steward: Enrique Lippe (ARG)  
Jury President: Rick Sheppe (USA)  
Jury Members: Bob Bickers (UK) Jaroslav Vach (CZE) both remote

##### b. 35<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Ostrow Michalkow, Poland (Club, Std., 15m)

Chief Steward: Lasse Virtanen (FIN)  
Steward: Bruno Ramseyer (IRL)  
Jury President: Marina Vigorito (ITA)  
Jury Members: Juha Silvennoinen (FIN), Wojciech Scigala (POL) both remote

#### 7.3.2 Approval of Officials for 2019 and 2020 Competitions

The following FAI/IGC officials were approved for competitions in 2019-2020:

##### a. 3<sup>rd</sup> FAI 13.5m Class World Gliding Championships 2019, Pavullo, Italy

Chief Steward: Brian Spreckley (GBR)  
Jury President: Bob Bickers (GBR)

b. 11<sup>th</sup> FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2019, Szeged, Hungary

Chief Steward: Christof Geissler (GER)

Jury President: Juha Silvennoinen (FIN)

c. 10<sup>th</sup> FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2019, Lakekeepit, Australia

Chief Steward: Frouwke Kuijpers (NED)

Jury President: Marina Vigorito (ITA)

d. 36<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Stendal-Borstel, Germany (18m, 20m, Open)

Chief Steward: Robert Danewid (SWE)

Jury President: Eric Mozer (USA)

e. 36<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2020, Châlons-en-Champagne, France (Club, Std., 15m)

Chief Steward: Frouwke Kuijpers (NED)

Jury President: Peter Ryder (GER)

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

Chief Steward: Dick Bradley (RSA)

Jury President: Angel Casado (ESP)

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

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels (BEL)

Jury President: Peter Ryder (GER)

h. 3<sup>rd</sup> FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2019, SW Ontario, Canada (18-Meter and Handicapped Classes)

Chief Steward: Renato Tsukamoto (BRA)

Jury President: Rick Sheppe (USA)

*Guest speaker: Angel Casado - Glider Tracking Challenges on competitions*

Mr. Casado started with outlining three focus areas of his presentation i.e. how is the live tracking changing strategies at the competitions; Challenges for live scoring; and some issues linked with tracking, visibility and drones. He initially presented the overview of available technology (10 technical solutions) and efforts aiming at combining all the positions into a single presentation, which was successful at the SGP Final in Chile. Within the second area he mentioned that technology is now available and there are positive consequences like organizers knowing position of all gliders, improved publicity and 2D or even 3D presentations. However, there are also challenges e.g. everyone can know the position of each other and the tracks are marked with colors showing the thermals which we will see soon integrated in the cockpits. Therefore there is natural conflict between the live tracking for public and current rules and associated tactics. Moreover, new challenges are on the horizon (e.g. LIDR radars, Big Data) that will allow for full thermal maps based on flights records and weather to be used by the pilots. Finally, there are also external developments that could not be ignored like those related to visibility of gliders and, the evolutions in the drones segment, where the authorities and drone manufacturers have a role. There are also the other considerations (e.g. security, police) interested in knowing position of drones. Mr. Casado concluded that IGC needs to adapt to the new situation and change the rules, including implementation of the real time scoring.

*Strategic discussion (Open forum): On use of real-time data available to teams (e.g. FLARM, weather, etc.) for pilot tactical decisions at IGC competitions*

The IGC President Eric Mozer introduced the discussion and highlighted its importance for the future of our sport. Then he mentioned that the IGC dealt with the issue in the past through a delay of presentation of glider positions. He asked: Can the information be encrypted in such a way that it would be only available to the organizers? Mr. Casado: Yes, it is possible, but the question is how to ensure that someone else will not create a parallel tracking means. Mr. Leinikki from FAI: What do you think will happen when 10.000 paragliders will join OGN (Open Glider Network)? Mr. Casado: I initially thought that the OGN will collapse with 100 stations, but the technology has evolved and OGN now uses 1.000 stations without a problem and, even a part of the technology is provided by the FAI. Mr. Spreckley from UK: Who pays for the technology? Mr. Casado: The cost is born by the one who installs the antenna. OGN is a cooperative organization and the resources are for everyone. Mr. Spreckley: Is there a risk of the OGN commercialization as the system grows? Mr. Casado: There is always such a risk. Mr. Bjørnevik from Norway: How many systems are used for the OGN? Mr. Casado: OGN is only a few systems that run by a dozen of people. Prof. Peter Ryder, the IGC President of honor: What frequency channels are used by the OGN? Mr. Casado: OGN utilizes 860 MHz public channel with some restrictions. It can use it for a max 1% of the time and only with a limited power. The OGN Trackers respect these rules as well as the FLARM, but the PowerFLARM is using higher power setting. Mrs. Kuijpers: Some pilots are switching FLARMS off or use the antenna switch to stop transmitting. When would be the OGN tracking devices available for the IGC competitions (~ 150 pieces)? Mr. Casado: If pilots prefer not to be followed at all, they could not be located in case of accident/incident. It is the pilot's decision, which cannot be controlled. However, it is possible to detect a sudden loss of signal, which is suspicious and it could mean that someone is doing something wrong with the transmitter. In response to trackers availability, in a semi-industrial way it would cost in a range up to 100 €. Mr. Geissler from Germany: That would be impressive, in such a case the OGC would be used very much. If we are going to rely on the OGN, how we can control it? M. Casado: There is no company, it is fully cooperative arrangements of a few persons (7-10) who contribute with 90 % of all efforts. We could think about giving up some of the control to the FAI. It is up to us. Mr. Spreckley: Our principal concern is the effect on our championships. Pilots complain that the sport is not as it should be. We need to take these concerns into account. There are two information to be considered, one that is available to pilot on board and another one is the external information available to teams on the ground. We should start addressing the latter. Mr. Bjørnevik: We have a new sport now, one pilot in the plane and 10 pilots on the ground. Mr. Cubley from Australia: We are in a transition phase that is the concern. Once we have the OGN trackers available and working we would be more in the control and the pilots will get used to it. It may change our sport, but at the moment only a few teams have a capability to make a good use of the information that is available. Small teams cannot follow these developments. We need to address this gap. The concern is that people will start to switch the FLARM on and off all the time. We need to find a way to control the situation. Mr. Casado: One clarification, the OGN trackers can live in parallel with the FLARM. If the tracker would be off, we can see what has happened (the reason). The tracker power is 5 time more than the FLARM. Also, I do not agree that the best organized teams will get an advantage when we will use own trackers. There is also no much difference on the computing power. Mr. Peter Eriksen, the IGC secretary of honor: There is a way ahead, i.e. to use the FLARM or trackers for online scoring. Also, we should be able to award pilots taking risk for departing early. Mrs. Vigorito from Italy: From the Jury perspective, there is a need for a clear statement in the rules to cater situations when the pilot switched it off intentionally or it is just a power supply problem. Mr. Georgas from Greece: The current rules do not foresee the pilots to carry FLARM, so anyone can switch it off without any record of

that. Tracker would have such a function. Mr. Bradley from South Africa: I accept this is the future which will change our competition. But the current rules do not allow external help. It does create a disadvantage in a significant way. We can get around it if asking the pilots to sign the document that the external help is not allowed by the rules. Mr. Spreckley: For clarification, the Annex A has some rules on the external help, but it does not apply for a cooperation between the pilots flying the same competition. Mr. Strachan, the GFAC chairman: There are many flight recorders approved by the IGC and there a technical possibility to link FLARM with the recorder. Mr. Spreckley: However, the FLARM is not mandatory. Mr. Motuza from Lithuania: One can think the discussion is about future, but it is reality. We could see it at the Junior WGC, features like online average speed, identification of the highest climb rate at the moment. Team captains can have access to and use such information. This is not a problem, but an opportunity. We were aiming for this by inventing expensive trackers, now we have them. We have all information online. We should consider this. We need to create more drama for the followers on internet to attract more audience. Event market should be considered to allow for a hidden start, no one would know whether the pilot has started or not. This would create a story. Mr. Rutkowski from Poland: Regarding the penalization of interruption of transmission, how we could control it? Mr. Casado: The idea is that the tracker will be transmitting the data which will be also stored in the memory and the latter will be used for the final score. However, we need to build in all necessary security as it was for the GNSS FR. Mr. Georgas: It depends on us on to provide tracker for the scoring, to recognize the technology and look for an opportunity how to use it for our sport. It is important to keep it as a sport for individual pilots rather than a sport for big teams. Mrs. Kuijpers in reaction on Lithuania and Greece: It is a challenge and also an opportunity. We are the ones who could change the rules, we must not discuss it too long, we should decide. Cockpit data are important, but could be less important in the future. We have to consider extra bonuses or awards. It is important too, the pilots like it. And the competitions must remain fun. I invite all to think about it and make proposals to the IGC. The challenge is here. Mr. Guerin from France: We should be careful about the possibility for pilots to turn their FLARM off, but unfortunately that option exists already today and everybody can see it happening live. However, the competitiveness of contests remains. Killian Walbrou won in Benalla because he was first at the first and also the last turning point. Also, Wolfgang Janowitsch finished first flying alone in Lasham. It is not a real concern, still the best pilots will win. Mr. Vidal from Chile: Could we eliminate the external aid, if pilots will be made aware it is forbidden? Mr. Fila from Sweden: The power of the data disappears with time. Once received on the ground, it could be already obsolete. How to manage it? We need to adapt our rules that use of the data is not encouraged. Mr. Leinikki from FAI: Regarding the early bird bonus, some organizers use a very complicated algorithm and that makes it very complicated for audience. Mr. Wolfgang Weinreich, The FAI President of honor: The past is repeating, the pilots will always find a way around. Indeed, the watching of online tracking was very interesting for the crowd on the ground at Zbraslavice. However the technology needs to be adjusted for that specific purpose. Mr. Spreckley: There are one or two options available. A number of people suggest that the benefitting from data should cost. One option is to make the rules so not to allow data to pilots at all or, we should be looking for modifications of the rules so we would be able to reflect the benefit of data in our scores. Mr. Motuza: We have a mix of tasks. There are not only two but three options, e.g. a competition without transmitting a signal like they do it at the general aviation navigation competitions. Mr. Spreckley: The question is about the objective of gliding sport: Should it be for individual pilot? The answer would give a clear signal on a way forward and we also need to find a way forward in our rules. Mr. Rutkowski: We have also the country ranking list, so the sport should not be a purely individual, but a combination of both. One cannot compete as a single pilot in a serious competition today. The IGC President Eric Mozer thanked to Mr. Casado and concluded: I encourage everyone to have a frank and



open discussion on opportunities this new technology brings. It was a very interesting discussion. We will certainly use the open fora in the future.

