



**FÉDÉRATION AÉRONAUTIQUE
INTERNATIONALE
INTERNATIONAL GLIDING COMMISSION**

Avenue Mon Repos 24, 1005 LAUSANNE, SUISSE
Tel: +41 21 345 1070
Email : SEC@FAI.ORG
Fax: +41 21 345 1077

**Minutes of the FAI/IGC Plenary meeting
Lausanne 2nd – 3rd March 2007**

Note: The agenda together with all reports, documents and proposals referred to in this report can be found on the FAI web www.fai.org/gliding/meetings

1. Opening

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

1.1 Roll Calls

FAI Secretary General Max Bishop called the roll of the meeting. It was determined that 29 votes were present, 1 proxy from Kenya to UK totalling 30 thus, 16 votes would be required for an absolute majority on any ballot and 21 for a 2/3rds majority. Portugal and Norway arrived during the morning, making the total number votes 32. 17 votes now required for absolute majority, 22 votes for 2/3rds majority.

The FAI General Secretary again called the roll in the beginning of the second day, the 3rd March. Members and proxies present totalled 33, absolute majority 17; 2/3rds majority 22.

Apologies were received from the Swiss Delegate and the Latvian Delegate, they were both represented by their alternates. The Secretary of Honour Fred Weinholz and Mr. John Roake had likewise informed the meeting that they could not be present.

The President noted that a couple of late proposals had been received after the Agenda close-off date and stated that according to the FAI By-laws these proposals would need a 2/3rds majority to be accepted for discussion.

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

2. Minutes of previous meeting, Lausanne 3rd and 4th March 2006

The IGC Secretary Peter Eriksen presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Lausanne 3rd and 4th March 2006, and noted some minor editorial modifications from Mr Tor Johannessen.

The minutes were adopted without further comments.

3. FAI Matters

The FAI Secretary General reported that the main event in 2006 had been the FAI General Conference in Santiago, a marvellous place for glider flying. The conference had been a great success.

Several important discussions took place at the meeting. The launch of bidding for 2009 World Air Games (WAG). A professional consulting company had helped developing the new concept, which has nothing to do with previous WAG. The new concept is a concentrated media type event, with serious competition on one main site.

Five bids had been received, all capable of doing the job, and with good backing from local authorities. Site visits will now be conducted at the five locations. The confirmation of the successful site will take place on the 1st June following final presentations to FAI Executive Board and Air Sports Presidents including Bob Henderson. A parachutist will land with the name of the organiser in front of the Olympic Museum.

FAI has received several new members; in particular Asian membership is exploding, Mr Bishop advised the IGC to focus on the possible scope for growth in the Asian region.

Two resolutions were adopted at the General Conference; one on airspace and one dealing with language proficiency. The first is to position FAI with respect to airspace questions, the second is due to the ICAO recommendation that requires pilots to have Level 4 language proficiency when flying outside their own country, something that will cause problems for many pilots.

A new FAI medal was instituted, the FAI Silver Medal, to reward people devoting lifetimes in administrative positions within air sports.

A new Executive Board was elected with 3 current and 3 new members.

An FAI Member Survey was carried out last year and is published on the FAI web site. The survey showed that big amounts of government subsidy are still provided to many of the FAI member organisations.

The ATMOS project was launched. A brief e-mail had been sent out to the IGC delegates before the meeting. This project has caused some discussion in the gliding world, as it was seen as a competitor to already existing on-line contests. The Secretary General acknowledged that he had not communicated well enough on this subject. A presentation and discussion on ATMOS was planned for later in the meeting

Mr Henderson thanked the Secretary General for the update, and acknowledged the good support given to IGC from the FAI office.

4. IGC President's report

Mr Henderson referred to the report circulated before the meeting and added:

“The Grand Prix Final has run into difficulties, this has occupied much of the Bureau's time.

A number of activities related to Championship Management and Quality have been undertaken, and we are starting to see the results of this. The first meeting with the IGC Chief Stewards was held just before the IGC plenary convened. This meeting resulted in a broad support from the Stewards to the actions undertaken by the Bureau, and the way forward towards improved quality of competitions.

For the first time we have received a bid request to hold a Continental Championship in South America. The Bureau will work closely with the organisers to assure that sufficient expertise and know-how is made available to have a high quality competition.

Discussions with OSTIV to undertake the maintenance of the IGC Handicap List, possibly with the support from a university, are ongoing.

The Australian Delegate Terry Cubley noted that this could not be done from an academic approach only, but required consideration of other factors also.

That was agreed by the President.

Mr Henderson continued: “The fall-out from the Husbands Bosworth accident is another important issue. FAI has had the chance to comment on the draft report. These comments have been taken into consideration by the British authorities. The impression we have is that the author has done a good job in analysing the causes of the accident.

One of the recommendations stated that:

- The IGC should, through national gliding associations, require competition team coaches to include techniques for the safe conduct of race finishes within their coaching sessions.

The main recommendations to the organizers and to the British Gliding Association (BGA) are:

- Regardless of the position of any finish line, glider approaches towards the airfield should prescribe a descending flight profile (other than to go-around where necessary), and;
- During the approach the landing area should be in the pilots sight, and;
- The approach should cross the airfield boundary at a height which cannot endanger persons (seen or unseen), vessels, vehicles or structures

The IGC Bureau now intends to send a formal letter to national gliding associations endorsing the BGA requirements, to review Annex A in order to adopt the BGA requirements immediately and to include this in notes to Stewards and Contest Directors and to provide a definition of “hazardous flying” in Annex A.

