



Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

held in Istanbul

Friday 8th and Saturday 9th March 2019

at Eresin Hotels Topkapı

Version: 9 December 2019

Note: When the minutes specifically refer to presentations, these are available to Delegates at the cloud folder dedicated to 2019 IGC Plenary meeting.

1. Opening and Welcome (Mr. Eric Mozer)

The IGC President Mr. Mozer welcomed the delegates to the 2019 IGC Plenary meeting and thanked them for coming to Istanbul. Mr. Mozer then asked people that were participating in the IGC meeting for the first time to present themselves. Finally, he thanked the local organizers of the meeting, in particular Ms. Kamile Yasdiman, the IGC Delegate and Mr. Aan Ali, the alternate delegate of Turkish National Aero Club (THK) to IGC for their support, which allowed the meeting to be well prepared.

In the beginning of the second day, Mr. Mozer welcomed the FAI President Mr. Robert Henderson and members of the FAI Executive Board: Mr. Alvaro De Orleans Borbon, Mrs. Marina Vigorito, Mr. Agust Gudmundsson, Mrs. Mary Anne Stevens, Mr. Jean-Claude Weber and Mr. Abdullah Mansour Al Jawini who joined the meeting for item 4 – FAI Matters. On this occasion, Mr. Mozer welcomed also the FAI Secretary General Ms. Susanne Schödel, who reported the FAI Matter as well as the FAI Sport & Event Director Mr. Markus Hagganey.

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 (Ms. Annick Hauser)

Ms. Annick Hauser from the FAI office 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 Switzerland to Austria). 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.

Ms. Hauser called the roll at the beginning of the second day, Saturday 9th March. The quorum was the same as on the first day.

1.3 Administrative matters (Vladimir Foltin)

- The IGC Plenary appointed monitors Tor Johannessen and Peter- Ryder to oversee the counting of ballots during the meeting.
- The IGC Secretary Vladimir Foltin briefed the meeting about the administrative matters including the new proposal templates and about possibility to use FAI cloud services for submitting and sharing proposals among the IGC bodies and IGC Delegates.
- The Secretary also informed about 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, Freudenstadt 2nd and 3rd March 2018 (Eric Mozer/Vladimir Foltin)

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Freudenstadt 2nd and 3rd March 2018 prepared by IGC Secretary Mr. Vladimir Foltin and asked if there were any comments. Mr. Pauwels from Belgium asked for correction of text on page 37:

Quote:

- *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.

End of quote.

This was accepted and the President then called the delegates for their approval. The minutes were then unanimously approved.

3. IGC President's report (Eric Mozer)

Mr. Mozer welcomed the new participants to the IGC Plenary meeting. He then referred to written report circulated before the meeting, where he reported on IGC activities since the last Plenary. He highlighted the first ever awarding of the newly defined World Soaring Cup to Mr. Michael Sommer from Germany for his performance at the World Gliding Championships 2018. He also praised the absolute altitude record attempt of Perlan Mission II team that on September 5, 2018 soared to an altitude over 74,000 feet in a flight out of El Calafate, Argentina. He also expressed his sincere appreciation of all the volunteer work of the Bureau, committee chairs and their members as well as all the specialists contributing to various IGC activities and events. The full report of the IGC President could be accessed via the following [link](#).

The President also briefed the meeting participants about the recent developments regarding FAI 2022 World Air Games in Turkey and outlined that this will be discussed in more depth on Saturday morning under item 4 – FAI Matters.

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

3.1 Bureau Decisions taken since the last Plenary that need the IGC Plenary approval

Finally, Mr. Mozer presented the IGC Bureau decisions taken on behalf of the Plenary since its last annual meeting in 2018. The list of relevant Bureau decisions could be found under the following [link](#).

3.2 Discharge of Bureau responsibility for decisions since last Plenary

The IGC Plenary then discharged the IGC Bureau of responsibility for the decisions taken since the 2018 IGC Plenary.

4. FAI Matters (FAI President Mr. Robert Henderson)

Note: The item covered on Saturday morning.

The FAI President thanked Mr. Mozer and IGC Delegates for an opportunity to address the IGC Plenary meeting. Mr. Henderson in a short speech mentioned his early days of closer involvement with FAI and IGC, which started in 1994 after he became Annex A committee chairman. At that time, he was involved in introduction of GPS, introduction of more stabilized competition rules as well as creation of World class, which was a good idea, but not a platform. He informed the meeting about current efforts of the FAI Executive Board to

gain more funds for development of joint competition formats for several WGC. He concluded that the FAI is a small group of people that relies on many volunteers working for the benefit of all air sports.

4.1 FAI's report to the IGC Plenary (FAI Secretary General Ms. Susanne Schödel)

Ms. Susanne Schödel, FAI Secretary General, presented verbal report.

First, she forwarded greetings to IGC from Max Bishop, former FAI Secretary General and noted his recent election as Vice President at the International World Games Association (IWGA) where he represents FAI at a very important level in international sports. She forwarded greetings also from Visa-Matti Leinikki, FAI IT Manager, who does not attend this year's meeting of IGC. Then she introduced Mr. Greg Pyzalka, FAI Events Manager, who has vast experience in multisport events and is now with FAI for the World Air Games, as well as Ms. Annick Hauser from FAI Head Office team working with all the FAI Air Sports Commissions.

Ms. Schödel then informed the IGC Delegates about manifesto "Preserving Airspace Access for Air Sports", which was discussed and approved at the FAI General Conference and distributed widely. She asked the delegates to use this in their discussions with authorities to explain and stress the importance of air space for all the air sports activities. The current developments show that Drones are taking more and more airspace, and that authorities started mentioning "high value airspace", which is reserved for non-air sports activities.

Regarding IT matters, Ms Schödel informed about a soon to be launched online Cat 2 event registration tool, initially addressed at those organizing and approving events in CIVL and CIAM commissions. She invited the IGC to check the tool and to use it for the Cat 2 events that are relevant for the IGC Ranking List.

Regarding anti-doping, she asked the Delegates to take note of the information material provided as an annex to this meeting (available on the cloud) and emphasized importance of staying up to date with regard to anti-doping, and of sharing the information among the competitors regularly. The information platform that FAI provides has been recognized by WADA as a good example for other International Sports Federations.

Furthermore, Ms. Schödel provided verbal report from the 112th FAI General Conference where she mentioned the following: The composition of new FAI Executive Board; The FAI Calendar and plea to align it with the IGC calendar; the statistics of FAI World Championships (CAT 1 events) and involvement of thousands of FAI Officials as volunteers. She also reported on the FAI TV production and distribution; Membership development with particular focus on growth in Asia namely in paragliding, skydiving and aero modeling. Ms. Schödel also informed about the One FAI initiative with a view to create more administrative synergies among air sports as well as about the NAC Handbook initiative and possible ways of involving Air Sport Commissions in FAI decision-making process. She concluded by presenting the revised concept for the FAI World Air Games (WAG) 2022 as agreed with the local organizers just prior the IGC Plenary meeting. The presentation is available on the cloud.

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas from Greece – TV distribution was central strategy in media advertising, but the current trends are shifting to direct video channels. What is the FAI strategy in air sports advertising?

Ms. Schödel – The FAI distribution channels are changing too, but the problem is that FAI does not have enough promotion video material. The FAI partner (Quatromedia) use their own distribution network, but the FAI uses also its own distribution channels.

Mr. Sabeckis from Lithuania – The WAG in Sailplane Grand Prix (SGP) format is not good format because the selection process does not ensure that all national have a chance to participate. The SGP Final selection process focuses on individual performances of competitors.

Ms. Schödel – This comment is noted and the FAI is currently discussing the WAG gliding format with IGC.

Mr. Mozer – The IGC is testing e-concept along the World Gliding Championships (WGC) at Pavullo in September this year. I can foresee a possibility that we could have e-sailplanes at WAG. The SGP could be too limiting due to how the race is done. Let us hope for success in Pavullo so the concept develops and could be used at WAG. The other problem IGC has is logistics associated with organizing the gliding event at the WAG. There could be a need to host up to 500 people at Innonu, which has limited facilities. The IGC asked the FAI to be involved and engaged since the beginning of WAG related deliberations. The only way to achieve success is through cooperation FAI/IGC.

Mr. Henderson – There was a meeting between THK board and part of the FAI Executive Board in November 2018. The THK, based on input received from the FAI, decided to move the event to 2022. Originally, there have been more venues. Now we have some time to do the work and decide the right format. The WAG is not an airshow, but it is a big event... a kind of Air Olympics. That is why the WAG were moved to 2022. I would like to use this opportunity to express thanks to IGC for support.

Ms. Schödel – I would like to remind again the FAI anti-doping paper and the need to share it with the pilots. It will be available as an addition to minutes.

5. Finance (Mr. Dick Bradley and Patrick Pauwels)

Note: The 2018 Financial statement and 2019 budget is available for download via cloud.

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2018 Financial Statement

The IGC Treasurer Mr. Dick Bradley presented the 2018 Finance Report and the 2019 budget based on very recent data from FAI.

The 2018 report showed an estimated income of 41,675 €. The expenditure was 41,550 €. The reserves increased by 125 € to 80,376 €. The IGC Plenary accepted the Financial Report with a caveat that the figures are still provisional and small adjustments could be made following the final review.

5.2 2019 Budget

The 2019 budget showed expected income of 48,925 € and expenditure of 60,760 €. The budgeted capital expenditure for IGC trackers is 20,000 €. The IGC Plenary then accepted the Budget for 2019. Mr. Mozer thanked to Mr. Bradley for the presentation and all his work for IGC.

6. Reports not requiring voting

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

6.1 OSTIV report (Dr. Rolf Radespiel)

Dr Radespiel reported on OSTIV activities since the last IGC Plenary as presented in the written report (could be accessed [here](#)). He highlighted in particular the new OSTIV safety initiative presented at the recent stewards meeting (the presentation is available on the cloud), which may allow to address safety issues before consequences happen.

6.2 Standing Committees

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

Mr. Mills, the member representing the Committee, reported that he has nothing to add to a written report that could be accessed [here](#).

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

Mr. Sheppe referred to a written report (could be accessed [here](#)) and added that there is no proposal from the Committee tabled for the consideration by the Plenary.

Post meeting note: Mr. Sheppe, the Committee chair informed about new member of the Annex A Committee, Mr. Øjvind Frank of Denmark. The Committee welcomes Øjvind, and looks forward to his contribution to the maintenance and development of Annex A.

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

Mr. Geissler referred to the written report that could be accessed [here](#). He added that on 1 April the committee would release minor changes to the list related to corrections of lower reference mass (e.g. SZD55). He regretted the inability to produce a bug free document despite efforts of the committee; there is always something to be corrected.

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

Mr. Reno Filla referred to written report that could be found [here](#). Additionally, he presented the Ranking List (RL) 2018 statistics, which showed a drop in competition classes since 2017 but the number of pilots remained the same or slightly increased. Mr. Filla informed about the staff involved in the RL work, which are Mr. Lars Rune Bjørnevik the RL administrator and himself as the RL Manager. The team receives support from members of Annex D Committee Mr. Spreckley and Mr. Nicholson and from the previous administrator and RL programmer Mr. Paul Crabb. The main challenge is excessive workload due to double pilot profiles, late and wrong result data sets and RL system shortcomings. There are also number of contests that need to be devalued manually. The Committee presented two proposals for the IGC Plenary consideration (see items 8.3.4 and 8.3.5). The presentation is available on the cloud.