#### 7.4 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley reported on the SGP developments since the last IGC Plenary meeting (items 7.4.1 – 7.4.4). He recalled the SGP objective “To showcase our sport to a wider audience”.

##### 7.4.1 Report on 8th series (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

The main milestones during the 8th Series were related to use of the OGN trackers, SGP team development, and introduction of “Race Highlight” videos. 140 pilots competed in 9 National SGP events and the Final SGP during the period from December 2016 to January 2018.

##### 7.4.2 SGP Final 2017, Vitacura, Chile (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

In addition to written SGP Final report Mr. Spreckley presented statistics about online audience that has nearly doubled since the SGP Final at Vazeze. It was for the first time that a digital pen was used to visualize the live commentary. The event also triggered a number of gatherings in gliding clubs to watch the final race of the competitions as evidenced through a group photo competition launched by the SGP team.

##### 7.4.3 Progress for 9th and 10th series (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

There are 9 national events planned from January to July 2018 and the SGP Final in La Cerdanya, Spain in June 2019 planned for 9th Series. The rules will be reviewed and amended with feedback from pilots and organizers as usually. The following changes will be considered: Qualification for the final in Series 9; Start penalty and height procedure; Wing loading limit versus mass limit; Finish height penalty.

The 10th Series will start in June 2019 and will last until September 2020 when the SGP Final will take place at the WAG 2020. The deadline for bids is 31 September 2018 (bid guidance is available on SGP web page [www.sgp.aero](http://www.sgp.aero)). The 10th Series objectives will be: Series partner; live scoring; In-flight live film transmission.

##### 7.4.4 SGP Management (Mr. Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley concluded that the FAI/SGP needs commercial management. The questions are: Who it should be? If not within IGC should we sell the series?

The IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer opened the discussion. Mr. Motuza: The SGP is competition for private pilots, because they do not need to go through the national team qualification process and are able to qualify to the SGP Final directly. Mr. Spreckley: Yes, that is correct, but they still need a sporting license issued by the NAC. Mr. Motuza: We talk about commercialization of the SGP already several years. Mr. Vidal from Chile: From an organizers perspective any negative publicity of the event is unfair in comparison to the job done and associated benefits for the organizers. We have to consider what impact it may have on our sport.

#### 7.6 Presentation of Bids for Future Championships (max. 10 minutes each)

The bids were presented in countries' alphabetic order.



#### 7.6.1 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2021 (18m, 20m, Open)

- Montluçon (LFBK), France
- Matkópuszta (LHMP), Hungary
- Ostrow (EPOM), Poland

#### 7.6.2 11th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2021

- Lisie Katy (EPGI), Poland
- Santa Cilia (LECI), Spain
- Husbands Bosworth, UK

#### 7.6.3 12th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2021

- Wiener Neustadt (LOXN), Austria
- Tabor (LKTA), Czech Republic
- Leszno (EPLS), Poland

#### 7.6.4 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2021 (Club, Std., 15m)

- Pociunai (EYPR), Lithuania

#### 7.6.5 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2021

- Luís Eduardo Magalhães (SWNB), Brazil

#### 7.7 Question to all bid presenters

Mr. Cubley: Do you offer discounted entry fee to overseas pilots? All bidders replied negatively. However, the bidders from the Czech Republic (Tabor) offered 3 free take-offs discount for all overseas competitors and bidders from Lithuania (Pociunai) offered unspecified discount for overseas pilots. Mr. Geissler (to France): The bid mentions a compulsory insurance; can you explain it? Mr. Guerin: There is no need for a special insurance, the usual one would be sufficient. Mr. Geissler (to UK): Should we expect any complications with Brexit<sup>3</sup>? Mr. Spreckley: The organizers are absolutely certain there will be no complications related to Brexit. Austria reported that unfortunately they have not got yet an approval from the authorities on the proposed venue. Mr. Sheppe (to PAGC) Will the organizer offer enough standard class (monotype) gliders for rent? Ms. Caselato from Brazil: Yes.

#### 8. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

---

<sup>3</sup> The UK is in the process of leaving the European Union.

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 1<sup>st</sup> October 2018.

## 8.1 Year-2 Proposals

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

The proposal affects Sporting Code 3, Annex A, 8.4.1a and 8.4.2a:

To change the distance required for 1000 points to:

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

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:

13.5 Metre and Club class	100 km
Standard, 15 Metre, and 20 Metre Two-seat classes	120 km
18 Metre and Open classes	140 km

Mr. Sheppe briefly introduced the proposal, which was the same as the Year-1 proposal.

Votes for: 34, against: 2, abstentions: 0

Repeated<sup>4</sup>: Votes for: 35, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal was adopted.

### 8.1.2 Definition of Silver distance (Sweden)

The proposal affects Sporting Code 3, definition of silver distance in 2.2.1.a and as a consequence introduction of a new flight term "launch point" in 1.2.:

*It is proposed to change the wording from "a straight distance flight of at least 50 km from the release point" to "a straight distance flight to a way point that has a distance of at least 50 km to both the release point and the launch point".*

*This makes it necessary to add a definition of the launch point to section 1.2, proposed as follows: "LAUNCH POINT 1.2.13 The WAY POINT where the glider is positioned for launch, found as the last FIX prior to the glider attaining non-zero ground speed with the intention of getting airborne."*

---

<sup>4</sup> Vote was repeated at the end of Agenda item 8 due to incorrect presentation of the proposal the first instance.

Mr. Georgas, the chairman of the Sporting Code Committee, commented that the significance of the Silver Distance is that it is the first cross country achievement. Therefore, it should be simple. The Committee could not support the proposal due to its complexity and is of the opinion that would be a move in wrong direction. Mr. Spreckley from the UK proposed following amendment:

*“a straight distance flight of at least 50km to a way point that has a distance of at least 50km to the release point or a start point.”*

He added: We believe that the statement that the silver distance has become a flight of 2x25km has no foundation. The 50km flight is the first cross country qualification and has most relevant to the local club environment. The rule must be as simple as possible to allow local club instructors and observers the maximum flexibility to conduct the flight in a fashion that is appropriate to the club environment. Adoption of the amendment dispenses together with the requirement to define the “launch point” further complication of the sporting code.

Votes for the amendment: 12, against: 20, abstentions: 4

The amendment proposed by the UK was lost.

The discussion on the original proposal from Sweden continued. Mr. Stieber from Canada: The distance needs to be true 50km from the home field. Mr. Howard Mills from Germany: There are clubs where the silver distance is a problem. The proposal may force pilots to go flying somewhere else. Mr. Rutkowski: If there are such locations, the silver distance could be done on several attempts, not necessarily during the first flight.

Votes for: 26, against: 7, abstentions: 2

The proposal was adopted.

#### 8.1.3 Move of FR technical requirements from SC3 (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects IGC Internal Regulations paragraph 2.9, SC3 rules regarding Fix sampling rate, Required FR calibration time period and Additional HAFR requirements.

It is proposed:

*To replace the current 2-year process for changes of technical requirements for flight recorders in SC3 with the following process:*

- 1. Bureau or GFAC makes a request for a change in the rule. In the event that GFAC is requesting such a change, the Bureau must approve the request*
- 2. GFAC proposes the recommendation for the requirement change*
- 3. Sporting Code Committee drafts the new rule language*
- 4. IGC Bureau approves the rule change*
- 5. Rule change is adopted in the following publication of SC3 or upon recommendation of the Bureau, immediately, if there is a significant reason to safeguard the integrity of the rules.*

*This procedure will only apply to technical requirements for Flight Recorders (FRs), not procedures involving how pilots and OOs use FRs to document flights.*

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal and added that the technical requirements may change in time. Therefore, it is proposed to remove them from the normal approval process. The IGC Bureau and the experts could deal with them.

Votes for: 34, against: 1, abstentions: 1

The proposal was adopted.