I ask the delegates to take these recommendations with you back home. The fact that BGA and IGC have responded promptly to recommendations after this accident has been recognised by the British authorities.

BGA will make their material available to other gliding federations through IGC.

There were no further comments to the President’s report, which was accepted unanimously.

5. Finance 2006 report

The IGC Treasurer Dick Bradley presented the 2006 Finance Report and 2007 budget, which are attached to these minutes as Appendix A.

He explained that we now enter into a new scenario, where the IGC pays the cost of Chief Stewards and Jury Presidents at IGC sanctioned events. This results in a higher turnover, but does not generate additional income for the IGC.

The 2006 report and 2007 budget were unanimously approved.

6. Reports not requiring voting

6.1 OSTIV report (L. Boermans)

Dr. Loek Boermans, OSTIV President, reported that OSTIV had held it’s 28th congress during the World Gliding Championships in Eskilstuna, Sweden.

The OSTIV Prize was given to the FLARM team. The prize for the best paper to Francois Ragot. The paper discussed the Best Speed Theories, which we often refer to as the MacReady theory.

In total 35 good papers were presented They will now be published in Technical Soaring.

The new Chief Editor of Technical Soaring had managed to get 7 issues published, and was rapidly catching up on the backlog.

The Sailplane Development Panel (SDP) also met in Eskilstuna to discuss the increase of Maximum Take-Off Weight (850 kg) in the Open Class. Cooperation with European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) to support their continued work on rulemaking was agreed with representatives from the EASA.

The Training and Safety Panel (TSP) is developing draft standard operations procedures. EASA is going to address this in the near future and TSP wants to propose their procedures to EASA. Next meeting will be in St Auban in September.

The IGC president suggested a closer cooperation between OSTIV and IGC. This was welcomed by Dr. Boermans.

The report was unanimously accepted by the meeting.

6.2 Sub-Committees

6.2.1 Business Development Committee Report (B. Henderson)

Mr. Henderson reported that this activity had been taken over by the Bureau.

“Our media and marketing capabilities are too limited; this becomes clear when we look at our approach to the Grand Prix events. We need to find ways to develop that.”

The report was accepted by the meeting without further comments.

6.2.2 Communications and PR Report (B. Henderson)

Mr Henderson said that we had to publish more information, but due to limited resources within the Bureau, we have not been able to do things the way we wanted to do it.

There was no membership report from 2006 yet. John Roake had found it very difficult to get information needed information.

It was unclear if John Roake had sent out the requests to the gliding organisations this year.

The report was accepted by the meeting.

6.2.3 Web Specialist's Report (P. Ryder)

Dr. Ryder explained that the FAI web was in a transition phase towards a new layout. He was waiting for that to be completed before he would send out the survey he had mentioned the previous year. Dr. Ryder asked the delegates to provide comments on the new lay-out of the web.

The report was accepted by the meeting.

6.2.4 Competition Development and Quality Control Report (E. Mozer)

Eric Mozer found the previous nights meeting with the stewards productive. He thanked Brian Spreckley, Roland Stuck and Dick Bradley for having organised the meeting and mentioned that he was convinced that the improved support from chief stewards would make the lives of contest directors easier in the future.

The Danish Delegate Mogens Hansen asked if the site visit to Rieti had been useful.

Mr. Mozer replied that it had been a good first step, beneficial to IGC and to the organisers, allowing the Stewards to identify problems in due time. A visit had also been conducted at Romorantin to help prepare for the 2007 Women's WGC.

“It’s part of our ongoing improvement strategy to systematically visit WGC sites before competitions, and to ask the Chief Steward to scrutinize the local procedures.”

The report was accepted by the meeting without further comments

6.2.5 Championship Management Committee Report (E. Mozer)

Mr. Mozer reported that in addition to the bids included in the agenda, as mentioned by the President, a late bid to host a Continental Championships in South America had been received. This bid would be discussed later during the meeting.

The report was received by the meeting without further comments.

6.2.6 Sporting Code Committee report (R. Macintyre)

Ross Macintyre had nothing to add to the report submitted before the meeting.

The report was accepted by the meeting.

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

Mr Bernald Smith started by mentioning that two members of the GFAC committee were up for election, Mr Ian Strahan and Mr Angel Casado Alonso. They were both re-elected for 3 years.

The European Gliding Union (EGU) was clearly in the forefront with regard to airspace and air traffic related matters, he was happy to see that development in Europe, and urged FAI to take initiative to have a similar activity covering the rest of the world.

Mr. Smith admitted that he had been too optimistic with regard to the implementation of Automatic Dependent Surveillance - Broadcast (ADS-B). He had earlier expected that it would be in operation by year 2000. Unfortunately the accuracy of the system is not considered acceptable for its primary purpose, which is to replace radar and to be used to separate aircraft. In addition to that there has been a battle between supporters of the different technical solutions. This has been blocking a worldwide implementation.

He mentioned that Flarm in principle is an ADS-B based application, but not compatible with the any of the other commercial protocols. Flarm is not certified, but it probably could be updated to enable it to be certified.