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas – Noted the information about decrease of classes and increase of participating pilots, which is very important proof that gliding activity grows.

Mr. Mozer – The WGC is IGC's top product. What about the RL system security are there any issues?

Mr. Filla – The RL database not under the treats, but the display element was attacked several times or an unauthorized recalculation has happened, but the core data were never affected. The Server Company however creates many troubles that need to be overcome.

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

Mr. Sheppe referred to the written report (could be found [here](#)) and mentioned that the Committee was not very active recently, but now will take a new direction by providing more resources for work on IGC tracker.

Emeritus Committee's chair Mr. Bernald Smith from the USA provided a written report (could be found [here](#)). The report highlighted the main concerns that related availability of airspace (related to drones etc.), safety in the sky (airport closures) or cyber-attacks. He encourages to work on these issues, as there are many more drones than all other airspace users together (thus they are minority). There is a High-Altitude Flight Recorder issue under study

for which a recommendation still needs to be provided. In that regard, the introduction of pre-flight and post-flight flight recorder check is currently considered.

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

Mr. Strachan introduced the written report (could be found [here](#)) and presented the members of the GFAC Committee and their recent activities, in particular the ongoing review of security of older designs that may result in recommendation to change the flight recorder approval levels for the oldest and less secure types sometimes without existing manufacturer's support. He concluded that the Committee needs new members and invited the meeting participants to recommend potential new members. The presentation is available on the cloud.

6.2.6 Championship Management Committee Report (Mr. Peter Eriksen)

Mr. Eriksen provided a short verbal report on the bids management part. He thanked to all the bidders for good cooperation. All bids were on time and in very good quality.

6.3 Working Groups

6.3.1 Stewards (Terry Cubley)

Mr. Cubley introduced the written Stewards Working Group report (could be found [here](#)) and added that some guidance documents will be provided following the Plenary to convey the working group decisions. There is a need for more stewards as a number of them are not available anymore. He invited each country to look for and propose suitable people.

Mr. Cubley also announced that this IGC Plenary is his last meeting due to his election as Australian delegate to the FAI and election as CASI vice president.

Mr. Mozer thanked to Mr. Cubley for all his work for IGC throughout the years. He and IGC look forward to Mr. Cubley's continued cooperation and engagement in IGC matters through the Stewards Working Group.

6.3.2 Safety (Mr. René Vidal)

Mr. Vidal referred to the written report on group past activities (available [here](#)) and presented statistics and analysis of the IGC safety data, now containing all accidents at major IGC events. All of them were classified in accordance with a common classification scale. The main issues relate to landings (41%), dangerous flying in gaggles during starting or in landing pattern (14%). Mr. Vidal stated that the IGC statistics indicates that there is on average 0.84 accident per event, which leads to assumption that there could be 6 accidents and 1 fatal accident during IGC Championships in 2019. In this regard, he referred to mid-air collision of two gliders at WGC in Hosin and posed a question whether such an occurrence could be avoided in the future. He then presented proximity analysis

report from the event, which suggested that the involved pilots had clearly the highest number of proximity encounters in the class, while the winners had much less recorded events. He concluded by presenting of the basic of FLYTOOL, which is one of the electronic tools used for reporting of safety related events at the IGC Championships. The presentation is available on the cloud.

Discussion:

Mrs. Kuijpers (Netherlands) – FLYTOOL is free for competition organizers. It is not a commercial tool owned by the National Airsport Control (NAC) of Netherlands.

Mr. Pauwels (Belgium) – The reporting systems are very good and we also need easy solutions for safety data analysis, but education is also very important. Otherwise, there will be no improvements. The systems alone will not help to improve safety.

Mr. Vidal – That is a good point; training for organizers, pilots and stewards is important.

Mr. Hansen (Denmark) – Thank you for the presentation. Safety is very important and this tool is interesting. Would it be available also to NACs?

Mr. Vidal – Do you mean data or tool? Both will be available to any competition organizer.

Mr. Geissler (Germany) – FLYTOOL is an interesting tool, but how to organize the championships so it will actually help to deal with reports?

Mrs. Kuijpers – The CD, stewards or safety manager have access to all data. I have experience with it when I was chief steward. It is also good for the Competition Director (CD) because all information is in one system. The CDs in Netherlands are now asking for using it after only few years of promotion.

Mr. Spreckley (UK) – I suggest that every proposal to IGC is assessed for its safety impact (e.g. pilot workload) and that assessment should be part of the proposal form.

6.3.3 Scoring Software (Mr. Angel Casado)

Dr. Casado reported that all information is included in the written report (available [here](#)).

6.3.4 History Committee (Mr. Peter Selinger)

Mr. Selinger referred to the written report (available [here](#)) and mentioned he has nothing to add. The IGC President Mr. Mozer thanked to Mr. Selinger for an excellent article about first Lilienthal medal award in connection with the first awarding of the newly tasked World Soaring Cup.

6.3.6 IGC Media (Brian Spreckley)

Note: This item was discussed together with item 7.4

Mr. Spreckley referred to the written report (available [here](#)) and added that IGC Media outreach is and will continue to be based on the three pillars as follows. The first one is focusing on communication with IGC delegates and the IGC (mostly emails or newsletters). The second one is focusing on communication of topics of general public interest (through FAI website and IGC website) and the last one is dedicated to gliding fans, pilots and followers (e.g. SGP home page; SGP event sites, Calendar of Championships and IGC Ranking List website).

6.3.7 E-Concept (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley referred to the written report (available [here](#)) and added that the webpage for the E-Concept test event is already up and running.

6.4 IGC Representatives

6.4.1 CASI Report (FAI Air Sport General Commission)

Mr. Mozer informed that there is a written report (available [here](#)) prepared by Mrs. Vigorito, the previous IGC representative to CASI. He added that IGC is now looking for a new representative to represent it at CASI.

Note: Mr. Terry Cubley (Australia) has been elected as CASI vice president.

6.4.2 EGU/EASA (Mr. Patrick Pauwels)

Mr. Pauwels provided update to the written report (available [here](#)), in which he mentioned EGU recent activities like successful and well attended 2019 EGU Congress in Budapest, status of ongoing European regulatory activities where EGU provides many inputs. In particular, Mr. Pauwels mentioned successful cooperation between EGU and EASA on

development of EASA “Rulebook for Gliding”. He concluded by inviting the representatives to join EGU Airspace Group meeting on 30 March 2019 in Hamburg, Germany.

6.4.3 Environmental Commission Report (Mr. Bernald Smith)

Note: Item discussed on Saturday morning.

Mr. Mozer welcomed Mr. Pierre Duval and invited him to address the IGC Plenary meeting.

Mr. Duval thanked for the opportunity and mentioned that it was IGC person Mr. Bernald Smith (USA) who was behind creation of the FAI environmental commission some 15 years ago. He added that environment is important because if we do not care about it, it would kill us all. Referring to last year discussion with Mr. Pauwels about the disappearance of an airfield years ago due to environment concerns, Mr. Duval stated that there is one thing we could certainly do better, i.e. to explain to the world how we aviators care about the environment. It is largely about how we are perceived by the rest of the world, we aviation should be seen as clean and efficient and not noisy. Mr. Duval appreciated IGC efforts especially in targeting electric gliding through E-Concept initiative. There is need to push for it because of young people, who need something safe, light, easy to operate and maintain. We have to show to the world and to young people that we take care of their future. Mr. Duval then asked the IGC delegates for a few very basic things. The first is to assign someone to take care and engage in the environmental protection matters. There is a good chance to reuse all information already available. One big challenge for aviation is where to take the electricity for charging of large numbers of electric aircraft in the future or how to involve with local companies or what is the source of the electric energy used at the airport? The second is about the fact that environment people are typically coming from general society and actually, it would be better if they would come from air sports community. Why not to combine the two and discuss the environment together? Mr. Duval conclude by saying that he remains available to discuss these things all day long if there is someone interested.

Mr. Mozer thanked Mr. Duval for the address and for raising a good point. He then asked the meeting participants if there is someone in the room interested to support IGC in environment commission. We ask organizers to sign environmental code of conduct, which is a good document, but we need someone who will take care of these matters on behalf of the IGC.

6.4.4 FAI Medical Commission (Dr. Jürgen Knüppel)

Dr. Knüppel provided verbal report in which he highlighted the issue of expensive and complex medical examinations that are sometimes very disproportionate to persons involved in sport and recreational aviation. He presented it in contrast to lighter systems, which are successful and safely used in several countries in the world. Dr. Knüppel concluded that a light medical for glider pilots should be sufficient and safe. The presentation is available on the cloud.

6.5 IGC Specialists

6.5.1 Trophy Management (Mrs. Gisela Weinreich)

Gisela - Overview of trophies, IGC Champion of the year, last year proposal clarified.

Rene – new Goran Ax trophy - see ppt

Mrs. Weinreich referred to the written report (available [here](#)) and its Annexes containing updated information and rules about various IGC – FAI Challenge Cups (available [here](#)). Furthermore, Mrs. Weinreich emphasized that the report now clarifies criteria for awarding of the World Soaring Cup given to the IGC Champion Pilot of the Year for 2019, i.e. includes also the FAI Women WGC that are concluding in January 2020. The IGC President

expressed his gratitude to Mrs. Weinreich for her work on collecting information about the IGC Trophies.

Following that, Mr. Filla (Sweden) introduced proposal for a new IGC trophy dedicated to Goran Ax. The Swedish Soaring Federation “Segelflyget” would donate the trophy for longest accumulated distance achieved by a pilot in the Open Class over the course of all valid competition days in a World Gliding Championship. The presentation is available on the cloud.

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

Mr. Geissler referred to the written report (available [here](#)) and indicated that he has nothing to add to what is in the report.

6.5.3 Youth Gliding (Nina Shalneva)

Mrs. Shalneva presented a Youth Gliding School (YGS) initiative in Russia. The presentation covered various details like flight principles used in YGS, required flight practice, various phases of YGS training process including its theoretical and practical elements, YGS safety aspects and finally skill acquired in YGS. She concluded by saying that similar activities are taking place in Lithuania for many years and invited the IGC delegates to share similar initiatives from their respective countries. The presentation is available on the cloud.

7. Championships (Terry Cubley)

7.1 Reports from Past Championships

Mr. Cubley referred to the written reports from the past Championships.

7.1.1 35th FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Ostrow Michalkow, Poland (Club, Std., 15m)

The report is available [here](#).

7.1.2 35th FAI World Gliding Championships 2018, Hosin, Czech Republic (18m, 20m, Open)

The report is available [here](#).

7.2 Reports about Future Championships (Peter Eriksen)

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 World Championships

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

Mr. Cernezzi (Italy) informed that a lot of work has been already done mainly at the airport and related infrastructure. He said that he expects the Championship will be a great event. The organizers are also very happy to host the first E-Concept gliding competition ever.

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

Mr. Gyongyosi (Hungary) informed that preparations are in progress, the national gliding federation is co-organizer of the Championships and the relations with aerodrome operator (city of Szeged) are very good. He emphasized that military restrictions around Kecskemet will be cancelled and thus the airspace will be available for the Championships and that web page and social media are set up and working. Mr. Gyongyosi concluded by inviting all interested pilots to register in time.