#### 8.1.4 Control and use of multiple FRs (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects

The proposal is following:

*Current SC3 rules regarding the interpretation of flight evidence from multiple FRs for Badges and Records be replaced by the following set of rules:*

- 1. All FRs in the glider during the flight will be considered in documenting a soaring performance.*
- 2. If the pilot wishes that one or more FRs be excluded from consideration, they will make a declaration to the OO pre-flight, documenting the devices to be considered as controlled for the flight.*
- 3. If there is any ambiguity in the declaration as to which devices should be considered as controlled, all the devices in question will be considered as controlled.*
- 4. IGC files from all controlled devices in a flight must be submitted with a claim to a sporting performance. If the claim is for a Silver Badge or Gold Badge performance, the OO may choose to submit IGC files from the FRs they consider as adequate for the documentation of the claim, provided there is no reason to suspect that additional IGC files contain evidence that would invalidate the claim.*
- 5. Data from any of the controlled FR IGC files may be considered by the validating authority in examining whether the claim to the sporting performance is valid.*
- 6. For every IGC file submitted, the coordinates of the declared way points must either be the same as listed in other IGC files or may be blank. The names of way points are not taken into consideration. Should there be a mismatch of declared way points, any claim to a performance requiring the declaration of way points is invalid.*
- 7. Should there be a mismatch between elements of the declaration relating to the identity of the pilot, crew or glider associated with the performance, the OO can supply additional evidence as observed in their monitoring of the flight to clarify any ambiguity which might otherwise invalidate a flight claim.*
- 8. Where it is allowed for PRs to be used, all above rules applying to FRs with relevance to PRs will apply to these devices as well.*

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal and also the intentions behind it which are to make simple rules for the work of Official Observers. Furthermore, the proposal introduces the principle that the badges and the records should not be bureaucratic for pilots thus should be as simple as possible. Mr. Casado: Would it apply only to the badges and the records (not for the contests)? Mr. Georgas: Yes. Mr. Spreckley: There is a need to clarify whether the IGC approved FR is necessary. Mr. Georgas: The Sporting code is clear on that aspect. Mr. Bjørnevik: Do all flights from all loggers need to be delivered? Mr. Georgas: There are two paths, if it is the record, the FR declaration is needed, but that is not required for the badges.

Votes for: XX, against: YY, abstentions: ZZ (*exact vote numbers missed*)  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.1.5 Correct table of badge and record requirement errors (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects:

- In the table of Badge and Record Requirements, change “OK if declared as start/finish point” to “no” in the Release or MoP stop column.
- In the table of Badge and Record Requirements, change the “declared” column of the Max # of TPs to “0” from “3”

It is proposed:

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

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

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal and the discussion. Mr. Mills from Germany: The proposal is trying to solve errors and inconsistencies introduced by editing and conversions from the previous code and it should not be considered as the rule change itself but a summary of corrections. Mr. Sheppe from the USA proposed an amendment to delete part 2, which was not seconded by any delegate. Mr. Cubley: Can you explain why the proposal contains two parts, 1 and 2? Mr. Georgas: *input missed*. Mr. Fila from Sweden proposed to discuss parts 1 and 2 separately because it is not appropriate to discuss it together, which was subsequently seconded by other delegates.

Discussion continued on point 1. Mr. Mills from Germany: Original proposal is correcting errors. Now it looks completely different and it is change of its spirit. Mr. Cubley: Now the proposal is completely different and should be out of order.

Votes for the amendment as proposed by Sweden: 9, against: 23, abstentions: 3  
The amendment was lost.

Discussion continued on the original proposal. Mr. Fila: I understand, as is already indicated in the text, that the proposal is about editorial changes (changed table). Mr. Georgas: Yes, if one never looked in the table. It was there for a number of years, but there were consequences some unwanted consequences. Prof. Peter Ryder: The actual proposal is in part 2. Mr. Georgas: That is correct. Mr. Eriksen: A year 2 proposal should contain exact text of the code, I am confused. Mr. Georgas: That is right, apologies for that.

Votes for: 33, against: 2, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.1.6 Triangle distance geometry planning (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects Sporting Code 3, 3.1.8 - Changes ... "official distance" to "course distance".

It is proposed:

*To examine the validity of an FAI triangle flight performance based on the claimed 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. Georgas introduced the proposal.

Votes for: 34, against: 1, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.1.7 Elimination of waypoint codes (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects Sporting Code 3, 1.2.2 – to delete the last sentence of the waypoint definition.

It was proposed:

*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 lat-long coordinates of the position.*

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal and added that the aim is simplification and removal of unnecessary burden.

The discussion: Mr. Spreckley: The proposal does not make it simpler. The GNSS FRs use the way point list, I cannot see anything making it simple. Mr. Bjørnevik: In practice, it will be in the GNSS FR either way. Mr. Strachan, the chairman of the GFAC: You need to have a code there as it is required by the GNSS FR. Also, it needs to be a national list of way points for that year. Mr. Georgas: I do not think it is superfluous in principle. One thing that matters here is multiple FR etc., the typing errors should not make the performance invalid. It is a small procedural way to help in this. Mr. Cubley: This proposal removes the paper declaration. I cannot understand why we should do that. Mr. Georgas: There are some exceptional situations where this may not be the best solution, but in the vast majority of use cases it would be all right. We cannot address all details. Mr. Spreckley: Definition of the position is latitude/longitude, it is no dispute. When I am doing it I choose the turn point name not the coordinates, actually it is a burden. Mr. Georgas: Should the rules examine the numbers and names or, only the one (coordinates) is fine?

Votes for: 29, against: 5, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.1.8 World Soaring Cup (IGC Bureau)

The IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer introduced the proposal as follows:

1. *The WORLD SOARING CUP (WSC) is to be awarded annually to the IGC CHAMPION PILOT OF THE YEAR.*
2. *A Qualifying Competition is any FAI-sanctioned World Gliding Championship that becomes valid in a given calendar year. The IGC CHAMPION PILOT OF THE YEAR will be selected from the World Champions in all the classes in all Qualifying Competitions. The selection will be made after the date of the Closing Ceremony 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 World Soaring Cup Score (CS) is:  $CS = 100 \times FS / MPS$*
4. *Each calendar year, the World Champion with the highest WSC Score will be given the title of the IGC CHAMPION PILOT OF THE YEAR and awarded the WORLD SOARING CUP. Ties will result in Co-Champions.*
5. *The WORLD SOARING CUP will be awarded to the new IGC CHAMPION PILOT OF THE YEAR in January of the year following the performance resulting in the award of the WSC. The winner has the option of having the WSC shipped to him/her by FAI or receiving the WSC at the IGC Plenary meeting normally held in February/March.*
6. *The current IGC CHAMPION PILOT OF THE YEAR will surrender the WORLD SOARING CUP to the FAI Home Office in Lausanne on or before December 15 in the year he/she has held the WSC.*
7. *A historical record of the WORLD SOARING CUP will be kept in the FAI/IGC archives and every current and former IGC CHAMPION PILOT OF THE YEAR will be chronicled on the FAI/IGC website.*

The discussion. Mr. Guerin from France: I am still not convinced, I do not understand the intentions behind the proposal, missing formula etc. The team cup formulas may have



several effects, both positive and negative. Mr. Fila: The proposal makes sense, I have no problem with it. Why not to have a special pilot of the year?

Votes for: 30, against: 2, abstentions: 4  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.1.9 Combine Junior and Women WGC from 2021 (IGC Bureau)

The IGC President Mr. Mozer introduced the following proposal:  
*The IGC may also accept bids for a combined Junior and Women WGC in a single event starting from 2021. Such combined event will have two competition classes for each category, juniors and women.*

The discussion. Mrs. Kuijpers from the Netherlands: Every delegate should have received my email on this matter, which is also linked to a late proposal to be discussed later in the afternoon. The Netherlands is against, because of the negative feedback from the pilots at the junior and women WGCs. According to them it is not a good proposal. The atmosphere at those two championships is completely different. It is not a good idea to combine them. Mr. Cubley: Australia is completely against, the current bids could offer a rather small competitions at smaller sites. We struggle to find juniors, we have one junior woman in the team and she may need to choose which event to fly, if both are combined. Mr. Mozer: I would like to clarify that the proposal states “may” and not “shall”. Mr. Casado: Spain is totally against, these are two different types of championships. If combined, some little countries may not be able to organize these kind of WGCs. Mr. Motuza: These event are too different based on the recent experience, the preferences of participants are different. The proposal would also affect the side events, which address a different community. The team captains and coaches are different too. Each group requires a different treatment. Mr. Rutkowski: The only problem is the number of classes, it could be difficult to manage and also more costly. Mr. Georgas: The proposal is well intended because of containing “may” instead of “shall”. Anyway, it could be superseded, because of the number of other proposals trying to solve the issue. Mr. Eriksen: Based on experience, it would be also difficult to manage it as the organizer.

Votes for: 2, against: 30, abstentions: 4  
Proposal has been lost.

## 8.2 Year-1 Proposals

### 8.2.1 Calculation of speed points and distance points (USA)

The summary of the proposed new scoring system is:  
*The proposal is to give each pilot distance points or speed points, but not both. There are two steps:*

1. *Calculate each pilot's distance points and speed points as follows:*
2. *Give the pilot a score equal to his distance points or his speed points, whichever is greater.*

*We justify the choice of 750 for maximum speed points as follows:*

*In the current system, the boundary between speed points and distance points depends on the number of outlandings. This creates the undesirable effects on tactics and the nonsensical reverse incentives that were described in last year's proposal.*

*In addition to those undesirable effects, the doubling of the slope of the points/performance curve on a good day (from 10 points per percent of the winner's speed to 20 points per*

percent) creates a doubling of point spreads that has no effect on the placings. The pilots would be ranked the same if the points/performance curve had a constant slope from the bottom to the top of the scoresheet. In effect, finishers receive 666 distance points and share 333 speed points. On days with outlandings, the number of distance points can be much higher than 666.

Thus, in the current system, if we ignore the artificial doubling of speed points, pilots get something between 666 and 1000 "effective distance points," depending on the difficulty of the day.

So, in a system that uses a points-performance curve of constant slope, a maximum value of 750 distance points is not out of line with the current system.

Mr. Sheppe from USA introduced the proposal and its objectives: Reduce late start, Reduce gagging, Increase reward for finishing every day, Encourage bold tactics and, Remove strange incentives. Then he explained and visually presented the consequences that proposal would have on the scores.