The report was received by the Plenum without comments.

6.2.8 GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Committee (GFAC) Report (I. Strahan)

Mr Ian Strahan referred to the published report and added that on 26 February, a SD card facility was added to the EW microRecorder IGC-approval document.

For future approvals it was reported that three other types of recorder are being tested by GFAC:

- Swiss Flarm with recorder module (for diamonds level approval,)
- LXN Red Box Flarm with Flarm recorder module (for diamonds level approval,)
- LXN Colibri with addition of Flarm module (for all flights approval)

With regard to security aspects, the original Swiss Flarm system was for anti-collision purposes and did not have a recorder function. When the recorder function was added, it is understood that it was decided not to add the long-life battery used in IGC-approved recorders to keep the UTC clock going and allow the security microswitch to work. Now that IGC-approval is being considered for the recorder aspects, GFAC and the Flarm company are looking at how security can be preserved without a security microswitch. The company is incorporating a special check at boot-up during which the recorder modules will be checked for integrity. In addition, the

satellite constellation will be recorded in the IGC file (Specification requirement, the F-record) that will make it very difficult to artificially manufacture an IGC file, particularly if a satellite is taken off line and replaced by another at short notice. Any other ideas on improving security when there is no security microswitch, will be gratefully received.

A special calibration mode is being added so that pressure altitude calibration can take place without UTC being available.

For the Quiet Motor Gliders, the preferred IGC system for recording the use of engine is noise recording using a microphone inside the recorder itself. Three Engine Noise Level (ENL) numbers between 000 and 999 are placed in the IGC file for each fix. This works well with internal-combustion engines. However, with the advent of electric engines the position is different. For instance, for the Lange Flugzeugbau Antares 20E, ENL of about 300 has been recorded with engine power for level flight. However, without engine but turning with cockpit vent panels open, ENL of about 350 has been recorded. Therefore, with quiet engines, ENL as used up to now is not adequate to record the use of engine. Two solutions are being looked at:

1. Modified ENL System. Lange Flugzeugbau is looking at whether a specially-modified recorder can be made where the ENL system is optimised to record the propeller RPM for the motor glider concerned.

2. RPM recording. The IGC file has always had provision for recording a variable related to engine or propeller RPM, under the three-letter code RPM. The GFAC agenda report proposed that where a motor glider is assessed by GFAC as being unsuitable for an ENL-based system, in addition to ENL, the RPM variable be recorded as well.

Mr Strahan concluded that it was agreed that the draft about engine recording that was in Appendix 2 to the GFAC agenda report will be added to Annex B to the code in an appropriate place.

The IGC GNSS web site had been updated with a new table for the 33 types of recorders that are currently IGC-approved. The link to each IGC-approval document is in the last column of this table. A short history of GNSS recording in IGC follows the table.

Appendix 1 to the GFAC agenda report gave some factors on the use of COTS GPS units. It is understood that the IGC Sporting Code committee will be proposing changes to the Code in 2008, part of which will be to suggest that photographic evidence be withdrawn and replaced by GNSS recording. Data security will always be a problem with non-IGC-approved recorders, which is why proposals are currently limited to Silver and Gold badge flights.

6.2.9 World Class Glider Committee Report (F. Pin)

Mr Francois Pin had nothing to add to the written report.

Mr Fred Weinholtz had decided to step down from the Committee. Mr Pin proposed that Mr Osvaldo Ferraro from Argentina be elected as new member of the Committee. This was unanimously agreed by the Plenum.

6.3 Specialists

6.3.1 Baron Hilton Soaring Cup Report (H. Linke)

Mr Hannes Linke had nothing to add to the published report, but reminded the Plenum that a camp was planned for this summer at the Flying M Ranch.

The report was accepted by the Plenum.

6.3.2 CASI Report (Air Sports Commissions) (T. Johannessen)

Mr Tor Johannessen had nothing to add to the written report, which was accepted by the meeting without comments.

6.3.3 Environmental Commission Report (B. Smith)

Mr Bernald Smith reported that the Environmental Committee was becoming more active with more and more NACs participating. This probably indicated that more organisations were experiencing environmental problems.

The report was accepted by the meeting

6.3.4 On-Line Contest Report (A. Reich)

Mr Axel Reich reported from the World League, where US clubs had taken the five first places. He also mentioned that it had been impossible to establish cooperation between OLC and FAI on the ATMOS project. This would be addressed later in the meeting.

The report was accepted without comments.

6.3.5 Simulated Gliding Report (R. Stuck)

Mr Roland Stuck reported that use of a gliding simulator to train pilots, supplemented by only five real flights, had been tried with success in Lasham, UK.

Mr Hansen added that similar trials had been conducted in Demark.

According to Mr Eriksen, ICAO allows the use of simulators as a substitute for actual flights to some extent, but it is important to agree to the procedures and to get the actual simulator approved by the national authorities first.

6.3.6 IGC Ranking List Report (B. Spreckley)

Mr Spreckley had nothing to add to the written report, which was accepted by the meeting.

6.3.7 Airspace, Licensing, Medical (P. Eriksen)

Mr Eriksen had nothing to add to the written report, which was accepted by the meeting.