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

The report is available [here](#).

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

Mr. Geissler informed that the venue would host German championships this year that will be open also to international pilots, which are very welcome to participate.

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

f. 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2021, Matkópuszta (LHMP), Hungary (18m, 20m, Open)

g. 11th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2021, Husbands Bosworth, UK (Club, Std., 18m Classes)

Mr. Spreckley informed that the test event in 2021 got a lot of attraction in the UK and referred to a document "WWGC2021 – calling all nations", disseminated to IGC delegates at the meeting, that is promoting women flying. The delegates should use it to promote women gliding in their countries.

h. 12th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2021, Tabor (LKTA), Czech Republic (Club, Std. Classes)

7.2.2 Continental Championships

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

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

Mr. Foltin (Slovakia) informed about a new paved gliding friendly runway constructed in Prievidza over the last winter and invited interested pilots to use several opportunities for training for the Championships e.g. Pribina Cup 2019, FCC 2019 or open Slovak national gliding Championships in Martin.

c. 3rd FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2019, SW Ontario, Canada (18-Meter and Handicapped Classes)

The report is available [here](#).

d. 21st FAI European Gliding Championships 2021, Pociunai (EYPR), Lithuania (Club, Std., 15m Classes)

Mr. Sabeckis informed about the main goals of the Championships and about the initiative to get additional support from Lithuanian government, as there were recent changes at the responsible ministry.

e. 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2021, Luís Eduardo Magalhães (SWNB), Brazil (Std. Monotype, 15m Handicapped)

The presentation is available on the cloud.

7.3 Approval of Competition Officials (Terry Cubley)

7.3.1 Approval of Officials for 2019 Competitions

The following FAI/IGC officials' nominations for competitions in 2019 were accepted.

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

Chief Steward: Brian Spreckley (GBR)

Jury President: Bob Bickers (GBR)

Jury Members: Angel Casado (ESP) and Marina Vigorito (ITA)

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

Chief Steward: Christof Geissler (GER)

Steward: Robin Van Maarschalkerweerd (NED)

Jury President: Marina Vigorito (ITA)

Jury Member: Peter Eriksen (DEN) and Regiz Kuntz (FRA), both remote

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

Chief Steward: Frouwke Kuijpers (NED)

Jury President: Gisela Weinreich (DEU)

Jury Member: Wojciech Scigala (POL) and Max Stevens (NZL), both remote

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

Chief Steward: Dick Bradley (RSA)

Jury President: Angel Casado (ESP)

Jury Members: Rick Sheppe (USA) and Alfonso Soto (CHL), both remote

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

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels (BEL)

Steward: Øjvind Frank (DEN)

Jury President: Peter Ryder (DEU)

Jury Members: Jaroslav Vach (CZE) and Gisela Weinreich (DEU), both remote

7.4 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships (Brian Spreckley)

Mr. Spreckley in addition to a written report (available [here](#)) provided presentation (available on the cloud) on recent SGP developments, where he among other reminded also the SGP objective: "To showcase our sport to a wider audience" and covered the following items.

7.4.1 Report on 9th series

There were nine qualification SGP event globally (Australia, USA, Poland, Russia, Sweden, France, Italy, Hungary, Germany), in which 18 pilots got qualified. The series helped to achieve number of milestones e.g. development IGC/OGN tracker system, SGP team development, Race highlight videos and video drawing function used for real time analysis during the race.

7.4.2 SGP Final 2019, La Cerdanya, Spain

The SGP Final will invite two additional wild card pilots so the total participation should be 20 pilots from 12 countries.

7.4.3 Progress for 10th series

The 10th series objectives are focusing on accident free contests, live scoring and in-cockpit live video. The venue of 2020 SGP Final is to be decided after the recent postponement of the WAG in Turkey to 2022. The 2022 SGP Final may be during the WAG 2022, subject to further deliberations between the FAI and THK.

7.4.4 SGP Management

With a view that the further evolution of the SGP requires professional engagement Mr. Spreckley presented the following set of conditions for agreement for the development of the FAI/SGP as a commercial venture.

The FAI retains ownership of the brand FAI, IGC, Sailplane Grand Prix, all sporting and safety aspects of the FAI/SGP, FAI/SGP specific rules and all regulations connected with FAI/SGP, final approval of event venues and selection of competitors. The partner will have exclusive rights for promotion and exploitation of FAI/SGP, will be responsible for the financing and organization of FAI/SGP events and will need to agree a contract that will provide the FAI/IGC with a percentage of any income after an agreed period.

Guest speaker: Angel Casado - IGC/OGN trackers and their use for World Gliding Championships

Dr. Casado started his presentation with summarizing historical background of the current tracking technology and anti-collision devices. Many things have changed since introduction of the first anti-collision device in 2005. Ten years later a group of gliding enthusiasts designed the Open Glider Network (OGN) and an open source and community-based backbone for sharing of live traffic data used for tracking. The OGN succeeded also in a difficult task to combine all the positions from many different sources¹ into a single presentation. There are now more than 50.000 of units on the market supported by several platforms for aircraft tracking. Dr. Casado continued his presentation by elaborating on conflicting objectives between collision avoidance and live competition tracking like e.g. disabling anti-collision function in order to become invisible to other competitors or use of ground team to support pilot in in-flight decision-making. This eventually led to generalization of tactical gliding with serious safety implications like creation of large gaggles and tailgating. Therefore, a separation of the collision avoidance function from live tracking function became the necessity. Such an approach would maintain the original function of anti-collision devices and allow for an independent secure and fully controlled tracking functionality managed by competition organizers. The solution should be technology agnostic so to allow utilization of future communication technologies. In order to achieve the objective, the IGC and OGN drafted a number of technical requirements for both, the trackers and the ground infrastructure. Although, it is not certain that the proposed solution is bullet proof, it will make the unwanted tracking at the Championships very difficult, very expensive and very time consuming and perhaps not worth of effort ... if just for the purpose of IGC competition. Dr. Casado then showed a video recording of one-day traffic tracked by OGN network and concluded the presentation by wish that the OGN/IGC tracker solution could create foundation for future FAI telemetry function allowing real time and online scoring (likewise in Red Bull Air Race). The presentation is available on the cloud.

Discussion:

Mr. Bjørnevik (Norway) – Is there an idea to certify the IGC/OGN tracker as GNSS FR?

Dr. Casado – Yes, the intention is to certify it to competition level.

Mr. Cubley – I have received some comments from pilots, that some pilots are putting OGN receivers in the cockpit. Is it possible?

¹ Flarm, OGN trackers, ADS-B, SPOT/SPIDER/INREACH, LT24/XCsoar/XCguide/Skylines, Skymaster/Flytech, Capture/SigFox, Oudie/LXNav, LX Navigation, Fanet, PilotAware, MAVlink

Dr. Casado – The OGN receiver would receive the data with a delay of 20 minutes. Technically, it is possible, but the FAI server will encrypt info only after 20 minutes.

Mr. Hansen – Is there a possibility that OGN/IGC trackers will allow for tracking of other gliders?

Dr. Casado – The final position displayed will be the encrypted one, trackers do not mutually communicate, but they relay the position information to each other in an encrypted form. Thus, the relaying of the position of another glider is irrelevant to the tracking function.

Mr. Sheppe (USA) – What if a pilot has OGN tracker that is configured not to respect NOTRACK setting?

Dr. Casado – That would be very difficult to achieve. Anyway, while the pilots can see surrounding gliders, he/she would not see the gliders that are far away out of the antenna reach.

Mr. Spreckley – In such a case one would need to have a complete separate system to achieve it.

Mr. Rutkowski (Poland) – The OGN trackers are collecting data, take position and they broadcast it in the air. Is that broadcast information encrypted?

Dr. Casado – Yes, it is. Only the authorized application can decrypt the broadcasted information, therefore there is such a possibility to delay position reports.

Mrs. Shalneva (Russia) – Because of encrypted transmissions, could it be that some countries impose some restrictions?

Dr. Casado - There are some countries, which require permission. Russia is one of them, but there is still a possibility to apply for such a permission.

Mr. Mozer thanked Dr. Casado for sharing his views and for providing more hindsight information about such an interesting and actual topic.

Note: The meeting at this point covered number of proposals, which substance relates to substance of the presentation by Guest Speaker. The following items were discussed in a given order: 8.1.8, 8.2.2.2, 8.3.3, 8.1.9, 8.2.2.3 a., 8.2.2.3 b., 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3 and 8.1.4. The meeting then continued by discussing the next item (7.5).

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

The bids were presented in countries' alphabetic order.

All presentations are available on the cloud.

7.5.1 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2022 (Club, Std., 15m Classes)

- Narromine, Australia

7.5.2 12th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2022 (two classes)

- Ferrara, Italy
- Zbraslavice, Czech Republic
- Fuentemilanos, Spain
- Arnborg, Denmark

7.6 Question to all bid presenters

Mr Geissler (Germany) – Question to all bidders: What classes are you bidding for?

Italy – We bid for club or 18m class, but we are flexible.

Czech Republic – We bid for club or 18m class, but we are flexible.

Spain – We bid for club or 18m class, but we can add additional class if there will be interest.

Denmark - We bid for club or 18m class.

Mr. Bradley (South Africa) – Will there be there other operations at the Championships site?

Spain – The airfield will be for exclusive use of the Championships and closed to other traffic.

Mr. Spreckley – to Spain: The proposed date is at the end of August, when the temperatures are usually very high.

Spain – The gliding conditions during that period are usually good and the summer season lasts much longer. In addition, temperature in July and August is similar, on average 23 degrees Celsius. The temperature in September goes down by approximately 5 degrees.

Mr. Cubley – What is the strength of your national women pilot community?

Italy – Our women gliding community is well organized, as there is an association of gliding women. Although, it is rather a small gliding movement, in overall it represents approximately 5% of all pilots. 2-3 of them are having relatively high competition results.

Czech Republic – We have more than 40 pilots competing at gliding competitions and that corresponds to number of pilots in our country.

Spain – We have very small number of women pilots, less than 12, but by organizing of the Championships, we want to attract more women to flying.

Denmark – There are handful of young women pilots in Denmark and the community developing, but they often stop competition flying after having family or getting pregnant.

Note: The first day of the meeting was concluded by the discussion on item 7.7.

The second day of the meeting started with item 4 followed by item 6.4.3 and then items 8.1.5 and onwards.

8. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

Note: Unless specifically mentioned in the minutes, Year-2 proposals endorsed by the meeting will be valid and included in the FAI Sporting Code from the 1st October 2019.

The following proposals (in a given order) were discussed on day 1 after concluding discussion on item 7.4:

8.1.8, 8.2.2.2, 8.3.3, 8.1.9, 8.2.2.3 a., 8.2.2.3 b., 8.1.1, 8.1.2, 8.1.3 and 8.1.4.