The discussion. Mr. Georgas: I am curious if we do not want luck factor in our competitions. The luck is linked to taking sporting risk, adapting to evolution of situation. Mr. Mogens Hansen from Denmark: I am not in favor of what has been just said by Greece. We have seen in history that there was only one finisher who in the end won the whole contest. (To originator) Please consider point differences (point spread) in the Year-2 proposal. Mr. Sheppe: The point spread is double in the current rule compared to the proposal. Mr. Georgas: We have had discussion on this last year. We should discuss the principles Instead of a detailed discussion (Year-1 proposal). We can rewrite it, the calculation is very complex. (To originator) Have you considered testing a similar system to the SGP system? Do you have such an example so the delegates could compare? Mr. Sheppe: Unfortunately, not. Mr. Eriksen: I respect the proposal, but I am not comfortable with it. Furthermore, the preparation of Year-2 proposal should not be dealt by the country initially proposing it, but by the Annex A Committee. Mr. Sheppe: The Annex A Committee will have an official opinion on this next year. Mr. Casado: I request to present the simulation for the last 10-20 years, because the devil is in the details. Otherwise, we may have unexpected problems in the future. Mr. Mozer: I welcome everybody to engage in this discussion, including simulation. Mr. Kristian Roine from Finland: There is a simulation software available as mentioned in the minutes of the IGC Plenary meeting 2017, item 8.2.2 (<http://apps.nil.fi/new-scoring/>).

Votes for: 36, against: 0, abstentions: 0

Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.2.2 Remove cylinder OZ deduction (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects the Sporting Code 3, paragraph 1.3.6.

It is proposed:

*To remove the deduction of 1km from the official distance of a performance for every cylinder observation zone claimed.*

Mr. Georgas introduced the proposal and mentioned that it had created a number of debates both last year and within the Sporting Code Committee. He added: When you declare the performance, the FAI sector is decided once you have made the flight. The avionics cannot tell you the distance until the flight is completed. Question is: Is the cylinder an advantage of the sector? E.g. energy line beyond the TP may be in favor of the sector. Mr. Fila: Sweden is very much in favor of the proposal. Many pilots were disappointed of not completing the task

because they were scored e.g. 749,7km instead of 750 km due to small technical errors. Mr. Casado: I strongly support the proposal, because I had to reject the national records claims on two occasions. Mr. Mills from Germany: The current rule is well understood, one should not plan the exact distances. The answer is simple, the flight was not achieved. Also, it is about records, not contests. The German sporting committee suggested classic zones instead of cylinder. For the time I do not support this. Mr. Cubley: I have no sympathy to those planning wrongly, I agree with Mr. Mills and I would rather delete the cylinder. The proposal is not supported by Australia. Mr. Georgas: The motivation is to make the rules simpler. Mr. Stieber: Canada is opposed, there are many records done using the sectors and if someone flies the record he/she should be up to date with the rules. Mr. Casado: The problem is that onboard equipment is telling the pilots the flight is all right, but the post flight analysis shows that it is not. And then we (official observers) are the bad guys. Mr. Georgas: There is only one specific case of 100km triangle, which needs to be addressed. Mr. Spreckley: If the intention is to simplify rules, how does having as separate rule for 100km triangle is making it simpler? Mr. Leinikki from FAI: I cannot remember any record claim using the cylinders (all international records are handled by the FAI office). Mr. Mills: I second what Mr. Leinikki just said, but when using the cylinders we do not have the reduction. Mr. Georgas: If the IGC Plenary wants, we (The Sporting Committee) may have a look at it when preparing the Year-2 proposal. Mr. Reich on behalf of Germany: The intention is that the records could be flown also during competitions. Mr. Foltin from Slovakia: The issue seems to be more about the flights for diplomas than about the records at contests.

Votes for: 22, against: 13, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been adopted.

### 8.2.3 Eliminate landing certificate (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects the Sporting Code 3, paragraphs 4.4.2e and 2.5.3b.

Mr. Georgas introduced the following proposal:

*That the current requirement for a landing certificate be removed from the rules.*

Votes for: 36, against: 0, abstentions: 0  
Proposal has been adopted.

### 8.2.4 Simplify declared 3TP performance task (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects the Sporting Code 3, paragraph 1.4.2f and Table of Badge and Record Requirements.

It is proposed:

*To simplify the definitions of the declared 3TP performance by making the following changes:*

- 1. The turn points must be claimed in the order declared*
- 2. If a Sector OZ is claimed, its orientation is defined by the way points as defined in the declaration and not by any fix selected post-flight as the finish point*
- 3. If the task is finished by selecting a fix post-flight, the distance claimed for this last leg should be calculated relevant to the declared leg applicable, rather than as the distance from the last claimed way point to the finish fix. The exact method of calculation of the distance might be one of the following (to be determined for year-two):*
  - a. The distance of the applicable leg, minus the distance of the finish fix to the declared distance (as in Annex A)*

- b. The projection of the fix to the leg applicable, as declared*
- c. As in b, but with a maximum distance not exceeding the applicable leg, as declared*
- 4. If a task is started from release, instead of from the declared start, the same formulation as in (3) is applied for the first leg.*

The proposal was introduced by Mr. Georgas.

The discussion. Mr. Roine from Finland: The advantage of current situation is that it allows tasks not optimal for the weather but allows achieving of the record instead of a declared task. This is about how to set the task for the record and that is incredibly difficult. Mr. Georgas: I agree with everything said. The first point is what we want from the declared tasks. Depending on the answer we will know how to make it happen. The second point is the complexity of the task. Mr. Cubley: This approach looks like “call it a declared task” where there is actually no need to fly what was declared. Mr. Guerin: How it affects the free flights? Mr. Georgas: The current rules already allow free tasks, but this aspect will be considered when developing a Year-2 proposal.

Votes for: 31, against: 2, abstentions: 3  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.2.5 Eliminate straight distance performance (SC3 Committee)

The proposal affects the Sporting Code 3, paragraph 1.4.2d and Table of Badge and Record Requirements.

It is proposed:

*That the straight distance performance type be eliminated.*

The proposal was introduced by Mr. Georgas who added: It is a record category that was cancelled years ago. The distance records are now ruled separately.

Votes for: 31, against: 4, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.2.6 Change of definition of FAI 13,5 meter class (Lithuania)

The proposal affects the Sporting Code 3, Annex A, paragraph 4.2.1 part f.

*Note: The proposal if adopted as Year-2 would not affect the class definition as in the Sporting Code 3*

The proposal is following:

*With the intention of giving more sport interest, space for innovations and safety to the class, we propose the following definition of the FAI 13.5 m Class:*

- *Wingspan of 13.5 m;*
- *MTOW 350 kg.*

The proposal has been introduced by Mr. Motuza. He said: It is a very simple proposal. The small gliders nowadays in reality can fly very fast average cross country speeds. There is a necessity of changes, especially to accommodate the engines and to allow for a possibility for all pilots to fly them. Therefore, there is a need to increase the maximum mass. The proposal is based on the opinion on pilots flying in the 13.5 meter class. It would also help development of this class. Dr. Rolf Radespiel, the OSTIV President: The last year the IGC was calling for minimum safety standards for these gliders (ref.: Participating sailplanes must

comply with basic requirements to ensure safety and fairness of the competition). This proposal does not address this objective. OSTIV suggestion from the technical point of view is to add a slightly amended sentence i.e. "Participating sailplanes have to fulfill the minimum safety requirements". Mr. Motuza: Yes, that is acceptable (by Lithuania). Voldemars Gavars from Latvia: I have started flying 13.5 meter miniLAK only last year. Before I have checked what is on the market, I have had a look at Silent. Unfortunately, the miniLAK is the only really available project. I am not lobbying for miniLAK or Blanik or Jantar or Ventus B, I have flown with all of them. I am lobbying for 13.5 meter class because now there is an opportunity to develop this class. Pilots who flew this class signed the proposal. Mr. Spreckley: The last couple of years a great time was spent on the wing loading limit in this class, in particular. Also, bearing in mind a result of accident in Vitacura, I believe the wing loading is a factor of safety. Therefore I prefer wing loading limit than the mass limit. Mr. Vidal: I am still lost in this class. It was created as a heritage of world class with the objective to bring more pilots to the gliding. We see the same pilots as in other classes and the gliders available are not inexpensive anymore. We are missing the main goal here. Mr. Guerin: Not sure if the 350 kg would reach a very high wing loading. Also, cannot see how it could be more dangerous than the current situation. Mr. Motuza: Please have a look at what pilots have signed. They are asking for 350kg MTOM. The GP14 has the smallest area and the wing loading 50kg/m<sup>2</sup> which is like LS8. Mr. Foltin from Slovakia: The certification specifications typically use MTOM limit and not the maximum wing loading limits. The minimum safety requirements sentence as suggested by OSTIV and already accepted by the originator (Lithuania) are already included in the discussed proposal. Mr. Rutkowski: The wing loading could be issue in the mountains and in such a case it could be addressed through local procedures. Mr. Spreckley: It is not issue of the current gliders but the future ones. Do we encourage it? Mr. Foltin from Slovakia: Regarding the design of future gliders, we have to accept that "we do not know what we do not know".

The amended proposal:

*With the intention of giving more sport interest, space for innovations and safety to the class, we propose the following definition of the FAI 13.5 m Class:*

- Wingspan of 13.5 m;
- MTOW 350 kg.

*Participating sailplanes must comply with basic requirements to ensure safety and fairness of the competition.*

Votes for amended proposal: 26, against: 5, abstentions: 5  
Proposal has been adopted with amendment.

#### 8.2.7 Delete communication of start times (Spain)

The proposal affects the Sporting Code 3, Annex A, paragraph 7.4.1.