6.4. Past & Future Championships (E. Mozer)

6.4.1 29th FAI Multiclass World Gliding Championships, 2006, Eskilstuna, Sweden

The Competition Director Robert Danewid reported that the weather, as often seen during a WGC, was unusual in Eskilstuna, starting with cold, winter-like conditions and a flooded airfield during the training period, ending up with a veritable heatwave, not seen since many years in that part of Sweden. The flying conditions were therefore often difficult.

The championships were environmentally certified and effort was put into, for example, minimizing the use of printed material. Unfortunately gliding people were not ready to accept such change, wanting printed copies of the task and results, which increased the paper consumption considerably.

The new procedure with Free Gridding worked fine.

The extensive use of Internet and SMS to inform Team Captains and pilots proved to be difficult, in particular because the intensive use of Skype or similar applications for telephones used more bandwidth than expected.

A DVD from the competition had been produced and would be sent to the participating pilots.

The Chief Steward Dick Bradley had nothing to add to his written report.

6.4.2 5th World Class and 4th Club Class World Gliding Championships, 2006, Vinon, France

The Chief Steward Peter Ryder added to his written report that it was one of the best organised contests he had been involved in.

6.4.3 5th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2007 - Italy

Mr. Leonardo Briigliadori presented the status of the preparations for the competition.

6.4.4 4th FAI Women's World Gliding Championships 2007 - France

Mr Stuck informed the meeting that the preparations were progressing as planned. The Chief Steward and Vice-president B. Spreckley had performed a site visit, which was a new procedure for all IGC sanctioned competitions. They were satisfied with the visit; a couple of issues were still under discussion with the organisers.

Mr Spreckley raised the question whether the 75 euros per pilot to cover the cost of the Chief Steward and the Jury President were in addition to the entry fee.

Dr. Ryder stated that this could not be the case; the entry fee and cost of aero towing were the only cost that could be claimed by the organisers.

This view was supported by the Australian Delegate.

Mr. Henderson stated that the new procedures, including the fee of 75 euros per pilot had been communicated to the organisers and that the organisers no longer had to cover the expenses of the Chief Steward and Jury President. This would be communicated to the organisers again.

6.4.5 14th FAI European Gliding Championships 2007 - France

Mr Stuck had nothing to report.

Mr Reich asked the organisers to pay special attention to the scoring of the non-European guests participating, and keep them well separated from the EGC scoring.

6.4.6 14th FAI European Gliding Championships 2007 - Lithuania

Only 8 preliminary entries had been received in the World Class.

Mr Stuck asked what would happen if there were not enough pilots at the end of registration.

The discussion about this was deferred to agenda item 9

6.4.7 30th FAI World Gliding Championships 2008 - Germany

The organisers had nothing to report.

6.4.8 30th FAI World Gliding Championships 2008 - Italy

The organisers had nothing to report.

6.4.9 5th FAI Women's World Gliding Championships 2009 - Hungary

The organisers had nothing to report.

6.4.10 6th FAI Junior's World Gliding Championships 2009 - Finland

The Finnish Delegate Visa-Matti Leinikki reported that the Nordic Junior Championships in 2008 would be in Rääskälä. This competition would be open to foreign pilots. Exact dates were to be communicated soon.

6.5 Approval of Competition Officials (E. Mozer)

The proposed list of Competition Officials for competition in 2007 and 2008 was unanimously approved by the meeting. See Appendix B to these minutes.

Officials for competitions in 2009 will be appointed at next year's meeting.

6.6 Worlds Series Gliding

6.6.1 Report from 2006 Qualifying Sailplane Grand Prix Race and proposals for 2007 Qualifying Grand Prix Race

The written report was accepted without comments from the meeting.

6.6.2 Report from 2007 World Series- Gliding Final (Verbal)

The President summarised the situation:

It had not been possible for Air Sports Limited (ASL) to sell the television transmissions for the final in New Zealand in the absence of a long-term agreement with the FAI the planned financial support from sponsorship or investment for the competition was therefore not available. In addition, Gliding New Zealand had advised that, as an organisation, they were not in a position to organise the competition.

This was a regrettable situation. The Bureau had analysed the situation and saw no other solution than to work with other possible candidates to find a solution for the final, either late 2007 or early 2008.

Post-meeting note: A solution has now been found, New Zealand will organise the event in December 2007. For more information see IGC president's letter of 18th April 2007.

The verbal report and the proposal to mandate the Bureau to find an organiser for the World Grand Prix were unanimously approved by the Plenum.

6.6.3 Proposal for the future allocation of World Series – Gliding Final

The proposal from the Bureau was that the organisation of the World Grand Prix should be determined by a vote of the Plenum one year before the competition.

The Austrian Delegate Peter Platzer asked if one year was enough time for the organisation, in particular if the organiser had to find sponsors.

This was supported by Mr. Stuck.

Mr. Herbert Martin asked for a sponsoring strategy. He stated that there was a conflict between the two products; Grand Prix and WGC. He asserted that the Bureau was looking for sponsors for the Grand Prix product in competition with the WGC organisers.

Mr. Mozer explained that the Bureau would not look for sponsors; this would be up to the organisers to do.

Mr. Bishop agreed that we had to avoid confusion in the market place.