8.1 Year-2 Proposals

8.1.1 Calculation of speed points and distance points (USA)

- Y2 SC3A 8.2 8.3 8.4 USA 2019 - Calculation of Speed and Distance Points

[Summary: to award distance points or speed point, but not both]

Mr. Sheppe (USA) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) by stating that the Belgian proposal wants event marker and the Polish proposal wants to correct some anomalies and those reasons are agreed, while this is another proposal on gagging, but taken more from fairness perspective than safety. Mr. Sheppe then presented the problems of the current formula, which gives no reason to start ahead of the others or to leave the gaggle on course, which provides small reward for finishing when there are few finishers. Additionally, it does not provide for taking a sporting risk, but has strange incentives, all of that based on the fact that points belong to the majority. He outlines the possible solutions as follows: Instead of

giving points to the majority, to give the points to the winners; to make the points dependent on the speeds in the same way every day and; to stop counting outlandings. Mr. Sheppe concluded his presentation with two recommendations. One about the need for a new devaluation to limit the winning margin (independent of the scoring system used) and another one about a need to test it at Continental Championships before deciding on replacement of the current formula in Annex A in 2022. The presentation is available on the cloud.

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas (Greece) – One of the primary objectives of the proposal is speed points spread. We were happy to have them on certain days but lowering of points actually provides disincentive to the pilot. Could you please explain more?

Mr. Sheppe - Why would the compression of scores be required?

Mr. Georgas – Because of feeling that with it the real time scoring would be easier.

Mr. Sheppe – Yes of course it would, because there will be no need to wait for outlanders.

Mr. Vidal (Chile) – I understand the idea is to have luck factor eliminated, but what would be safety effect of the proposal? What would be the difference?

Mr. Sheppe – There will be only minor effect on safety, but positive. I would characterize it as a mild anti-gagging proposal, because there will be stronger motivation to leave the gaggle, so the difference will be appropriate.

Mr. Roine (Finland) – Let's think of situation when everyone has landed out. You can see what I mean. What would be my incentive to cross the line? The scoring needs to stop at certain altitude.

Mr. Eriksen (Denmark) – I disagree with this as an active pilot. Regarding the unknown conditions, pilot can feel if it would be a speed or a distance day and based on that it is possible to calculate own estimated points. Another thing is that experienced people were not usually lucky but saw what others did not see. They should be rewarded for that not penalized. We should not aim at reducing these excellent performances in the future.

Mr. Sheppe – I agree, but this proposal offers more choices to leave before the gaggle when compared to the current rules.

Mr. Filla (Sweden) – The issue is nor black or white. The pilots would be less dependent on performances of other pilots, but competitor reaction and new day factor will remain in place. I do also not agree that this would completely remove the issue of inability to do online scoring.

Mrs. Kuijpers (Netherlands) – I like that the fact outlandings are not severely penalized and I can agree with it in situation when there is only one pilot finishing, but I would like to see also that if you lose one day your contest should not be completely lost.

Mr. Roine – This is the problem. The pilots are worried about outlanding so do not take any risks. As a solution, we could propose not to count the worst day.

Mr. Geissler – Regarding information that this is a mild anti-gaggle proposal. Whether to start or not is mainly decided in starting procedure. Leaving the gaggle solely due to new formula seems to me unrealistic.

Mr. Spreckley – I would like to remind the delegates what will be the consequence of the positive vote. If this proposal is adopted it will introduce a new system into Annex A in addition to the current one. This new system will be available until 2022 for testing and only when the tests are successful, the old (current) system in Annex A could be discounted.

Mr. Filla – Does it mean that it would automatically vote out the current system in 2022 if the new system is successfully tested?

Mr. Mozer (USA) – The Plenary will reevaluate the proposal in 2022 before the old (current) system in Annex A will be taken out.

Mr. Johannessen (Norway, IGC President of Honor) – It would be worth of trying the new system also at national championships.

Mr. Cubley– It should be first tested at national championships, then at Continental Championships and only if successful at the World Championships.

Proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

8.1.2 Eliminate landing certificate (SC3 Committee)

- Y2 SC3 2.5.3.b 4.4.2.e IGC 2019 Eliminate landing certificate

[Summary: landing certificates no longer necessary]

Mr. Mills (UK) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the Committee.

Mr. Mills added – Currently every flight for badge has to be documented by landing certificate (except for the 5 hours flight). We just do not need this; thus we are proposing a simplification of the code.

Proposal has been adopted unanimously.

8.1.3 Simplify declared 3TP performance task (SC3 Committee)

- Y2 SC3 1.4.2.f IGC 2019 Simplify declared 3TP performance task

[Summary: to change the definition of declared 3TP performance]

Mr. Mills introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the Committee.

He added – This proposal would not simplify the code. The committee wants to add a note to a text defining a sector.

Discussion:

Mr. Cubley – Our understanding of this proposal is that 500km out and return flight would automatically turn to 2 times 250 km flights.

Mr. Georgas – This is not a proposal at all, also the wording is wrong.

Mr. Mills – summary from Tony = withdrawing

Proposal has been withdrawn.

8.1.4 Change of definition of FAI 13.5 meter class (Lithuania)

- Y2 SC3A 4.2.1.f LTU 2019 Change of Definition of 13,5 m Class

[Summary: substitute MTOM limit for wingloading limit]

Mr. Foltin (IGC Secretary) informed about publication of corrected version of the proposal (available [here](#)) in order to align it with the adopted Year-1 proposal

Note: The following text was added (and highlighted): Participating sailplanes must comply with basic requirements to ensure safety and fairness of the competition.

Discussion:

Mr. Sheppe – I would like to clarify that this is change of Annex A and not the text of Sporting Code 3.

Mr. Cubley – Can someone explain the impact of the proposal on current and future gliders?

Mr. Gavars (Latvia) – The proposal will bring significant increase in safety. The sailplanes are designed against the same criteria as certified gliders and there is a possibility of installation of FES and other safety features, which would be otherwise impossible without increase of the Maximum Take-Off Mass (MTOM) to 350 kg as was demonstrated in Szatymaz. In addition, the gliding performance is better.

Mr. Cernezzi – I would like to say two words in favor of the proposal. There were many outlandings at the last WGCs because no one could fly with an engine due to MTOM limitation. The most competitive gliders have small wing area and could not accommodate heavier pilots. An alternative was the use of less competitive gliders. When visiting previous WGCs I have met many pilots unhappy with the current rules so I wish to have this proposal adopted. It would be good, also for Italy, if it could be applicable at upcoming WGC in 13.5-meter class in Pavullo that start in just a few months.

Mr. Spreckley – We should have two votes, one for the proposal and second for its applicability date.

Dr. Radespiel – The weights for microlight sailplanes are now defined in EASA regulation so it is possible that there will be also certified sailplanes in this class in the future.

Proposal has been adopted with large majority.

The immediate applicability of the proposal (including at the WGC 13.5-meter class in 2019 in Pavullo) has been adopted unanimously.

8.1.5 Delete communication of start times (Spain)

- Y2 SC3A 7.4.7 ESP 2019 Delete communication of start times

[Summary: end requirement for start time reporting if tracking is available]

Dr. Casado introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and indicated that there is no change in the proposal compared to a Year-1 proposal adopted last year.

He added - It makes no sense to report the start times if we have IGC tracking system, but the start times would still be reported in case of no tracking is available.

The proposal has been adopted unanimously.

8.1.6 Scoring programs (Spain)

- Y2 SC3A 10.1.4 ESP 2019 Scoring programs

[Summary: additional version control]

Dr. Casado introduced the proposal (available [here](#))

He added - It is quite a technical proposal, but otherwise we won't to be sure there was no change of parameters for scoring during the contest. We want to make the main parameters visible to everyone. The two main competition software developers support it.

The proposal has been adopted unanimously.

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

- Y2 SC3A 4.1 DEU 2019 Sailplane visibility requirements

[Summary: mandatory registration in OGN database]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn.

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

- Y2 SC3A 4.1.1.c DEU 2019 Use of FLARM and OGN

[Summary: tracking to be controlled by Organizers]

Mr. Geissler said he has nothing to add to the written proposal (available [here](#)).

Discussion:

Mr. Rutkowski (Poland) – This Year-2 proposal is in my opinion too general.

Mr. Mozer – The Year-1 proposal was the same as this Year-2 proposal.

Mr. Rutkowski – My understanding was that the Year-2 should contain the exact wording that will be used in the sporting code.

Mr. Spreckley – I would like to clarify that the vote is on the text the Year-2 proposal.

Mr. Rutkowski – Could you please explain what would be the consequence of our vote?

Dr. Casado – In my opinion the exact wording is proposed in this proposal.

Mr. Rutkowski - Where will be the proposed text reflected? The proposal indicated that it affects Annex A.

Dr. Ryder (IGC President of honor) – I would expect presentation of precise wording.

Mr. Sheppe – The text in the rule will state that if tracking is used, only IGC tracker could be used.

Mr. Filla – We all have a problem. There are some pilots, who could circumnavigate the OGN setup. They could set up a NOTRACK option. The IGC tracker is safe solution. We do not have another option other than to accept this proposal.

Mr. Georgas – This is an important proposal because it will influence safety and other aspects. However, it addresses two separate things, one is the FLARM and another is the OGN tracker. Is that correct?

Mr. Mozer – Yes, it is. The intention is split these two functions.

Mr. Cernezzi – Does it mean that it will be compulsory to set NOTRACK in competitions?

Mr. Spreckley – The wording that is presented is what we want. We also need to agree if we want pilots to be able to set off the FLARM. If we do not allow pilots to choose the FLARM setting, they may choose not to use the FLARM at all.

Mr. Hansen – The proposal states: IGC is asked to re-establish the basic purpose of FLARM and define different and/or additional trackers for IGC/OGN tracking.

Mr. Rutkowski – The proposal has not been changed from the Year-1 proposal.

Mr. Mozer – That is correct and sometimes it is like that.

Mr. Rutkowski – The proposal has a very general statement. We do not have a detailed wording of the rule.

Mr. Foltin (IGC Secretary) – I would like to clarify that the proposal template does not require exact wording of the proposed new rule or rule changes in the Year-2 proposals.

Mr. Rutkowski – May I have a clarification question? Who will implement the precise wording in the rule? Will it be the Annex A Committee?

Mr. Mozer – Yes, that is correct and the proposal, if adopted, will be implemented in Annex A as of 1 October 2019.

Mr. Rutkowski – And What about this year’s contests?

Mr. Spreckley – The bureau discussed it and adopted Local Procedures reflect this proposal.

Dr. Casado – Even if the proposal will be adopted there is a need to test the recorders. The necessary work should be completed in 2020.

Mr. Mozer – I will read the proposal once more for clarity: IGC is asked to re-establish the basic purpose of FLARM and define different and/or additional trackers for IGC/OGN tracking.

Mr. Cubley – IGC cannot dictate the pilots what FLARM setting to use.

Mr. Mozer – The question is: What is the basic purpose of FLARM? It is safety. So the additional tracker will be a separate component.

Mr. Cubley – Why would we want to establish it in a way that does not allow organizations to demand specific setting? The OGN tracker could be then used when they become available.

Mr. Cernezzi – The proposal means that pilots will not be required to set a certain transmissions.

Mr. Gyongyosi (Hungary) – I have a question related to Junior WGC. Will it be possible that some pilots may not use FLARM?

Mr. Hansen – If we are voting for this proposal, we will actually stop live tracking because the technical solutions (IGC tracker) may not be available.

Proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

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

- Y2 SC3A 5.3.1 DEU 2019 External aid to competitors

[Summary: specifically allow external aid]

Mr. Geissler said he has nothing to add to the written proposal (available [here](#)).

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas – We have just voted on the prohibition of live tracking and we should avoid to regulate external aid. I am not in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Filla – I can see a similarity with the proposal about cloud flying. From my point of view, the external aid should not be allowed. Otherwise it could change our sport.

Mr. Cubley – When reading the text of the proposal it looks that it would allow all sorts of external aid.

Mr. Roine - Will it allow it or will it prohibit it to be part of the rule?

Mr. Geissler – If you look around there is external help happening at the competitions that then create risk of protests. The aim of the proposal is not to allow any external aid.

Mrs. Kuijpers – The Team Captains are part of the team according to IGC rules. Is also someone who is at home, a part of the team? If a pilot has a mobile phone, he can receive through it all kinds of information. However, how to control it? I have no answer.

Mr. Hansen – In 1994, at the time we had been about to allow GPS, Mr. Bernald Smith said that the GPS will be very small, so small that pilots could hide it. He suggested allowing the GPS in a controlled way. We need to do it the same way today.

Mr. Georgas – The rule makers have two different responsibilities. The one is direction and the second is to define actual procedure. It is bad to mix the two. We need to decide whether our contests are individual and if our rules encourage it.

Mr. Bjørnevik – What about other pilots from my team helping me in contest?

Mr. Vidal – There is no way to control it. We should delete paragraph 5.3 from the Sporting Code.

Mr. Spreckley – This issue was discussed before, but it was difficult to resolve it. We have seen the result of our inactivity. If our sport is deemed to be individual, we need to have the rules like that. Another aspect is safety. If we allow safety to develop in nonregulated way, the workload in the cockpit may be too high and perhaps also unsafe. Are we going to take control or do we leave the situation to evolve on its own? The situation then may be even more difficult.

Mrs. Kuijpers – I will repeat what I have already said and Mr. Georgas explained my question. We need to decide what do we want to achieve and then we can make the rules. That is my proposal.

Dr. Knüppel (IGC representative at FAI Medical Commission) – The Perlan project monitors all parameters in-flight including human parameters. This demonstrates that comprehensive in-flight monitoring could be used.

Mr. Mozer – I would like to clarify that the proposal is about contests, not the records.

Mr. Cubley – If this proposal is not adopted, we may see all sorts of external help happening at the competitions. I am very worried about the consequences.

The proposal was voted against by a large majority.

8.2 Year-1 Proposals

8.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3 (SC3)

Note: The following proposal was omitted from the originally distributed meeting Agenda.

8.2.1 Y1 SC3 3.1.6 IGC 2019 Speed Record LoH

[Summary: adjust speed for excess LoH]

The text of the proposal is available [here](#).

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – The Option 2 presented here is not how we used to fly. The Option 1 is all right, but needs amendment, the figure 100 should be changed to 200.

Note: The proposed amendment was seconded by Greece.

Mr. Rutkowski – Glider L/D=70 is theoretical, I do not see a need to double the figure.

Mr. Filla – Despite of that I still support the change to 200.

The amendment was not supported in the vote.

Discussion on the original proposal:

Mr. Georgas – My concern is that there are two options and there is no proper assessment of what happens with existing records. Is there any problem we are trying to solve? Or are we starting completely new category of records?

Mr. Roine – There are many ways to destroy potential record performance, we need to make rules simpler.

Mr. Sheppe – USA is against this proposal due to reasons mentioned by Mr. Georgas and Mr. Roine. On top of that the proposal come from the Committee without anyone asking for it.

The proposal was voted against by a large majority.

8.2.1 a. Y1 SC3 5.5.4 5.5.6 Poland 2019 Std. and 15 Meter Class Merge

[Summary: merger of two classes]

Mr. Rutkowski Introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

He added - There are problems with availability of gliders and we simply have too many classes. Perhaps now is a right time to merge the classes. However, there is one important need to reduce MTOM bellow 500 kg due to insurance costs. The 25 kg above the 500 kg limit puts gliders in heavier category where a more expensive insurance is required. Another reason is that lighter gliders will be also easier to handle.

Discussion:

Dr. Casado – Spain supports the proposal. We have been doing it the same way for a number of years simply because there were not enough gliders in the class.

Mr. Georgas – It would make more sense to merge the standard class into the 15m class.

Mr. Geissler – Germany is completely against the proposal. It addresses both class the definition and competition classes in Annex A. We would like to highlight, that there are many competitive gliders in standard class. It is very competitive and good for juniors and also for women pilots. Standard class was fully booked at the last WGC, as well as the 15m class. The insurance difference is approximately 10 € per year so that is not an issue or it is only minor issue.

Mr. Spreckley – This proposal opens some possibilities, but it also deletes the 15m class. Therefore, UK does not support it. While I like the discussion I do not like the proposal.

Mr. Roine – I do not support the proposal to combine classes. I hate ad-hoc decisions on the competition classes. We need to have a long-term roadmap for these changes because pilots need to be able to prepare and adapt to changes.

Mr. Hansen – I am against the proposal because it does not affect only the class definition, but also the competitions. There is a two-year process for changes of competition classes and a four-year process for changes of class definitions in the sporting code. This creates a confusion.

Mr. Filla - If the aim of the proposal is to reduce the number of competition classes, there are other ways to achieve it.

Mrs. Kuijpers – There were no changes in 15m and standard classes for years. We can start to see them happening now, especially in standard class and also at the Championships in Poland. Most of the national Championships are flown in combined classes. We would need it for that purpose, not necessarily for the EGC and WGC. It could help to develop the handicaps.

Mr. Trimmel (Austria) – in favor of reducing classes, but std. is the only class with affordable competitive gliders,

Mrs. Temple (Australia) – It is difficult to make a decision if we do not have a roadmap. Is there any IGC strategic direction in these matters?

Mr. Rutkowski – I defer the proposal to next IGC plenary meeting.

Proposal has been withdrawn.

8.2.1 b. Y1 SC3 3.0.c IGC 2019 Decouple National & World Records

[Summary: remove prerequisite for World Records]

Mr. Mills introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the Sporting Committee (SC3).

He added - I was involved in its development. There is a requirement that all world records need to be the national records. However, another paragraph allows that national record criteria may deviate from the world record criteria. Some of these deviations are significant. Therefore, we have seen situations that someone has broken the world record, but that performance was not necessarily a national record. The proposal suggests that NACs will be still obliged to check whether the performance meets the Sporting Code requirements, so only the valid claims would reach to FAI.

Discussion:

Mr. Rutkowski – I agrees, but with a reservation. The current procedure in the Sporting Code was introduced for some purpose. What purpose it was?

Dr. Casado – Does the proposal require also approval by the NAC?

Mr. Mills – It was like that before, but such a requirement does not exist anymore. Therefore, we are hanging in the air.

Mr. Georgas – What the term “organizing NAC” means?

Mr. Mills – It is defined in the Sporting Code.

Note: ORGANISING NAC (as defined in the Sporting Code)

The pilot's nationality or residency determines the NAC responsible for issuing them a Sporting Licence, certifying the pilot's achievement and, in the case of a World or Continental record, sending the record claim dossier to the FAI, regardless of where the record attempt took place.

Mr. Bajpai (India) – We would be happy to support the proposal. At home we have several deviations for national records, which could hamper the world record claim.

Proposal was adopted by a clear majority.

8.2.2 Sporting Code Section 3, Annex A (SC3A)

- Y1 SC3A 1.2.3 NED 2019 Maximum Period and Minimum Separation of Events

[Summary: change to event scheduling]

Mrs. Kuijpers introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) by mentioning that its objective that is to structure the schedule so that participation in IGC championships including travel will be always maximum 3 weeks. The reason is that pilots as working people need holidays to participate at championships. The proposal also mandates at least 11 days separation between two championships.

Discussion:

Mr. Frenc (Serbia) – The proposal may be split in two separate proposals, 15 days for the competition period and 11 days for separation between competitions.

Mr. Cubley – The 11 days separation could cause a lot of additional cost for overseas teams.

Mr. Hansen – Do the proposed 11 days encompass also period of official training?

Mr. Foltin – Yes.

Mr. Roine – We should use spare time rather for flying than for repetitive technical check e.g. wing span.

Mr. Geissler – Germany is against the proposal because it does not allow a reserve day. Germany always sends different pilots to different championships and thus does not see a need for change. The current setup suits better.

Mr. Georgas – The proposal has many good points. Major Championships are now scheduled to odd and even years and that may create some scheduling challenges for the IGC. In any case this is a Year-1 proposal that could be still adjusted.

Mr. Kuijpers - [to Mr. Roine] The opening ceremony is often a no flying day. [to Mr. Geissler]. We have experience with reserve day only for class from EGC 2011. The question is when to do the closing ceremony in such cases etc.

Mr. Eriksen – If the proposal gets adopted, we want the discussion to encompass schedule of opening and prize giving ceremonies. For example when a Danish pilot win the title of world champion last year, we had lost a possibility to announce it to media in the evening of last competition day because the results were not yet official due to delayed protest period. It does not make a lot of sense to media people especially when compared with sailing competitions where the winner is announced almost immediately.

Mr. Spreckley – I agree with Mr. Eriksen and totally support what he has said. I table an amendment to delete part c) and c) of the proposal. The amended proposal would then consist only of point a)

The amendment was seconded and the amended proposal was adopted unanimously.

8.2.2.1 Safety

8.2.2.1 a. Y1 SC3A 1.4.2 AUS 2019 Proximity Analysis

[Summary: introduction of Proximity Analysis to competitions]

Mr. Cubley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and supporting document (available [here](#)). He added that stewards are strongly supporting utilizing proximity analysis data. He then explained how the bubble works and when it does not register the incursion. He informed that it is a factual tool, and it will be provided to each Championship and made available to stewards and Championship Director who then can then talk to concerned people. He concluded that in past many pilots were just not aware of their behavior.

Discussion:

Mr. Geissler – Thank you, we see the software tool as very interesting and very good as long as the outcomes are displayed only to stewards and to contest director. However, the tool does not show who caused the infringement, it could be useful to have that information too.

Mr. Hansen – When you ask pilots if they were close, they say no. It is very subjective. The proposal should not be treated as Year-1 and it should be immediately applicable.

Mr. Filla – I support the immediate application of the proposal. [to Mr. Geissler] The infringement cannot be taken individually, but it needs statistical approach (e.g. in case of games). I agree that it not for public use.

Mr. Mozer – If there is a desire by the Plenary to have the proposal applicable immediately, it needs to be amended.

Mr. Eriksen – That may not be necessary if the proposal is need for safety reasons.

Mr. Cubley – The proposal itself states that it would be applicable immediately.

Mr. Georgas – There is no provision requiring incorporation of the proposal in Annex A. Some other proposals were also immediately applicable.

Mr. Bradley (South Africa) – I support the proposal. We have used a similar system during EGC in Lasham. The competitors knew we are looking at their behavior. We could actually do it regardless of the applicability or whether it is Year-1 or Year-2.

Mr. Bjørnevik – I propose to delete the reference to Annex A and change it to “Other” proposal.

Mr. Rutkowski – Could you please explain the proposed amended?