Mr. Casado introduced the following proposal:

*To delete completely ANNEX-A paragraph 7.4.7 Communication of Start Times if real time tracking is provided.*

The discussion. Mr. Sheppe: I like the proposal very much. Mr. Fila: The requirement was introduced as a means for media interaction, but it did not materialize. Mrs. Kuijpers: We brought the requirement back during the IGC Plenary meeting in Papendal. The Netherlands can agree with the proposal, but organizers should have a live tracking capability if there will be no communication of start times. Mr. Casado: This amendment is accepted by Spain (originator). There was not further discussion on the amended proposal.



Votes for amended proposal: 32, against: 0, abstentions: 4  
Proposal has been adopted with amendment.

#### 8.2.8 Scoring programs (Spain)

Mr. Casado introduced the following proposal:

*In order to improve the transparency on the scoring process, to mandate to the scoring program to print the checksum (aka message digest 5 – MD5) of the key elements of the computing process (Handicap list, configuration data, program itself, scoring script if exists, etc., ...).*

*Those MD5 values will be printed along with the results of the day, so any change can be detected by the jury, stewards, CD or team captains comparing with the values of the previous days.*

*If any change on the MD5 values from previous days needs to be explained to everyone.*

He added: The proposal is supported by Scoring Software Working Group. Scorers sometime change formula in the Software even without informing the competition director. Therefore, there is a need to have electronic signature and visibility of such changes to all. The software suppliers SeeYou and StrePla support the proposal too. Mr. Georgas: I support the intention. However, it should be included in Annex A because we do not have an official software program for the championships. Therefore, the requirement should be part of our rules, Annex A or other. Mr. Casado: Annex A requires publishing of results with the signature. Mr. Fila: This is about making sure that the software was not interfered and that could have an impact on any program used. The requirement should not be software specific and should be technology neutral. Mr. Casado: I totally agree. Mr. Leinikki from FAI: I understand the problem, but I fail to understand how the proposal solves the problem. Mr. Sheppe: The proposal is not suggesting addressing a dishonest motivation of scorers.

Votes for proposal: 34, against: 0, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.2.9 Annex A starting procedure (France)

Mr. Guerin introduced the following proposal:

*7.4.5.b. A pre-start altitude (MSL) limit must be imposed and shall be specified at the briefing. After the start gate is opened and before making a valid start, the pilot must ensure at least one fix below the specified pre-start altitude limit. Failure to do so will be penalized.*

He then described the situations at the WGC in Benalla when pilots launched late were actually disadvantaged because they were unable to gain the same height as the other pilots who took off much earlier. The issue is visible in particular when the launching takes longer. Mrs. Vigorito: I suggest using 'shall' instead of 'must'. Mr. Guerin: I agree. Mr. Eriksen: The proposal will not solve the problem; the CD may set the pre-start altitude so high that it would be useless. Mr. Guerin: There is an example of computation of the pre-start altitude, which aims at all pilots having the same period of time to reach maximum altitude. Mr. Fila: What about unsafe diving to record just 1 fix below the announced altitude? We may run into other problems. Mr. Guerin: There are plenty of days when the pre-start altitude does not need to be set, but sometimes there are situations which would require it. Mr. Casado: What would happen if the CD decides not to apply it or not to penalize it? Mr. Guerin: There will not be a valid start similarly like starting before the start line is open. Mr. Casado: I did not mean that, but a situation when the CD decides not to set the pre-start altitude at all. Mr.



Cubley: There is a rule in Annex A and it was used successfully. It is not for the start, but it requires a point below a defined altitude any time before the actual start of the pilot. Normally the altitude should be slightly above what is altitude of the clouds. Mrs. Kuijpers: I agree, it is useful rule especially in case of the wave conditions. It often happens that organizers do not set the limit and then some pilots may have an advantage. The Netherlands supports the proposal. Mr. Eriksen: No rule will compensate a bad Competition Director. There is also a possibility to delay the start line. We may overcomplicate the rule. Why to penalize severely for a few meters higher? Mr. Guerin: I agree, but some Competition Directors do not use this tool. Mr. Spreckley: I have the same concern Mr. Eriksen. We should rely on the stewards to look after it. Mr. Rutkowski: I second what Mr. Spreckley just said. We should wait positives and negatives before introducing it. It may create a higher workload for pilots therefore, there must be a good reason to introduce it. It should not be mandatory. Mr. Antti Koskiniemi from Finland: The argument presented is for unexpected weather, but the briefings could be several hours before the launches. Mr. Vidal: If it would be mandatory, the Competition Director may decide to set it very high thus making it ineffective. Mr. Guerin: The same applies in case of a late start line opening. It just prevents a few cases that happened.

Votes for proposal: 17, against: 17, abstentions: 1  
Proposal has been lost.

#### 8.2.10 IGC rules (incl. penalties) for proper visibility of all gliders of the Championship (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the following proposal:  
*IGC is asked to define rules (incl. penalties) to arrange proper visibility of all gliders of the championship. Noncompliance must be penalized.*

The discussion. Mr. Casado: The solution is going towards trackers. Mr. Geissler: The organizers may not have the right expertise. Mr. Sheppe of behalf of Annex A Committee: The presentation states that the proposal affects The LPs only but elsewhere it is mentioned that it will be reflected in Annex A, could you please clarify it? Mr. Geissler: A better solution should be applicable. Mr. Sheppe from USA: OGN does not exist per se, it would need to be in place before this proposal could be agreed.

Votes for proposal: 27, against: 6, abstentions: 2  
Proposal has been adopted.

Mr. Casado proposed to help to draft a Year-2 proposal, which was gladly accepted by Mr. Geissler.

#### 8.2.11 Re-establish the basic purpose of FLARM and define different and/or additional trackers for OGN tracking (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal as follows:  
*IGC is asked to re-establish the basic purpose of FLARM and define different and/or additional trackers for OGN tracking.*

The discussion. Mr. Fila: While I understand the reason why this is proposed, I cannot see the physics. How can you forbid someone to have own receivers? Mr. Geissler: We see the way through the use of small OGN trackers which could be located away of pilots reach. Mr. Georgas: I like the aim of this proposal, but I have concerns to establish what a basic

purpose of FLARM means. Would Germany consider rewording to delete a reference to FLARM? Mr. Casado: The rationale behind is understood, but I am afraid we could not do anything about it. The solution is a tracker linked with the scoring. Then no one will be able to switch it off. Mr. Sheppe from USA: It is not about FLARM, but about the tracking. Mr. Vidal: I like to see the Year-2 proposal but I realize the issue is a bit tricky. Mr. Cubley: I agree with separating tracking/recording from the safety warning. Mrs. Vigorito: I suggest concentrating on the tracking side of the proposal.

Votes for proposal: 33, against: 2, abstentions: 0  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.2.12 External aid to competitors as part of the rules (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the following proposal:  
*External aid to competitors should become part of the rules.*

The discussion. Mr. Georgas: We should aim sport of for individual pilots. Mr. Cubley: The team captains are part of the team, we should specify the source of information. Mr. Guerin: The proposal is hypocrisy, because all pilots have phones with live OGN information already now. Mr. Motuza: I agree with Australia, the external aid should be defined. The information from the team captain it is not external help. Prof. Peter Ryder: There is a need to distinguish between information available to all teams and information available only to some teams/pilots. Mr. Vidal: The sporting code refers to individual performance of pilot not combination of the team support and pilots skills. Mrs. Kuijpers: It is very difficult to define external help, it is really uncontrollable. We should accept it.

Votes for proposal: 27, against: 3, abstentions: 4  
Proposal has been adopted.

#### 8.2.13 Allow instruments for cloud flying in the cockpit (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal and added that the cloud flying will be still forbidden.

The proposal:  
*To allow instruments for cloud flying in the cockpit.*

The discussion. Mr. Casado: Spain supports the proposal, but the use of such instruments has to be recorded in the IGC file. Mr. Roine: You cannot remove the instruments anymore, because of the integration with gliding computers. Also the switching on/off is recorded in the IGC file. Many do not remove such instruments even if standalone because it is difficult. I personally installed an app for testing and it did not work on my phone, but I have not tried other phones. It is quite easy to fly with artificial horizon, if allowed there won't be any way to control its use. Mr. Spreckley: I appreciate the principle in this proposal, but it would send completely wrong signal to the pilots. All modern instruments could be switched off. By allowing them we may encourage flying in the clouds. Mr. Guerin: I concur with Finland, the existing devices do not work properly. May be the GFAC should be tasked to look at it. Mr. Cubley: I agree with the UK and France.

Votes for proposal: 5, against: 31, abstentions: 0  
Proposal has been adopted.

### 8.3 Other Proposals

### 8.3.1 E-Concept gliding competition (IGC Bureau)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal by explained its background and objectives for creation of the working group, which were to develop a competition to deregulated machines and for gliders with electric Mean Of Propulsion (MOP). He also provided statistics of participation at the last two WGC (12 pilots in 2012, 14 in 2017). The issues are: Maintaining the current wing loading limit, there will be no development of new higher performance gliders and not enough gliders for a WGC. Removing the current wing loading limit would cause that the Microlight gliders will not be competitive and no contest would encourage development of Microlight gliders. The emphasized that the proposal affects only the WGC in 2019 and that the review of project and plan for future events will be presented at 2020 Plenum.