“There is now a possibility to have our sports on television, even if ASL did not work, the environment is improving. But to get on TV we will have to change our product, the ordinary WGC is not attractive. The fact that we now have 2 WGCs in the same year is confusing; we need to have a strategy for how to address the media.”

Mr. Henderson mentioned the fact that other sports have the same problem, and we maybe should contact them to find out how they manage that.

Mr. Stuck was of the opinion that we should call for bids for the next final as soon as the organisation of 2007 final had been agreed.

This was unanimously approved by the meeting.

7. Presentation of bids for future championships

7.1 2010 World Gliding Championships

The following bids were presented:

Finland (Räyskälä), 15-meter, 18-meter and Open Class

Hungary (Szeged), 15-meter, 18-meter and Open Class

Slovakia (Prievidza), World, Club and Standard Class

7.2 2009 European Championships,

The following bid was presented:

Russia, (Orel), Club, Standard, World, and 20-meter multi-seat class

7.3 South American Championships (new agenda item)

Mr. Mozer explained that a bid had been received but not in time for the agenda. It would require a 2/3rds majority to include this in the agenda.

It was agreed to include the item in the agenda with 30 votes for, 1 abstention.

The proposal had been submitted by Argentina and suggested a competition to be held in Gonzales Chaves with competition in 3 not yet specified classes, but in accordance with Annex A.

It was expected that 4 maybe 5 countries would participate.

Mr. Francois Pin mentioned that he had got the understanding that the organisers were looking for a pan-American Championship including North and South America.

Mr. Bishop replied that nothing was wrong in having Continental Championships combined for several continents.

The Finnish Delegate proposed to mandate the Bureau to work with Argentina to get these championships organised.

8. Questions on all Bid Presentations

Mr Danewid asked if the World Class would be included in Slovakia, as we were not obliged to do that.

Mr. Mozer responded that we have never been obliged to hold Continental Championships in the World Class, and that Continental Championships as a general rule were held in the classes suggested by the organisers and approved by the Plenum.

The Slovakian Delegate Vladimir Foltin added that Slovakia was ready to include the 20-meter 2-seater class if requested.

Mr. Platzer asked if Finland would be able to lower the entry fee, as he found 1100 Euro too expensive.

The UK delegate Brian Spreckley noted that the dates proposed by Russia clashed with other competitions.

To a question raised by Dr. Boermans about the ability to host the OSTIV conference at the competition site, Finland replied that they had room for OSTIV at the airfield, Hungary and Slovakia could find suitable facilities 2-5 kilometres from the airfield.

Mr. Reich reminded the meeting about the Annex A rule that requires 4 days separation of two Category 1 competitions.

The President closed the debated by noting that the voting would take place under agenda item 12 Saturday before noon.

9. Reports and proposals requiring voting (B. Henderson)

The first proposal to consider was from Lithuania, to change the number of pilots allowed at the EGC 2007. Currently the restriction was maximum 6 pilots per NAC. Many NACs had chosen not to participate in the World Class under these conditions.

First the delegates were asked to vote on whether this proposal could be tabled:

30 votes for and for, 1 abstention, the proposal could be tabled

Mr Henderson then proposed to delete the restriction of maximum 6 pilots per NAC, and simply allow 2 pilots per class. This would mean up to 8 entries per NAC.

To a question about what would happen if there were not enough entries for the World Class, the answer was that the competition could run but the winner would not be declared European Champion.

According to Annex A, pilots have the possibility to change to another class up to the end of the registration period.

The proposal to allow 2 pilots per class was carried with 27 votes for and 3 abstentions.

9.1 Proposals from the Bureau

9.1.1 WGC Event Location (Year 2)

A long debate took place. The proposal from the Bureau was considered unclear, and although many delegates expressed support to intention to have one of the two WGCs outside Europe every 4 years, they would have difficulties voting for the actual proposal.

The President therefore withdrew the proposal with the intention to present a reworded proposal later during the meeting.

The following reworded proposal was presented on day two of the meeting:

1. *Beginning in 2012 each of the two Multi-Class World Gliding Championships (WGC) preference will be given to bids from outside of Europe once every eight years according to the following schedule:*

<i>WGC</i>	<i>2010</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2016</i>	<i>2018</i>	<i>2020</i>	<i>2022</i>	<i>2024</i>
<i>15/18/Op</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Non-Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Non-Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>
<i>Std/W/Club</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Non-Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Europe</i>	<i>Non-Europe</i>

2. *European NAC's will not be permitted to bid for a Multi-Class WGC that is scheduled to be held in a non-European country prior to the close of normal bidding.*

3. *In the event that no valid bids from a preferred region are received by the IGC deadline for each of the scenarios outlined above in 2 and 3, then the bidding process will be opened up to all NAC's and the deadline for receipt of bids will be extended by two months.*

First the new wording was put up for a vote:

32 votes for, 1 abstention

A vote on the proposal was then conducted:

32 voted for, 1 abstention, the proposal was carried.

9.1.2 Establishment of a Working Group for the “Light-end”.

A Low Cost Entry Classes Committee is created.

This committee would regroup all existing subcommittees and representatives of the low-cost classes and initiative groups (World Class, Microlift class, Ultra-light gliders, Microlight Motorgliders, etc.) into a single committee.