Mr. Cubley – The proposal is to be changed to “Other” proposal and reference to Annex A will be deleted.

Mr. Foltin – It is also possible to keep it as Year-1 proposal and make it immediately applicable, but change to “Other” proposal is also possible.

The amendment was seconded and the amended proposal was adopted unanimously.

Note: The proposal was discussed during Day 1 of the meeting after agenda item 8.2.2.3.

8.2.2.1 b. Y1 SC3A BEL 2019 List of Proposals

[Summary: overview of proposals]

Mr. Pauwels introduced the list of proposals from Belgium (available [here](#)) and presented rationales behind them (presentation available on IGC cloud).

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas – We can see here a number of Year-1 proposals with many details. Are we going to vote on concept or on the details?

Mr. Roine – Some improvements are possible already under the current rules. For example the finish ring radius could be adjusted in local procedures. Regarding the starting options, we will not achieve the objective by simply moving from start line to start circle. There is also a good Year-2 proposal on starting from Belgium allowing for use of event marker during start.

Mr. Spreckley – We will not vote on all individual proposals, we will vote whether we like or not like the idea behind them.

Mr. Rutkowski – I have a few technical questions. How will the proposal look like as Year-2 proposal? Will it be submitted as a single proposal or broken in separate proposals?

Mr. Spreckley – My advice it that it should be submitted as a single composite proposal. The UK supports principle to start discussion about new task.

Mrs. Kuijpers – This proposal may also affect live scoring that we aim to develop.

The proposals (see the note below) have been lost by a narrow majority.

Notes: The previous vote concerned the proposals from Belgium listed under agenda items 8.2.2.5, 8.2.2.6 a., 8.2.2.6 b., 8.2.2.6 c., 8.2.2.7 a., 8.2.2.7 b., 8.2.2.7 c., 8.2.2.8 b., 8.2.2.8 c., 8.2.2.8 d., 8.2.2.10 that were subsequently withdrawn.

The subsequent proposals in the agenda were discussed on Day 2.

8.2.2.1 c. Y1 SC3A POL 2019 Sailplane Rules of the Air

[Summary: additional rules of the air for gliding competitions]

Mr. Rutkowski presented the list of all Year-1 proposals from Poland (presentation available on IGC cloud). Then he introduced the proposal 8.2.2.1 c. (available [here](#)) and added that ICAO rules are not fully developed for gliding, therefore this proposal. He concluded that Poland introduced rules of the air for sailplanes and that proposed rules could be also a reference for application of penalty for dangerous flying or for not adhering to rules.

Discussion:

Mr. Foltin – There may be conflicting requirements between IGC rules and national rules. The ICAO does not mandate the rules but leaves to the States to transpose ICAO standards into national regulations.

Mrs. Kuijpers – We are trying to do rules for good airmanship, even in EASA there could be a principle and not always the rule.

Mr. Cernezzi – I support the idea but the competition director has difficulty to apply penalties. However, I have concerns about statement in the proposal that there are more accidents in FLARM era.

Mr. Pauwels – I support what was said by Mr. Foltin. Let's use common sense and not try to regulate everything.

Mr. Roine – I support the proposal. We are not creating legislation. It is more about how we behave, some pilots fly really dangerously. We do not always need to set rules how to fly. For example opposite circling is dangerous, but it may not be necessarily against the law.

Mr. Filla – That was exactly what I wanted to point out, we can achieve it e.g. through changes in penalty list.

Mr. Vidal – The proposal seems relevant from safety point of view therefore, if there is anything safety relevant please share it with the safety working group.

Mr. Foltin – I support the approach as proposed by Mr. Filla. We should elaborate more detailed list of penalties or guidance to pilots on airmanship.

Mr. Koutny (Czech Rep.) – We should state how competitors should behave.

Mr. Rutkowski – I can agree with the argument about the conflicts with law. For example ICAO Annex 2 is also not directly applicable. We could put a phrase in the rules stating that local rules apply or set complementary rules. I can also agree with a guidance material containing examples how to adhere to rules.

Mr. Foltin – I think that a code of conduct for pilots and more detailed list of penalties could be the right way forward. However, the amount of work on such materials would be substantial and it would require broad participation.

Mr. Spreckley – I can support what Mr. Foltin said. I did code of conduct for club class in the UK and it was well received.

The proposal was lost, but the safety working group will take it into account in their work.

8.2.2.1 d. Y1 SC3A 1.4.2 NED 2019 Digital Safety Registration System

[Summary: requirements for safety event reporting]

Mrs. Kuijpers introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that at this time it would be too early to say that every competition has to use it. She concluded by saying that now is the right time to get rid of physical paper-based safety box and make it digital.

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – Sweden is very much in favor of the idea but is wondering why we need a proposal.

Mrs. Kuijpers – We have encountered problem last year when trying to mandate digital safety box through Local Procedures, but that turned to be difficult because there was no such a reflection in the sporting code.

Mr. Trimmel – The rule says “shall” and that means it is mandatory.

Mr. Cubley – We have tried by asking Competition Directors nicely, but they have said no because it is additional work for the organizers. Therefore, we need to make the digital system mandatory.

Mr. Hansen – I have an issue with the proposed wording referring only to ‘organizers’. If I recall it correctly, at stewards meeting it was said that the system shall be made available to pilots, team captains and also other team members.

Mr. Vidal – From safety working group perspective the proposal should be immediately applicable.

Mr. Geissler – Who is owner of the system? It should be FAI or IGC. At the moment the only available system is in Netherlands. How it will work and how it will be administered?

Mrs. Kuijpers – The discussion is about digital registration system not the Flytool software applications. Furthermore, this is Year-1 proposal that will be further developed before being submitted as Year-2 proposal.

Mrs. Vigorito – I have heard that IGC wants to use it immediately. The first contest is in two months, but the discussions at FAI can take much longer.

Mr. Mozer – The Year-1 proposal states that the digital system will be used sometime in the future, but it does not forbid its voluntary use.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

Note: Agenda items 8.2.2.2 and 8.2.2.3 has been dealt with on Day 1.

8.2.2.2 Procedures for use of FLARM and OGN

- Y1 SC3A 4.1.1 BEL 2019 Use of FLARM and OGN

[Summary: free configuration of FLARM]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn.

8.2.2.3 External Aid to Competitors

8.2.2.3 a. Y1 SC3A 5.3 BEL 2019 External Aid to Competitors

Note: This proposal has been processed after proposal 8.2.2.3 b.

[Summary: enforcement of external aid rule]

Mr. Pauwels – I would like to make a plea to all organizers to take care of this matter during Championships.

Following adoption of proposal 8.2.2.3 b the proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn.

8.2.2.3 b. Y1 SC3A 5.3 GBR 2019 External Aid to Competitors

Note: This proposal has been processed before the previous proposal 8.2.2.3 a.

[Summary: disallow inflight use of mobile devices and internet]

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and explained the rationale behind it. He added – We should think about the pilot’s attention and workload in the cockpit. The information available from the collision in Hosin strongly suggests that looking at the display could have been the factor. We are not in an environment where cheating is allowed. The pilots watch other pilots and our community is law abiding. This proposal is a simple proposition that could stop the information on internet to influence our contests.

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas – I have a question about last sentence in the proposal, “*Use of data not available in the public domain by competing pilots will be considered to be cheating.*” What if a private meteorologist will give me a private advice just before take-off?

Mr. Spreckley – This comment is partially right, but this proposal is designed not to allow OGN hacking, e.g. by decoding stolen FLARM data and retransmitting it to another pilot, which means not respecting wish of other pilots who do not want to be tracked.

Mr. Filla – We need experts to find a right wording.

Mr. Mozer – This is a Year-1 proposal when we are voting about concept. The final wording in sporting code will be drafted by Annex A committee.

Mr. Frenc – The limiting of devices like mobile phones is difficult. These are often used for e.g. weather radar or for connecting in case of outlanding.

Mr. Vidal - From safety point of view I can see the positives in reducing pilots’ workload.

Mr. Rutkowski – What is meant by “mobile device”? Another question is, what if pilot will use software with data that are not in the public domain?

Mr. Spreckley – The term “mobile device” is perhaps not very appropriate, this point is taken. Regarding the data, any data available out there are allowed.

Mr. Rutkowski – I suggest to clarify it in an amendment.

Mr. Mozer – The vote is about the principle. This is a Year-1 proposal that does not require exact wording.

The proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

8.2.2.4 Starting

8.2.2.4 a. Y1 SC3A 7 POL 2019 Event Marker

[Summary: use of event marker for starts]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that more details will be presented in Year-2 proposal.

Mr. Mozer suggested to discuss all four proposals under 8.2.2.4 together.

Mr. Pauwels – Belgium supports the idea of discussing all start procedure proposals together.

Mr. Toselli (Argentina) - We supports the proposed approach.

Mr. Cubley – Australia also agrees with the proposed approach, including a big single vote on the principles presented in all four proposals.

Mr. Rutkowski – I suggest to vote on Polish proposal as that one is the most generic. Polish proposal would then incorporate all ideas from other proposals when submitting it as a Year-2 proposal.

Mr. Hansen – This is supported by Denmark.

Mr. Gerbaud (France) – One of the issues is the start. The gaggles happen mostly at the start. The question is if approved flight recorders support the event marking function.

Dr. Casado – All approved flight recorders should have the event marker function because it included in IGC technical specifications.

Mr. Georgas – I can sense that most delegates want this proposal to go forward. There however may not be a complete agreement so there should be more than one option, if it will be needed.

Mr. Vidal – On one hand there is reason of safety, but on other hand there is no evidence presented how it would affect the pilots.

Mr. Filla – The event marker function is not required by the rules now, although probably all flight recorders have it. Think about two flight recorders, how one can be sure that pilots will not press the event marker at different times?

Mr. Koutny (Czech Rep.) – It may be dangerous to take away pilot's attention during a difficult period of starting.

Mr. Spreckley – Regarding the pilot's workload, the starting is really a difficult period, the procedure to make this proposal work is critical and therefore the safety and stewards working groups need to be involved. The second issue is the use of multiple flight recorders. We need to ensure that this is not unsafe to pilots.

Mr. Rutkowski – There is a way to address the issue of two flight recorders. I also agree with the involvement of safety and stewards working groups. If the Polish proposal is accepted, others may join to work towards a joint approach to be presented as a Year-2 proposal.

Following the discussion a vote on individual proposal 8.2.2.4 a. took place.

The proposal was adopted by a clear majority.

Note: Poland will establish a working group composed of Belgium, Argentina, Australia, stewards and safety working groups, which would consider ideas proposed in other proposals reflected under agenda item 8.2.2.4 for development of Year-2 proposal.

8.2.2.4 b. Y1 SC3A 7.4 BEL 2019 Starting

[Summary: changes to start geometry, procedures]

Mr. Pauwels requested the vote on this Belgian proposal (available [here](#)).

The proposal has been lost by a narrow majority.

8.2.2.4 c. Y1 SC3A 7.4.1 ARG 2019 Start Procedures

[Summary: use of event marker for starts]

Mr. Toselli briefly introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and expressed will to be part of joint working group.

The proposal has been subsequently withdrawn.

8.2.2.4 d. Y1 SC3A 7.4.2 AUS 2019 Pilot Event Marker

[Summary: use of event marker for starts]

Mr. Cubley briefly introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and expressed will to be part of joint working group.