The following proposal was presented:

1. *The 13.5m class should no longer be included in the IGC calendar for WGC events. If point 1 is approved the IGC Plenary will vote on the following two points (2 and 3).*
2. *The 2019 13.5 WGC currently on the calendar for Pavullo, ITA is proposed to be renamed to the 1st FAI E-Concept World Gliding Championships. It is proposed that the 1st FAI E-Concept Gliding Championship will be hold at the same time as the FAI World 13.5-meter WGC 2019 in Pavullo, ITA.*
3. *Participation in this 2019 WGC will be in two groups.*
  - a. *E-Light Class (Electron)*
    - i. *a 35kg W/L limit,*
    - ii. *Electric Means of Propulsion (MOP)*
    - iii. *Self-launching capability required.*
  - b. *E-Racing Class with*
    - i. *Span of 15m or less,*
    - ii. *no wing loading limit,*
    - iii. *the current 15m class weight limit*
    - iv. *Electric Means of Propulsion (MOP).*

*It is not yet clear how gliders using electric MOP will develop so the 2019 contest should be open to all current machines with a span of 15m or less. To fairly accommodate current 13.5m gliders in competition with 15m span gliders the 2019 contest would have a span factor applied in the E-racing group.*

*Following the experience of the 2019 event the IGC will consider the future structure and rules of the event.*

Then Mr. Spreckley concluded that maintaining the 13.5m span limit would cause that there will not be enough gliders for WGC and it would also restrict development of 15m electric powered gliders. Finally, he explained the way how the proposal will be tabled. Following that the proposal was split in three separate parts, which were discussed and voted separately.

The discussion on point 1. Mr. Sheppe: USA is completely in favor of E-class, but IGC cannot to remove the class in less than 2 years, because it would be illegal according to the Sporting Code. Mr. Geissler: Germany proposes the following amendment:

- a. E-light class
    - i. instead "a 35kg W/L Limit" ==> 40kg W/L Limit (can also be 38 if that incorporates the additional mass of motor and battery.)
- He added that the limit for 35 kg W/L originates from World class glider PW5. By adding electric Motor and Batteries for electric self-launching the possible W/L must be increased to a reasonably higher number.

The amendment was seconded. Mr. Spreckley: The proposal is not relevant to point 1. being discussed now. Mr. Geissler: The comment is accepted (amendment by Germany was withdrawn). Mr. Voldemars Gavars from Latvia: The approved meeting agenda should not be changed in that way. The IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer clarified the way how the proposals could be handled during the IGC Plenary. Mr. Fila from Sweden propose amendment: to add "after 2019" at the end of sentence, which was seconded. Mrs. Kuijpers: I am not clear about the consequences. Mr. Spreckley: There is no change of the class definition in the sporting code. Mr. Motuza: I am not clear what are we discussing and also the Latvian delegate is confused. Mr. Sheppe: I am happy to vote for if we call it a Year-1 proposal. Mr. Fila: Now we discuss it as a Year-1. Mr. Georgas: I have a question. Year-1 and Year-2 process is related to changes of the Sporting Code. The Championship Calendar is not in the Sporting Code. Is the Year-1/Year-2 process applicable? Mr. Sheppe on behalf of Annex A Committee: Yes, the calendar is not in Annex A. therefore the process is not applicable. Mr. Spreckley: This is not the change of the rule. The consequences are: If we vote 13.5m class championships out of the calendar, we can bring it back anytime in the future. If 13.5 m class will not be there, there is also back up proposal by the Bureau.

Vote on the part 1 of the proposal to be amended as proposed by Sweden:  
Votes for the discussion about the amendment: 22 against: 7, abstentions: 6

Point one has been amended as follows:

1. *The 13.5m class should no longer be included in the IGC calendar for WGC events after 2019.*

Discussion on point 1 as amended. Mr. Gavars from Latvia: I appeal on the IGC to reflect the later Lithuanian proposal. We have accepted/created this class, but the new "child" does not fit in existing limitations. Now, when gliders are modern, affordable and show the direction of development the IGC wants to stop the development and move the glider out from the scene. It is hard to understand why to change a good existing product to the concept which is not clear. Mr. Motuza: It is a nice name of the working group - 13.5meter class promotional group. In fact it is class killing group, which proposed to kill the class. We have nothing against the E-concept, but we need to separate it from the removal of the class. Main message is: What is our face as the IGC or the Bureau like the partner for business? Yesterday we have discussed a possibility to sell the SGP competition to partners. How will the partners see us? After 4 years we are trying to move to a rule that is only for one plane, which is Silent 2. Pilots can have money to buy a sport machine now and we are cancelling the class? Consequence could be that IGC is not seen as a good partner. Mr. Cubley: Is this definite deletion of the 13.5m class? Mr. Spreckley: This is not in any way to stop these gliders to fly competitions. We are creating a new home for these gliders. We need to change now. If we do not do something now, we will not have 13.5 meter WGC in 2019. We are trying to find right way forward for this class. Mr. Guerin: Are the figures presented by Mr. Spreckley (12-14 pilots at WGC) considered as unsatisfactory? Mr. Spreckley: That was not said. Mr. Guerin: Do we define future class with an existing (15 meter) class? I am quite surprised to see the proposal. I am not sure we could shake these guys every year. Some people were putting a lot of money into a new glider and were relying on the IGC to keep the rules stable. Mr. Fila: There is another proposal 8.2.6, about 13.5 meter class. Now we are discussing its discontinuation. I am not sure that is the right way forward. Mr. Spreckley: The reason for the change of order was to not to discuss the thing that could be unnecessary. Mr. Rutkowski: The class was setup two years ago and now we have a proposal to cancel it. It is simply too early. We do not need to cancel the class to establish the E-concept. It should be vice versa. We could incorporate or merge 13.5m with E-concept later. I do not agree

with the outcome of our job. We should clearly indicate that the E-concept is clearly for 13.5 meter class.

Vote on the part 1 of the proposal as amended by Sweden:

Votes for the amended proposal: 14 against: 19, abstentions: 3

The amended proposal was lost.

The whole proposal (parts 1, 2 and 3) was modified as follows:

*It is proposed that the 1st FAI E-Concept Gliding Championship will be held at the same time as the FAI World 13.5-meter WGC 2019 in Pavullo, ITA.*

The remaining text was deleted.

Discussion on the amended proposal. Mr. Guerin: I request clarity on order of the proposal. Mrs. Kuijpers: Deleting of point 3 does not mean that we could not organize it like initially proposed? Mr. Spreckley: E-Concept will be completely inclusive event. Mr. Rutkowski: We need to think about a completely separate event to be able to test it properly. Ms. Nina Shalneva from Russia: What will be the name of competition? Can we establish any name? MR. Spreckley: IGC has the power to name it. Mr. Guerin: We have tried to reduce the number of classes and now are proposing a new event. We are running out of people. Mrs. Kuijpers: I was hesitated before, but the Netherlands never liked the 13.5 meter class because it is just another class with the same kind of competition. The E-concept is something really new, we can use it for promotions. It is green, it is in addition to what we have. I appeal on the IGC Plenary to support the E concept. We really need it and we also need a place for Microlight gliders and that we can do well within the E-concept. Mr. Fila: I would like to reemphasize what the Netherland just said. It is not just another contest, but new exciting rules for this concept, with which our sport may further evolve.

Votes for the amended proposal: 31, against: 3, abstentions: 2

The amended proposal was adopted.

A follow up discussion on point 3. Mr. Reich on behalf of Germany: The initial presentation contained a wrong glider availability numbers, at least for one manufacturer. Mr. Geissler: We should support the evolution as it was in the case of 18m class.

### 8.3.1a E-Concept draft rules (IGC Bureau)

Mr. Spreckley introduced the new rules and outlined the main points and principles of these rules as follows:

1. *These rules are an initial draft to be used in the 2019 FAI E-concept Championships.*
2. *The rules are based on the FAI Sailplane Grand prix rules*
3. *These rules apply to all classes of E-concept competitions.*
4. *Modification and amendments to these rules will be approved by the IGC bureau*
5. *Scoring is based on a total elapsed time system. (similar to the Tour de France)*
6. *To accommodate day devaluation issues no pilot will receive more than 1.2 x the elapsed time of the competitor immediately faster than them.*
7. *All outlanding pilots will receive 1.2 x the slowest finishers time.*
8. *Requirements for energy measurement will be published in the event Local procedures.*

The discussion. Mr. Georgas: What is the rule for using electric engine during the flight? Mr. Spreckley: There is no such a rule, it is about kW used (energy) for that part of powered flight. Mr. Gavars from Latvia: What is the working group membership? May be it would be good create a new group for the E-concept. The IGC President Mr. Mozer: The bureau will



consider this constructive proposal. Membership will be sent by the IGC secretary Mr. Foltin. Mr. Geissler: Regarding point 2, the gliders should not be on a heavy end of the spectrum, but rather lighter ones. Mr. Mozer: It is a very good point, the working group will take it into consideration. Mr. Fila: The rules would need to address *input missed*. Mr. Rutkowski: A new procedures could be tricky for organizers. It is also linked to definition of wing loading limit and problems with measuring it. We should be careful with inducing a limit for such a new class to the working group. However, we should be mindful about. Poland is in favor of the future evolution of this class.

Votes for the proposal: 34, against: 1, abstentions: 1  
The proposal was adopted.

### 8.3.2 Integration of 13.5 meter class WGC from 2022 (IGC Bureau)

The proposal has been introduced by Mr. Eric Mozer, the IGC President on behalf of the Bureau:

It is proposed to:

*Combine 13.5-meter, club, and standard, 15 meter classes into one WGC event with maximum 6 entries per NAC with a limit of 2 entries per class.*

The Discussion. Mr. Motuza: This would eventually limit the number of pilots in these classes. Mr. Foltin: The proposal allows the teams to decide which class to support. Mr. Geissler: There will be two classes in 2019, Germany would prefer to link the E-concept with the 13.5m championships. Mr. Cubley: We want to encourage the E-concept, maybe it is a bit early for that. Mr. Georgas: The 13.5 meter class may develop into something entirely different than the conventional WGC. Mr. Rutkowski: The combination of the WGC in 13.5 meter class and the E-concept would be a good idea, but it would not give the pilots a chance to decide which championships to fly, if they have flown both previously. Furthermore, it also reduces chances of the E-concept to attract more pilots.