This Committee would be tasked with coordinating and managing actions across the entire low-cost, light-end, segment of Soaring toward better exploitation of that segment of Soaring toward global membership growth by targeting attraction and retention of less (financially and soaring infrastructure) fortunate pilots and countries.

Initial action of this committee would be a thorough review, and report to the plenum, of the entire class structure at the low-cost, light-end of Soaring, with recommendations on actions to better exploit that segment and optimize its class structure, as requested by the 2006 IGC Plenum.

The French Delegate Roland Stuck explained that a proposal that was raised by France in 2006 to establish a Micro-light Class was agreed to by the Plenum.

He had since then developed 3 different proposals, and presented them to the Bureau at the meeting in September. The Bureau had been unable to reach a conclusion, and therefore preferred to leave it to a working group to develop the proposals further.

Mr Henderson added that the Bureau would like a working group with participation from the Bureau.

Mr Macintyre asked why the name was “low cost”, it should be “low weight”, as these could be quite expensive.

Mr. Hansen stated “It is important to act quickly. This group must not spend too much time before delivering. We are losing members who prefer to fly on these new gliders.”

The proposal to establish the group was carried with 30 votes for 1 against.

9.1.3 Resolution to support the establishment of an FAI Airspace and Navigation Technical Commission

The President mentioned that this proposal was developed by GFAC. The original proposal came from the UK to the FAI General Conference in Santiago.

“FAI has a number of commissions, but none dealing with airspace and navigation. We are not asking you to adopt this paper as Terms of Reference for the group, but to endorse that FAI should have such a group.”

Mr. Danevid expressed the hope that such a group should work closely with the European Gliding Union (EGU) and Europe Air Sports (EAS)

The American Alternate delegate Rick Sheppe asked what the next step would be if this was endorsed.

Mr. Bishop answered that having a Technical Commission means that each NAC can nominate a delegate to a Commission.

Mr. Henderson added to the question of Mr Sheppe that this proposal was lending effort to the proposal from UK to the General Conference.

Mr. Stuck was worried if we would have sufficient capability to do this; at least for Europe, EAS and EGU already requires a lot of participation from the NACs.

Mr. Bishop mentioned that the FAI Executive Board (EB) had already looked at the UK proposal and that it would be presented to the next FAI General Conference. The EB agreed that these are important issues, but it would be up to the General Conference to decide if this was the best way forward.

Mr. Strahan supported the view of Mr. Stuck. "Even if I wrote parts of this proposal, I agree that we have to consider it carefully; we cannot afford to duplicate effort."

The proposal was carried with 27 votes for and 4 abstentions.

9.1.4 Resolution to seek improvements to crashworthiness of gliders

The President explained that the Bureau had asked the OSTIV SDP to address this. This proposal is the recommendation that came out of that.

Mr. Smith had participated to the recent meeting of the Crash Worthiness Committee of the SDP, and gave a short resume of the conclusions.

Dr. Boermans explained that this had been discussed by the SDP in Eskilstuna, where it was agreed with EASA to work with them on the further development of Community Specification (CS) 22, dealing with requirements for construction and certification of sailplanes.

The first action is the amendment of CS 22 to include crash worthiness, therefore the Crash Worthiness Committee recently met to discuss this. They will now come up with recommendations.

The question about mandatory use of Energy Absorbing Foam seat cushion was raised. Dr Boermans answered that it was a difficult question. The thicker the better, but many existing gliders have no room for them in the cockpit.

The Italian Alternate Aldo Cernezzi: "Italy is asking for these measures in competition gliders only"

Mr. Spreckley: "UK can't support point 2 of the proposal, as all gliders cannot be fitted with this"

Dr. Boermans: "I agree that only new gliders can fulfil the requirements for crash worthiness, it is not something you can retrofit"

The German Delegate Hans Obermayer: "Is there a deficit on the safety?"

Dr. Boermans: "This was what is discussed now, it is at least demonstrated now that it is possible to obtain safer cockpits in new gliders"

Mr Cernezzi: "What would happen if we required all glider in competitions to have safe cockpits?"

Dr Boermans: "They have that already. Compared to the first fibreglass gliders, modern gliders were more safe, but not to the extent we would be demanding in the future"

The Lithuanian alternate delegate Petras Beta: "How many accidents have we had during championships?"

The Irish Delegate Bruno Ramseyer: "This certainly is desirable, but I am worried about how far we have to go. We can end up with complete rescue systems"

Mr. Henderson: "We can only endorse the work done by SDP. We are not in a position to have an understanding of the technical implications in this expert group." He continued: "I also propose to change Item 2 of the proposal to read "should" and not "shall". If endorsed, the proposal will be included as a part of Annex A with immediate effect as it concerns safety."

Mr Cubley: "I would like to ask the SDP to define the term Energy Absorbing Foam more precisely."

Dr. Boermans: "A definition is under way"

The change to the proposal from the President was then put up for vote.

1. That the IGC endorses the work of the OSTIV SDP in developing reinforced glider cockpits to improve safety and the IGC urges OSTIV to work with EASA to ensure that modern standards for reinforced glider cockpits are incorporated in CS 22."

2. That the IGC require that energy absorbing foam cushions should be used in all gliders flying in IGC sanctioned competitions after 1 October 2007."

3. That the IGC investigate whether the safety modifications proposed in the OSTIV SDP Crashworthiness Subcommittee Report, be applied to all gliders flying in IGC sanctioned competitions."