The proposal has been subsequently withdrawn.

8.2.2.5 New Turn Point Definition

- Y1 SC3A 7.5.1 BEL 2019 Turn Point Definition

[Summary: distance credit within turn point circle]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.2.2.6 Deletion of finish line option and compulsory use of finish ring

- 8.2.2.6 a. Y1 SC3A 7.7 BEL 2019 Finishing

[Summary: change to finish geometry and procedures]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

- 8.2.2.6 b. Y1 SC3A 8.2.3 BEL 2019 Finisher

[Summary: change to wording]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been lost in a narrow majority (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

- 8.2.2.6 c. Y1 SC3A Part 11 BEL 2019 Local Procedures Content

[Summary: change to wording]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.2.2.7 Mandatory submission of all flight recorder files

[Summary: require all log files in case of use of multiple flight recorders]

- 8.2.2.7 a. Y1 SC3A 5.4 BEL 2019 Control Procedures

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

- 8.2.2.7 b. Y1 SC3A 7.10 BEL 2019 Flight Documentation

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.2.2.8 New Tasks

- 8.2.2.8 a. Y1 SC3A 6.2 AUS 2019 Distance Handicap Task

[Summary: new method of applying handicaps]

Mr. Cubley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that it allows for setting a fixed task in handicapped competitions.

Discussion:

Mr. Geissler – The system may work in places with homogeneous landscape like Australia but it may not work elsewhere.

Mrs. Kuijpers – We have used it in the past and pilots liked it. We need it as an option in our rules.

Mr. Gerbaud – I have my personal experience with the system 10 years ago. The difference in distance was 7 to 10 km. It was a very exciting and interesting experience. It works well in case the difference in distances is not too big, but it could be a problem in mountains.

Mr. Sabeckis – We have tried it in our nationals and it was not a successful trial because pilots do not have to fly in the same region. A shower in part of the turn point could be a problem.

Mr. Bjørnevik – We have used it for many years even in mountains with very good results.

Mr. Spreckley – UK does not have the conditions like in Australia and we use the system. It even became our standard system for club class. We encourage the IGC to use it too.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

8.2.2.8 b. Y1 SC3A 6.2 BEL 2019 Task Definitions

[Summary: proposed new tasks]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.2.2.8 c. Y1 SC3A 6.3.1 BEL 2019 New Racing Task

[Summary: racing task with distance credit within turn point circles]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.2.2.8 d. Y1 SC3A 6.3.2 BEL 2019 New Assigned Area Task

[Summary: accounting of start/finish heights in distance credit]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.2.2.9 New or Changed Scoring

8.2.2.9 a. Y1 SC3A 7.4 GBR 2019 Early Bird Bonus

[Summary: incentives for starting earlier]

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that the vote will be on the principle and that details will be developed for Year-2 proposal.

Discussion:

Mr. Bjørnevik – Is this proposal early bird bonus or late bird penalty?

Mr. Spreckley – This proposal introduces a principle if we want to award pilots who start early. The implementing details will be developed later.

The proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

8.2.2.9 b. Y1 SC3A 8.1 AUS 2019 Place Scoring System

[Summary: reintroduction of place scoring]

Mr. Cubley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that currently there is no incentive to leave up front and to take sporting risk. The Sailplane Grand Prix demonstrated that taking risk helps in getting better results.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

8.2.2.9 c. Y1 SC3A 8.2.2 AUS 2019 Early Bird Bonus Points

[Summary: incentives for starting earlier]

Mr. Cubley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

The proposal has been adopted automatically by adoption of the proposal 8.2.2.9 a.

8.2.2.9 d. Y1 SC3A 8.3.1 8.4.1 8.4.2 POL 2019 Highest Handicapped Distance Calculation

[Summary: new method of calculating credited distance]

Mr. Rutkowski briefly introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – Sweden does not support this proposal.

The proposal has been lost by a clear majority.

8.2.2.9 e. Y1 SC3A 8.3.1 8.4.1 8.4.2 POL 2019 New Championship Days Parameters

[Summary: new or modified scoring parameters]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – The set of Polish proposals is not very consistent. This proposal devaluates distance and another proposal tries to improve distance points. Next year we may have problem how that fits the overall scoring system.

Mr. Rutkowski – I do not see the contradiction. The idea is to have quicker results and winners and this proposal goes in that direction.

Mr. Filla – I do not oppose the idea of quicker results, but I oppose the way it is proposed.

The proposal has been lost by a clear majority.

8.2.2.9 f. Y1 SC3A 8.3.1 POL 2019 Finisher Marking Time Calculation

[Summary: change of credited time in speed task via assigned areas]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)).

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – This proposal is for situation like if someone came home too early, but for that we do not need to change the rule because the problem is undersetting of the task.

Mr. Cernezzi – Personally, I am in favor of this proposal. Sometimes it may help to make a 1000-point day. On another hand, as a competition director I sometimes want to avoid thunderstorms in the afternoon so I set a shorter task. The current rule does not encourage that.

Mr. Sheppe – The question is whether we want to calculate only speed or distance and speed point in Assigned Area Tasks. This aspect would be worth of looking at when preparing Year-2 proposal.

The proposal has been adopted by a narrow majority.

8.2.2.9 g. Y1 SC3A 8.3.2 IGC 2019 Distance Assigned Area Task

[Summary: modification of speed task via assigned areas to give more points for distance]

Mr Spreckley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that it intends to change distance calculation of assigned area task only for open class. It is currently defined by a finisher who has flown longest distance and not by the pilot flying furthest distance from all pilots who started. It means that everybody who finishes gets the same points. The magic of open class should be to fly longest distance. That is the essence of this Year-1 proposal.

Discussion:

Dr. Casado – That means the proposal is encouraging longer tasks, but if competition director wants that pilots are home by 6PM they may be still flying far away.

Mr. Sheppe – I have the same comment as Dr. Casado.

Mr. Trimmel – I am in favor of this proposal. Why to limit it only to open class?

Mr. Filla – It should not be limited to open class. I second the notion of Mr. Trimmel.

Mr. Rutkowski – I am support. The proposal is in line what Poland has proposed before. It makes sense to set distance tasks.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

8.2.2.9 h. Y1 SC3A 8.4 ARG 2019 Scoring with 95% of the total distance

[Summary: to compensate for speed task via assigned areas with not enough available distance]

Mr. Toselli introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that the scoring has been used at in Argentina for quite some time.

Discussion:

Mr. Cubley – We also use it in Australia very successfully after someone came too early one day, but we do apply it differently. We change task time to a one, which fits the shortest distance.

Mr. Filla - We should perhaps go for time unlimited assigned area task.

Mr. Rutkowski – This proposal is to help to fit the task to weather. It helps competition director to decide better in situation of uncertain weather. I am very much in favor of this proposal.

Mr. Sheppe – We tried it and retracted back. The pilots complained that they have to think too much. Also, the proposal tries to resolve the problem of wrong task setting, which is impossible to resolve.

Mr. Roine – I am afraid it would not work in practice, but I am still in favor in spite of that.

Mr. Bjørnevik – We have had situation when two pilots have flown the maximum possible distance, but they still came home before the minimum time.

Mr. Rutkowski – Do we need to set exactly 95%? We should leave it open for consideration for Year-2 proposal.

The proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

8.2.2.9 i. Y1 SC3A 8.4 POL 2019 Handicapped Distance Calculation

[Summary: new scoring system for handicapped competitions]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that if someone is looking at the formula the proposal may not be that clear. It is about calculating distance and speed scores independently and sum them up only after the calculation. We would get rid of anomaly when point per km is changing.

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – Yesterday when I was looking at it I have noticed that it is a consequence of encouraging certain minimum flown distance. The anomaly is not strange, as it is the consequence of intention. This is a completely new system.

Mr. Koutny – Today there were many small ideas presented to change the current system, but I am missing a big picture, thus I am not in favor.

Mr. Vidal – What about the impact of this proposal on the Ranking List?

Mr. Filla – I have no clear idea. It looks like 1% would be always the same value, but I am not certain.

The proposal has been lost by a clear majority.

8.2.2.9 j. Y1 SC3A 8.4 POL 2019 Minimum Bonus Guarantee for Finishers

[Summary: bonus for finishing]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and reminded that the principle behind it that is to give incentive for pilots who try to initiate flight earlier than gaggle i.e. those who are taking more risk. The winner has a guarantee at least 100 points bonus if finishing the task.

Discussion:

Mr. Roine – I have trouble with such a safety incentive, it is not a good thing. The idea is wrong because in the end it will award the gaggle, which will always get home, not the single pilot.

Mr. Filla – It is good that other proposals from Poland did not carry on, because this one would be in a direct conflict with them. Also, I agree with Mr. Roine that this proposal is a wrong idea.

The proposal has been lost by a clear majority.

8.2.2.9 k. Y1 SC3A 8.3.1 8.4.1 8.4.2 POL 2019 Longer vs Shorter Task Scoring

[Summary: scoring formula depends on length of task]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and highlighted that in this proposal every minute counts.

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas – I can agree with the principle, but we have just voted for a proposal, which achieves the same in a simpler way.

Mr. Filla – I was about to say the same. I am against this proposal. It raises a good point, but I am not intrigued enough to vote for it.

Mr. Roine – I have made a simple study to calculate the margin. The results were totally opposite to what I see here in this proposal, but the sample was only from a few contests.

Mr. Sheppe – I have analyzed it and I realized that in all racing rules we have a choice of what to score. Currently in 1000-point system it is speed, in Sailplane Grand Prix it is place. This one is mathematically equivalent to elapsed time scoring. As a result we would have two blends at our championships, speed scoring and elapsed time scoring.

The proposal has been lost by a large majority.

8.2.2.10 Additional penalties

- Y1 SC3A 8.7 BEL 2019 List of Penalties

[Summary: changes to list of approved penalties]

The proposal (available [here](#)) has been withdrawn (see 8.2.2.1 b.)

8.3 Other Proposals

8.3.1 Introduction of Club Class World Gliding Cup

8.3.1 a. OTH IGC Calendar POL 2019 Club Class World Gliding Cup

[Summary: new type of World Gliding Championships]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that club class WGC are typically oversubscribed. We should set another opportunity for the old club class gliders that would be equivalent to level of WGC (CAT1), but it would be outside WGC events.

Discussion:

Mr. Filla – Will the WGC for club class discontinued? It would be always another event that will need to be organized, but the idea is good in general.

Mr. Georgas – It is a good idea and it mirrors the positive experience in SGP. Who would run it? Is there a need for specific team to run it?

Mr. Gessler – As chair of handicap sub-committee, I would like to clarify that index list has been modified to accommodate newer gliders. The reason presented here, that the old club class gliders are not good anymore for the club class championships, is not fully valid.

Mr. Spreckley – There is a quite good spirit in this proposal, but it also opens many questions like the one that we would still have club class WGC, but in a different format. The current WGC would need to still be organized, but with one class less.

Mr. Roine – I would like to thank to Mr. Spreckley for his input. I just wanted to say the same.

The proposal has been lost by a large majority.