Votes for the proposal: 18, against: 12, abstentions: 6  
The proposal was lost.

### 8.3.3 WGC calendar (IGC Bureau)

*The proposal was tabled after the proposal in the agenda item 8.3.4.*

On behalf of the IGC Bureau, the IGC President Mr. Mozer introduced following proposal:

*To continue the World Gliding Championships (WGC) calendar, starting from 2022, as follows*

- *WGCs shall be held in the Club, Standard, 15-meter classes and Women (WWGC) in even years.*
- *WGCs shall be in the 18-meter, 20-meter multi-seat and Open classes and Juniors (JWGC) in odd years*

The discussion. Mrs. Kuijpers from the Netherlands proposed the following amendments:

*To continue the World Gliding Championships (WGC) calendar, starting from 2022, as follows:*

- *WGCs for Women (WWGC) and WGCs shall be held in the Club, Standard, 15-meter classes shall be held in even years*
- *WGCs for Juniors (JWGC) and WGCs shall be in the 18-meter, 20-meter multi-seat and Open classes shall be held in odd years*
- ~~*WGCs for Women (WWGC) and Juniors (JWGC) shall be in odd years*~~

Votes for the amendment: 31, against: 1, abstentions: 2  
The amendment was accepted.

The discussion on the amended proposal. Ms. Nina Shalneva from Russia: The effect of the proposal is that e.g. women may not be able to compete at another WGC because Women WGC are in the same year. Mr. Rutkowski: Will the proposal be directly applicable i.e there will be Women WGC both in 2021 and 2022? Mr. Mozer: Yes, correct. Mr. Eriksen: If the Women WGC will be two years in a row I would prefer the Junior WGC two years in a row. Mrs. Kuijpers (in response to Russia): Indeed it is in the same year, but the competitions will not be at the same time. Mr. Georgas: The Women champions from the previous Women WGC will be invited. Mr. Motuza: That is not fully correct, because the woman champion will prefer most likely to fly Woman WGC than other (non-restricted) WGC.

Votes for the amended proposal: 31, against: 4, abstentions: 1  
The proposal was adopted with amendment.

#### 8.3.4 Future WGC schedule (UK)

*The proposal was tabled and discussed before proposal under the agenda item 8.3.3.*

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal as follows:

*The period between WGC and CGC events be changed from a 2-year cycle to a 3-year cycle.*

The discussion. Mrs. Kuijpers from the Netherlands: I have sent (by email) the amendment to the WGC calendar proposals, which suggests to keep the WGC in two year cycles. Mr. Georgas: The change from a 3 year cycle (the UK proposal) to a 2 year cycle (the amendment by the Netherland) is a fundamental change. It would be wrong to amend this proposal before the other proposal is discussed. The IGC president Mr. Mozer explained that the bureau decided on the sequence of proposals. Mr. Cubley: The amendment from a three to a two year cycle goes against the original proposal from the UK. Mr. Mozer: The correct way forward is to defeat the amendment. The amendment by the Netherland has been withdrawn.

(The discussion continued on the original proposal by the UK) Mr. Motuza: I am always confused, especially this year. On the first day we discuss how our sport is changing like the discussion on the OGN an how to promote our sport and at the same time we try to reduce our visibility like in this proposal. Lithuania has never fielded a full team to all championships, but had it as a possibility. Accepting this proposal would not be possible for us. Mr. Georgas: It is a great proposal, the problem is that there are the WGC with all those different classes. Our direction is diluted. With this proposal adopted we will have a WGC during the first year, another WGC in the second year and we will have again two WGCs in the third year. This proposal also allows for EGC. It is a great way forward. Mr. Cubley: I see it in combination with the Junior and Women WGC. It is very much anti junior and woman. Mr. Spreckley: There is no issue with amendments, the real focus is on a big cycle. But the proposal actually impacts the Junior WGC in 2022, it reduces opportunity. Mr. Rutkowski: I can see the idea behind it but the WGCs will be imbalanced throughout the three years. Three years is a bad idea. Mr. Stieber: Canada would support it if 15m and 18m classes will be separated. Mr. Motuza: The problem of our community is that the number of pilots goes down. If young pilots start early, they disappear, but eventually return later after being well settled. The IGC should have a target for as many juniors and as much as competitions. It will result in newer member in the clubs which is the best promotion. Especially the Juniors WGC should be every 2 years. Mr. Spreckley: I would like to remind the delegates of the

original proposal which was in response to the costs of frequent championships, lack of officials, low number of bids, exposure of world champions, need to focus. Regarding the juniors, a good idea would be to bring back the Junior EGC. Mr. Vytautas Sabeckis from Lithuania: In the end it will be the same pilots at the different championships, some of them are professionals. The good pilots may fly in many classes, which mean there are less faces in total.

Votes for the proposal: 12, against: 21, abstentions: 2  
The proposal was lost.

8.3.5 Task GFAC to improve the requirements to properly identify any part load power as well as for part load electric driven machines (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal as follows:

*To task GFAC to improve the requirements to properly identify any part load power as well as for part load electric driven machines.*

The discussion. Mr. Strachan, the GFAC chairman presented the GFAC work on the issue. The recent GFAC tests were successful. Mr. Georgas: We need to address this issue. Mr. Geissler: The aim was to bring the issue to GFAC attention. Mr. Cubley (to Mr. Strachan): They were able to check engine records (readings) in Benalla and it was successful. Mr. Strachan: We talk here about the IGC file, which is an independent method. Mr. Reich: To know the time of engine run would be very useful. Mr. Strachan: It does not give that information. Mr. Fila: There is a requirement to check ENL recording. We should demand to run engine at different RPM to get the traces.

The proposal was withdrawn.

#### 8.4 Late proposals

*Note: The quorum has changed, for more details see item 1.2.*

##### 8.2.14 Participation of reigning Champions at FAI WGC 2018 (Germany)

Mr. Geissler asked the IGC Plenary to discuss this late proposal.

Votes for acceptance of the late proposal for discussion: 7, against: 14, abstentions: 10  
The proposal was not accepted for discussion.

Late proposal - Withdrawal of the current version of Annex H (Finland)

Mr. Kristian Roine asked the IGC Plenary to discuss this late proposal and proposed to process it in two separate parts.

Votes for acceptance of the first part of late proposal for discussion: 23, against: 6, abstentions: 2

The first part of the late proposal was accepted for discussion as follows:

*1. We propose that current Sporting Code 3, Annex H (15 Jan, 2018) is withdrawn immediately and replaced by Annex H (11 May, 2017).*

Discussion on the first part of the late proposal. Mrs. Vigorito: It is not correct to introduce the proposals at such a late stage. The delegates could not discuss it within the NAC. Mr.

Motuz: The club class is the biggest success for the IGC, but it is also very sensitive to the handicaps.

Votes for the first part of the late proposal: 12, against: 19, abstentions: 4  
The first part of the late proposal was lost.

Votes for acceptance of the second part of late proposal for discussion: 26, against: 2, abstentions: 3

The second part of the late proposal was accepted for discussion as follows:

*2. We propose that in the future IGC Plenary votes for Annex H annually, and it is published only after approval by Plenary.*

The second part of the late proposal has been introduced by Mr. Roine.

Discussion on the second part of the late proposal. Mr. Casado: It is a question of procedure. Every single handicap should not be discussed, but a complete list could be then rejected or approved by the IGC Plenary. Mr. Fila: I strongly advise against this proposal. There is lack of transparency, it is like a scientific disagreement, which should be open for open discussion on the web. Mr. Guerin from France (member of the Handicap Committee): If it goes like proposed, every year there will be a reason to reject the list. Mr. Roine: There are 30-40 years old gliders in the list. How many times do we need to change the handicap of those gliders? I fail to understand. Mr. Kuijpers: Like Mr. Casado said, I can imagine the process how the handicaps are calculated. The current list is based on the reality. We should not discuss every single handicap separately. Mr. Roine: The new handicap list is based on IDAFLIEG measurements and a very old mathematical model. We do not have access to this information anymore. Obviously the process is not working; the results are wrong. I strongly disagree that it is scientific. It is product of a wrong process. Mr. Spreckley: We do not want to discuss the details of handicaps, but I agree on the process to be followed by the committee. Prof. Peter Ryder: The DAeC list is calculated for decentralized competitions where flights last from early morning till late evening. We should not discuss it at this level, but to discuss why there is a need for change and discuss the process. Mr. Geissler: In terms of data availability, the measurement data were passed from the IDAFLIEG for those gliders that were measured. Also, the method of calculation is published. The emphasis was on comparing older standard class gliders (e.g. Discus or LS-4) with the original club class (LS-1 or ASW-19). The IGC reference mass has been considered (like flown without water). Mr. Mozer: I would like to ask all delegates to focus on the proposal. Mr. Sabeckis: I support the proposal. May be the committee calculated it right, but there are many gliders now that are not able to fly in WGC. The change of the handicap las year seems to be political. Mr. Georgas: The handicapping is not exact and perfect in any sport. Taking into account the age of gliders (30+ years old) etc., are we trying to say that the IGC Plenary will approve job of experts? That is very incorrect. Mr. Fila: The delegates as politicians could be overruled by experts, but it is stipulated in the By-Laws that all committee decisions needs to be approved by the Plenary. Mr. Rutkowski: I do not understand why we need this discussion. We should have the possibility to scrutinize all proposals. Mr. Guerin: Do we proceed in the same way in case of GFAC? Do we approve every FR at the Plenary? The IGC President Mr. Mozer explained that all newly approved GNSS FR are listed in the GFAC report which was always accepted by the IGC Plenary.