The change received 28 votes for, 3 votes against.

The amended proposal was then carried with 27 votes for, 3 against, and 1 abstention.

9.1.5 IGC Strategic Improvement Plan

The President presented the IGC Strategic Improvement Plan, which was unanimously adopted.

9.1.6 Confirmation of Sailplane Grand Prix locations by Bureau

Mr Henderson presented the proposal.

Mr. Cubley was concerned about the lead-in time. 12 months was not long enough to raise sponsors and financial support from authorities and he proposed to change the lead-in time to 18 months, as the Austrian Delegate had suggested earlier in the meeting.

The President agreed to amend the proposal accordingly.

The host and location for the World Series – Gliding Final (at which the race will be a Sailplane Grand Prix), after 2007, will be determined by a Plenum vote at the IGC Plenary meeting at least 18 months before the races.

The amendment was put of for vote, 28 delegates voted for, 2 against, 1 abstention.

The amended proposal was then voted on, 30 votes for, 1 against, 0 abstentions.

The President then raised the issue of the final for the next round, and asked the Plenum to empower the Bureau to decide the location for the 2009 final, so that it could be done promptly.

The Bureau would take into consideration the decision on the World Air Games (WAG), and seek cooperation if possible. The decision on the WAG venue will be taken on 1st June 2007.

This was unanimously carried by the meeting.

9.2. Sporting Code Section 3, General Section

9.2.1 Proposals from the Sporting Code Committee

a. General rewrite of Sporting Code Section 3, General Part (Year 1)

The Sporting Code Committee Chairman Ross Macintyre noted that Chapters 1 and 4, in particular, needed rewriting.

He asked to have the meeting's view on two particular issues related to Virtual Starts and Virtual Landings.

An inclusion of a Virtual Start would allow the pilot of a non-declared task to select his start point after landing, e.g. if he wanted to reduce the number of turn points.

The vote showed 7 delegates for including Virtual Start in the Sporting Code, 19 against and 5 abstentions.

Mr. Macintyre then explained that the Virtual Finish already exists, but only for powered gliders. An inclusion would allow the same rules to apply for all gliders

26 voted for this inclusion, 1 against and 4 abstained.

Mr Macintyre explained that Photographic Evidence would be deleted from the Sporting Code. Pre-notice had already been given. No reaction had been received to this notice.

Mr Henderson said that the Bureau supported the Sporting Code Committee in their proposal to have all the changes, including the use of Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) Flight Recorders included in the 2008 version of the Sporting Code. The changes would therefore be presented at the Plenum Meeting in 2008

30 delegates voted for the proposal, 1 against.

Dr. Ryder reminded the meeting that an update of Annex C would be needed in parallel.

This was supported by Mr Macintyre, but he was not sure it all could be done during the same year.

b. Loss of Height (Year 1)

Mr. Johannessen explained the background for the proposal. By having the same start and finish altitude for records, it would be a more fair and correct comparison between flights.

The Dutch Delegate Robin van Maarschalkerweed asked what would happen to the old records, which were not made in the same way

Mr Macintyre felt that it would be very difficult to handle that problem.

Mr Danewid and Mr Ax explained that it would be impossible to fly records from many airfields in Sweden this way due to airspace restrictions, and due to sea-breezes in the afternoon.

Mr Spreckley stated that he saw little benefit of this proposal.

Mr Macintyre made it clear that if this proposal was carried, it would take some time before a Year-2 proposal could be formulated.

To Mr. Cubley, the proposal did not make sense, a glider towed to a certain altitude and then glided and landed, therefore a gliding record should be the same principle, gliding to a landing.

The proposal was put up for vote and received 0 votes for, 26 against and 5 abstentions. The proposal was lost.

c. Microlight Motorgliders (Year 2)

The President informed the meeting that the Bureau would withdraw the proposal and given it to the newly formed Working Group. They would be asked to come up with a proposal in 2008

Mr. Stuck was disappointed about this. The Year-1 proposal was carried last year.

This should result in a Year-2 proposal this year, he stated.

d. Abandon restriction on speed and distance records (Year 2)

3.0.2 Records in any one flight

Any record or records may be broken in any one flight for which the requirements are met, except that:

a. A speed record will be certificated for the record distance immediately less than the official distance of the flight.

b. Within any single class and/or category, only one distance and one speed record may be certificated for the flight. (See Annex C para 4.5.)

Mr. Stuck mentioned that other sports had implemented this principle, in athletics you can set a new record on the Mile distance and, if you break the record on 1500 in the same attempt, you get the two records.

Mr. Macintyre informed the meeting that the Sporting Code Committee was against this proposal: "It is an old principle in gliding that you only can break the speed record corresponding to the distance you fly"

A discussion on whether or not the Sporting Code Commission can recommend how to vote took place. The President stated that they are entitled to provide their opinion and advice, but the delegates would eventually decide.

The Australian and American Delegates both stated that someone flying a 500 km triangle faster than the existing 300 km record should have the 300 km record as well.

Part a,

22 delegates voted for the proposal, 7 against, 5 abstained

Part b

26 voted for, 5 against 2 abstained

Both proposals were carried

9.2.2 Proposals from Austria

a. Suspension of SC3, para 3.02 part b, More than one distance record.