8.3.1 b. OTH IGC Calendar POL 2019 IGC Championships Calendar

[Summary: reorganization of IGC championships calendar]

Mr. Rutkowski introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added this proposal is linked to the proposal that was just lost. He used the opportunity to remind the delegates that 13.5 meter class World Gliding Championships in 2019 would be the last one in this class. He suggested to start discussion on the calendar to incorporate all championship classes.

Discussion:

Mr. Mozer – All competitions related to the previous calendar would disappear. The proposal also removes the current club class WGC. Also, it is in conflict in our current calendar adopted recently.

Mr. Filla – Apart of that, there is a typo (2m class instead of 20m). Nevertheless, there is also good point, there should be some review of our calendar in the longer term.

Mr. Rutkowski – We missed out the 13.5-meter class and we need to find solution.

IGC Secretary clarified that the 13.5-meter class is still eligible as WGC class if there will be a proposal, despite it is not in the championship calendar.

The proposal has been subsequently withdrawn.

8.3.2 IGC defined WWGC classes

- OTH IGC Calendar DEU 2019 WWGC classes

[Summary: specification of classes at Women World Gliding Championships]

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that the request concerns the Women WGC beyond 2024. Germany would like to have clarification of the classes in order to have a confidence in qualification process e.g. merging of standard & 15m classes.

Discussion:

Mr. Cubley – I prefer to leave it to countries to decide in which classes they want to organize the Women WGC. That information is available three years in advance.

Mr. Koutny – There is no reason not to have three classes at the Women WGC.

Mr. Spreckley – I agree with Mr. Geissler. The women pilots need to know in advance which gliders to choose to prepare for the WGC.

Mrs. Kuijpers – to Mr. Koutny: The decision to reduce the classes to two was because we could not reach the minimum number of pilots required for class. Also the woman pilots say they do not like to compete in such a small class. Mr. Spreckley wants to start the discussion which class to choose. I do not agree to start the discussion now. The standard class is much more available than 15m class. I have a question, who will decide about the class and how it will be decided?

Mr. Koutny – There are some countries that will lose three places for pilots at Women WGC. The proposal has been lost by a narrow majority.

8.3.3 Requirement for Delayed Time Tracking

- OTH Local Procedures GBR 2019 Delayed Time Tracking

Note: The proposal was discussed on Day 1.

[Summary: tracking to be controlled by organizers]

Mr. Spreckley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added that if organizers want to have live tracking, they will need to have it from IGC. The requirement would need to be reflected also in bid document and in Organizer's Agreement.

Discussion:

Mr. Georgas – I have a simple question: What is meant by “a secure data source”?

Dr. Casado – Essentially these are the data of which the IGC has total control. It could be through encryption or by using GSM channel because it has its own security mechanism.

Mr. Georgas – Will the final wording clarify that? We need to clarify a bit further I think.

Mr. Spreckley – The SGP tracking has a complete control of data.

Mr. Georgas – More explanation about these aspects will avoid future problems.

Mr. Spreckley – This is another proposal that is applicable immediately.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

8.3.4 Procedures for insertion and correction of competition results

- OTH SC3D 4.2 IGC 2019 Competition Results

[Summary: new deadlines for submissions to IGC Ranking List]

Mr. Filla introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) through a presentation (available on IGC cloud).

Discussion:

Mr. Bradley – I support hard deadlines for the Ranking List. The missing results create a lot of problems for us in South Africa, because we use the Ranking List for our team selection.

The proposal has been unanimously accepted.

8.3.5 Pilot's rating score calculation for Two Seat glider entries

- OTH SC3D 5.6 IGC 2019 Pilot's Rating Score

[Summary: declaration of pilot to whom the ranking score shall be attributed]

Mr. Filla introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) through a presentation (available on IGC cloud).

Discussion:

Mr. Geissler – I would like to get a clear understanding of the Ranking List. We in Germany do not want to distinguish Pilot 1 and Pilot 2. In our view it is a team of equal pilots, so they should not be differentiated.

Mr. Filla – This proposal is a minor technical thing. The pilots will always be distinguished. Now the result goes automatically to Pilot 1. The Pilot in Command concept does not suit as they are equal competitors.

Mr. Koutny – I like the proposal. There is always difference in pilots' performances. I want to know the date, from which the proposal will apply.

Mr. Spreckley – Some time ago this plenum decided about the two-seat class. Mr. Filla is trying to implement that decision.

The proposal has been adopted unanimously.

9. Elections of Officers

Note: All officers were elected for two years.

Mr. Eric Mozer from the USA was re-elected as President of IGC by acclamation.

Mr. Brian Spreckley from the UK was re-elected as 1st Vice-President of IGC by acclamation.

The following Delegates were elected as Vice-Presidents of IGC:

Dr. Angel Casado, Spain

Mr. Aldo Cernezzi, Italy

Mr. Christof Geissler, Germany

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers, Netherlands

Mr. Rene Vidal, Chile

Mr. Vladimir Foltin from Slovakia was re-elected as IGC Secretary by acclamation.

Mr. Dick Bradley from South Africa was re-elected as IGC Treasury by acclamation.

9. Votes on bids

9.1 37th FAI World Gliding Championships 2022 (Club, Std., 15m Classes)

The Championships were awarded to Australia by acclamation.

9.2 12th FAI Women's World Gliding Championship 2022 (two classes)

The Championships were awarded to Spain.

Dr. Casado expressed his gratitude to IGC Plenary and concluded that the organizers will try their best to organize great event

9. IGC awards

9.1 Lilienthal Medal

The Lilienthal Medal was awarded to Mr. Dick Bradley from South Africa.

9.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma

The Pirat Gehriger Diploma was awarded to Dr. Angel Casado from Spain.

9.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal

Not awarded.

11. 2020 IGC Plenary Meeting

The IGC Plenary authorized the Bureau to decide the venue for IGC Plenary 2020 taking into consideration potential offers received from the delegates before June 2019. The meeting will take place on 6 – 7 March 2020. Bureau will seek to avoid conflict with the dates of the EGU meeting.

Post meeting note: IGC Bureau decided that Budapest, Hungary will be the venue for 2020 IGC Plenary.

IGC Secretary informed the IGC Plenary about important deadlines for the 2020 IGC Plenary:

Notification of proposals and bids to the Bureau and/or the Bid Specialist: 30 September 2019

Final Bids: 31 December 2019

Proposals, nominations and reports: 31 December 2019

All material available for delegates: latest 45 days before next IGC Plenary

12. AOB

12.1 Approval of expenditure for IGC tracking system

Mr. Spreckley introduced the following proposal:

The IGC Plenary is requested to approve budget of 20.000€ for design, development and procurement of IGC owned glider tracking system for use in WGC's. Standards for the system are still to be determined but will focus on safety, fairness and transparency.

Discussion:

Dr. Casado – The research has been already completed and it was for free to support the IGC. The proposed tracking system could be used also for other air sports and the project is supported by FAI office.

Ms. Schödel – There is a limited communication between air sports on this matter and the FAI would like to encourage broader use of systems across the air sports.

Mr. Bjørnevik – How many units would be built?

Dr. Casado – The initial batch is 25 units. These will be tested at next SGP final in Cerdanya. The next step is to produce more than 50 units so to have also spare trackers.

Mr. Spreckley – The SGP trackers are financed by the organizers and not by this project, which we need to start early.

Mr. Hansen – I would like to suggest that IGC offers the trackers to other air sports so to decrease cost and to get some income for IGC.

Mr. Cubley – Is there a cost estimate?

Mr. Mozer – The proposal was to allocate up to 20.000€ for this project.

Mr. Vidal – To Dr. Casado: You have said earlier that the future is in telemetry. Could you please elaborate more on that? Could it be used also by other sports?

Dr. Casado – We call it tracker, but from engineering point of view it is telemetry.

Mr. Mozer – What type of data you could get from the system?

Dr. Casado – We can get all kinds of flight parameters, like e.g. angle of attack, FLARM warnings or the status of battery. What may evolve in future is the transmission channel.

Mr. Filla – This is an incredible piece of engineering and I am truly astonished. Well done to the team! There is no reason not to approve the spending.

Mr. Vidal – The spending should be understood as not for one year, but for several years.

The spending has been unanimously approved.

12.2 Approval of expenditure for technical support for e-Concept event in Pavullo

Mr. Mozer introduced the topic.

The IGC Plenary is requested to approve budget of 2.000€ for technical support for e-concept event in Pavullo

Discussion:

Mr. Spreckley – There are no clear plans about e-Concept future yet. We need to see how it will develop. If successful and we would need some technical help we will need some travel costs to be reimbursed

The spending has been unanimously approved.

12.3 Future flight recording (ANDS & GFA Committees)

- AOB - Future Flight Recording

Mr. Strachan presented the project (presentation available on IGC cloud) that is based on the concept paper prepared by IGC ANDS and GFA committees (available [here](#)).

Discussion:

Mr. Mozer – I would like to thank the gentleman who contributed to this work for their dedication. This is something crucial for the FAI.

- The proposal to organize 13.5-meter WGC in 2021

Mr. Sabeckis asked about a possibility to organize 13.5-meter WGC along EGC 2021 in Lithuania.

Mr. Mozer informed that the Plenary authorized the IGC Bureau to make a decision when the bid arrives.

13. Late proposal

13.2 Designated Start (Australia)

- Y1 SC3A 7.4.2 AUS 2019 Designated Start - late proposal

This late proposal has been accepted for discussion by 2/3 majority vote.

[Summary: additional interval during starting]

Mr. Cubley introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added it tries to regulate a designated start.

Discussion:

Mr. Sabeckis – We may create gaggles by this proposal instead of reducing them.

Mr. Spreckley – I agree with the proposal. We used it in France and we had a very good experience. It really reduces the gaggles. A 5 min interval may improve flexibility of current rule.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority. It will be applicable immediately.

14. Closure (Eric Mozer)

Mr. Mogen Hansen from Denmark stepped down as IGC Delegate after outstanding 45 years of service to international gliding. He made a plea to the IGC continue in the same spirit as he has seen during those many years.

Mr. Cubley and Mr. Bradley also announced they are stepping down as IGC Delegates. Both thanked IGC friends for great years spent on development of beautiful sport of gliding.

Mr. Mozer, the IGC President, expressed his gratitude and thanked to all three gentlemen for their service to international gliding. He also thanked Ms. Susanne Schödel, the FAI Secretary General and Mr. Jean-Claude Weber, the FAI Vice-President for their participation and contributions to the 2019 IGC Plenary meeting.

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

Vladimir Foltin, IGC Secretary



Fédération Aéronautique Internationale
Avenue de Rhodanie 54
CH-1007 Lausanne
Switzerland
Tel: +41 21 345 10 70
Fax: +41 21 345 10 77
www.fai.org
info@fai.org

Appendix A IGC Committees and Working Groups, Representatives and Specialists

Committee	Chair
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
ANDS:	Rick Sheppe
Championship Management:	Peter Eriksen
GFAC:	Ian Strachan
Working Group Chairs:	Chair
Country Development:	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
IGC Representatives	
CASI:	To be appointed
EGU:	Patrick Pauwels
Environmental Comm.:	To be appointed
Medical Commission:	Jürgen Knüppel
Specialist Officers	
Sailplane Grand Prix:	Brian Spreckley
Trophy Management:	Gisela Weinreich
OLC:	Christof Geissler
Youth Gliding	Nina Shalneva