Votes for the second part of the late proposal: 11, against: 17, abstentions: 8  
Also, the second part of the late proposal was lost.

- To include all gliders from DAeC list 2017 in the IGC Club class handicap list (Lithuania)

Mr. Motuza asked the IGC Plenary to discuss this late proposal.

Votes for acceptance of the late proposal for discussion (2/3 majority without proxy): 20,  
against: 7, abstentions: 4

The proposal was not accepted for discussion.

### 8.3.6 Women WGC classes (France)

Mr. Denis Guerin asked the IGC Plenary to discuss this late proposal.

Votes for acceptance of the first part of late proposal for discussion: 25, against: 1,  
abstentions: 4

The following proposal was accepted for discussion:

*The WWGC shall be organized in only two classes - instead of three today.*

*This proposal will apply for the 2019 WWGC in Australia and also next editions of WWGC.*

Mr. Guerin introduced the proposal and the rationale behind.

The discussion on the late proposal: Mr. Eriksen on behalf of Denmark proposed the following amendments:

*The WWGC shall be organized in only two classes - instead of three today from 2022 onwards.*

~~*This proposal will apply for the 2019 WWGC in Australia and also next editions of WWGC.*~~

Mr. Eriksen: The IGC Plenary meeting accepted the bid for Women WGC in Australia and we cannot change it legally anymore. Therefore, it should be applicable as of 2022. The proposal was seconded.

Discussion on amended proposal. Mr. Guerin: We have intended the proposal for Women WGC 2019. Mrs. Kuijpers: It is very difficult to decide, I do not like the idea, but we need to do it. There is also a feedback from women pilots which shows that some pilots are not coming due to a small number of pilots in class. We have to do something. Mr. Spreckley: The UK will support the amendment because the bids were approved under a different conditions. Mrs. Vigorito: I agree with UK. Mr. Geissler: Yesterday we have seen motivated bid from UK, we should not reduce the number of classes at this time. I do not recommend it. Mr. Luděk Kluger from the Czech Republic: For us is not a good idea because we were sending three pilots to each class from the Czech Republic.

Votes for the amendment by Denmark: 31, against: 4, abstentions: 1

Amendment was accepted.

Discussion about amended proposal. Mr. Cubley: Australia proposes another amendment as follows:

*The WWGC shall be organized in only two classes - instead of three today from 2022 onwards if there are at least 16 entries in the class.*

~~*This proposal will apply for the 2019 WWGC in Australia and also next editions of WWGC.*~~

Mr. Guerin: That would be completely against the original proposal as tabled by France. Mr. Cubley: The argument was that the classes are too small, 16 is a good number. Mr. Rutkowski: Will you cancel the class after the deadline for entries if there will be less than 16 pilots? What to do then? Mrs. Vigorito: I have a similar comment, at the time of entries the budget and the team are approved. This may create a lot of problems for all.



Votes for acceptance of the late proposal for discussion: 7, against: 14, abstentions: 10  
The proposal was not accepted for discussion.

Mrs. Kuijpers: When would be this applicable? Mr. Mozer: The proposal will be applicable with immediate effect.

Votes for the late proposal as amendment by Denmark: 21, against: 11, abstentions: 4  
The late proposal was adopted.

- Unsporting behavior (IGC Bureau)

The IGC President Mr. Mozer asked the IGC Plenary to discuss this late proposal.

Votes for acceptance of the late proposal for discussion: 29, against: 2, abstentions: 4  
The proposal was not accepted for discussion.

Mr. Mozer introduced the late proposal and the reasons for it.  
It is proposed:

*To add "Unsporting Behavior" to the list of penalties in Annex A. It is also proposed that this change be applied with immediate effectiveness.*

The discussion: Mr. Hermann Trimmel from Austria: How to define an unsporting behavior? Mr. Spreckley: The current process used at the championships is that competition director awards penalty, then there could be complaint and protest. Mr. Cubley: How would it work in practice? Mr. Motuza: There could be a bilateral case between the pilot and the organizer. Both parties should be heard. Mr. Leinikki from the FAI: The only other members at the IGC competitions are the Team Captains. Mr. Cubley: When reviewing the reports at the stewards meeting we have examples that some pilots have abusive behaviors to organizers' ground staff. Our rules do not have a tool for the competition director to make an action. Complaint - protest process should address it (in response to remark by Mr. Motuza). Mr. Georgas: I do not see this as a problem. The crew members do not have a sporting license. Competition directors should have a right to authorize or not to authorize people at the contest site. Mrs. Vigorito: Usually the crew members have accreditation/registration with the organizers, thus they are recognized members of the teams. Mr. Motuza: There is a need to specify a bit more definition of unsporting behavior, because for our mentality also the stealing the FAI flag is unsporting behavior, but for some other nations it is a joke. Mr. Hansen from Denmark: Thanks for the proposal, Denmark is in favor. The sanction should be for all at our competitions. The solution could be that all crew and other members are included in the penalty. The problem however could be if they are only visitors. Mr. Fila: If crew members are not accredited and they have no license, the organizers have no right to remove these people from the site. Mr. Leinikki: I was not saying that the crew members should not be penalized, but we are changing the Sporting Code. These persons should not be mentioned in the Sporting Code. Mr. Cubley: The way could be that they all will be official team members. The IGC President Mr. Mozer: Mr. Leinikki indicates that this proposal should be only applicable for those with a license. Mr. Rutkowski: Team Captains do not need to have a sporting license, but are referred to in the Sporting Code so it should not be a big problem. But how to penalize the team captain for misconduct of the crew? We need to allow team captains to act e.g. to remove member from the team. Mr. Leinikki: Team captains are required to have a sporting license.

Votes for the late proposal: 35, against: 0, abstentions: 1

The late proposal was adopted.

#### 9. Votes on bids

##### 9.1 37<sup>th</sup> FAI World Gliding Championships 2021 (18m, 20m, Open)

The Championship was awarded to Matkópuszta (LHMP), Hungary with 22 votes in the second round.

##### 9.2 11<sup>th</sup> FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2021

The Championship was awarded to Husbands Bosworth, UK with 21 votes in the second round.

##### 9.3 12<sup>th</sup> FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2021

The Championship was awarded to Tabor (LKTA), Czech Republic with 28 votes in the first round.

##### 9.4 21<sup>st</sup> FAI European Gliding Championships 2021 (Club, Std., 15m)

The Championship was unanimously awarded to Pociunai (EYPR), Lithuania.

##### 9.5 4<sup>th</sup> FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2021

The Championship was unanimously awarded to Luís Eduardo Magalhães (SWNB), Brazil.

#### 9. IGC awards

##### 9.1 Lilienthal Medal

Not awarded.

##### 9.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma

The Pirat Gehriger Diploma was awarded to Mr. Rick Sheppe, USA.

##### 9.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal

Not awarded.

#### 10. 2019 IGC Plenary Meeting (Eric Mozer)

##### 10.1 Announcement of the dates and place of the IGC Plenary meeting 2019

The IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer informed about the request for IGC to consider the next IGC Plenary meeting in Turkey, in conjunction with the CIA Plenary meeting on 8-9 March. However, no precise details were available. The IGC may eventually need to move out of the normal meeting dates which are typically in the beginning of March. Therefore he requested the IGC Plenary to authorize the Bureau to decide the venue for IGC Plenary 2019 taking into consideration potential offers received from the delegates before September 2018. The meeting will take place on 8 - 9 March 2019. Bureau will seek to avoid conflict with the dates of the EGU meeting.

Votes for the proposal: 35, against: 0, abstentions: 0

The proposal was adopted.

## 10.2 Useful dates and other practical information

Notification of proposals must reach the Bureau by Saturday 30 September 2018;

Bids must reach the Bid Specialist by Saturday 30 September 2018;

Proposals, nominations and reports must be finalized and delivered to the secretary on the 31 December 2018.

All material will be made available for delegates 45 days before the meeting, the exact date still to be determined.

### AOB

Mr. Mogen Hansen from Denmark expressed that in his view it was a good meeting with 36 delegations present. He made a plea to make gliding easy because IGC does sometimes things quite difficult. He invited all to come up with proposal next year that will be (stupid) simple KISS.

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers shared her experience after being the first time in the IGC Bureau. She appreciated the leadership of the IGC President Mr. Eric Mozer both throughout the year and during the Plenary.

Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki expresses appreciation on behalf of the FAI of the work of Mr. Axel Reich and Christof Geissler to make this meeting happen. Mr. Reich thanked all delegates, experts and officials for coming to Freudenstadt,

### 11. Closure

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 2018

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Chair</b>
ANDS:	Rick Sheppe
Championship Management:	Peter Eriksen
GFAC:	Ian Strachan
Sporting Code Section 3D	
Main Section & Annex C:	Ross Macintyre
Annex A:	Rick Sheppe
Annex A: Handicap Subcommittee	Christof Geissler
Annex B:	Ian Strachan
Annex D:	Reno Filla
<b>Working Group Chairs:</b>	<b>Chair</b>
Country Development:	Working Group to be renamed and the Chair to be appointed
History:	Peter Selinger
E-Concept	Brian Spreckley
Safety	Rene Vidal
IGC media	Brian Spreckley
Stewards	Terry Cubley
Juries	Marina Vigorito
Scoring Software	Angel Casado

<b>IGC Representatives</b>	
CASI:	Marina Vigorito
EGU:	Patrick Pauwels
Environmental Comm.:	Bernald Smith
Medical Comm.:	Jürgen Knüppel
<b>Specialist Officers</b>	
Sailplane Grand Prix:	Brian Spreckley
Trophy Management:	Gisela Weinreich
OLC:	Christof Geissler