The proposal was withdrawn as a consequence of the decision under agenda item 9.2.1.d

b. Suspension of SC3, para 3.02 part b, More than one speed record.

The proposal was withdrawn as a consequence of the decision under agenda item 9.2.1.d

c. Reconsideration of records rejected due to SC3, para 3.02 part b.

Several delegates stated that they were against this proposal, expressing that records cannot be applied retroactively, as there is no guarantee that pilots have kept documentation for previously conducted flights.

The proposal was lost with 1 vote for, 25 votes against, and 6 abstentions.

d. Definition of Annex for Scoring Software (Year 1)

The Chairman of the Annex A group, Mr Reich, agreed that more expertise on scoring software to support the work of the Annex A group was needed, but did not support the idea of having a specific Annex for Scoring Software.

Dr. Ryder asked how we could define such an Annex. "It is important to define the requirements to the software, but how do we establish a standard for the software?"

Mr Stuck was of the opinion that we would be surprised if we tried to recompute old competitions on new software.

The Spanish Delegate Angel Casado Alonso was convinced that we needed a set of calibration flights or competitions to validate scoring software. Just defining a standard would be too difficult.

Mr Smith was of the opinion that it would be better to look at the next proposal first, once we had a sub-group looking at this. "We should ask them to come up with a proposal for how to handle the scoring software".

The Austrian Delegate explained that the intention was not to come up with software requirements but to define the functional requirements.

Mr Eriksen was of the opinion that the calculation of points was the easiest part. Scoring software should also look into airspace infringements which would be far more difficult to validate.

The proposal was then put to the vote.

9 delegates voted for the proposal, 21 voted against, 3 abstained. The proposal was lost.

e. Definition of Committee to test Scoring Software (Year 1)

Mr Visa-Matti Leinikki: "Is the idea behind such a committee to validate all scoring software, as we do with Flight Recorders, and will this lead to Sanction Fees for all scoring software?"

Mr Henderson: "The software for IGC sanctioned competitions would need to be validated before each competition. There will probably be a Sanction Fee if there is cost related to these tests"

Mr. Sheppe: "I am in favour of forming a committee, but it does not make sense to make it mandatory to approve all software before competitions"

Mr. Mozer "It does not seem logical to me to have a committee if they were not tasked with the verification of software for IGC sanctioned competitions"

Mr. Stuck: "Does anybody think this is a real problem?"

Mr Reich: "The Annex A group consider it desirable to assure that new scoring programs and new versions of existing software are validated before competitions"

Mr Ramseyer: "I would like to remind the meeting that we are talking about two software packages, the flight analysis and the scoring"

It was then proposed to amend the proposal and delete the second line, stating that only approved software should be used. The proposal would therefore only require the group to be defined.

It is proposed to define a Committee for the test of scoring software.

The amendment was put up for vote.

22 delegates voted for the amendment, 9 voted against, 2 abstained.

The amended proposal was then put up for vote:

31 voted for. 1 voted against, 1 abstained. The amended proposal was carried.

9.3. Sporting Code Section 3, Annex A

9.3.1 Proposal from the Annex A Committee

a. SC3, Annex A, 3.4.3, Women and Junior World Champions (Year 2)

Mr Reich explained the background behind this proposal, originating from a request from Sweden to include Woman and Junior champions.

The world champions of the limited category Women and Junior Championships may compete as an additional member of their team in the appropriate classes

Women: Club / Standard / 15m

Juniors: club / Standard

The proposal was unanimously approved.

b. SC3, Annex A, 4.2.1, Weight Limits Open Class (Year 2)

The proposal to change the Maximum Take-off weight with immediate effect was unanimously approved, and will therefore be in force for 2007 competitions.

c. SC3, Annex A, 8.2.4, Revised Handicap Factors (Year 2)

Mr. Reich raised the question if these proposed new handicap factors should be voted on one by one, or as a complete package.

It was pointed out that the list mentioned the type Discus 1, the correct type should be Discus A, B or CS

For one type, the Std. Cirrus, the proposed amendment was 0.01, to follow the logic of the other proposed changes, this should read "1", meaning that the Std. Cirrus would go from handicap 99 to 100 (with winglets from 100 to 101).

Mr Stuck asked if the philosophy was to include more and more gliders in the Club Class, or if there was a maximum limit, in which case an upper performance limit should be fixed.

Several delegates responded that it would be natural to gradually include more and more gliders. As a consequence, the performance of the Club Class gliders would gradually increase.

It was also stated that if the ASW20 should be included in the Club Class now, the Glasflugel 304 and the ASW24 E should also be included.

Mr. Stuck felt that the Plenum was unable to deal with such a technical discussion. The proposal was not mature. He proposed to mandate the Bureau to deal with this once the Annex A group had developed a mature proposal.

The Danish Delegate supported Mr. Stuck in his viewpoint.

The Dutch Delegate did not agree to the process.

The Spanish Delegate felt that the proposal was unclear, in particular with regard to the Std. Cirrus.

Mr. Reich repeated that the Std. Cirrus would change from 99 to 100 (100 to 101 with winglets).

Mr. Ax stated that the Club Class was important. "We have many of these gliders, and they have no other home than the Club Class".

Mr. Stuck repeated that we were losing time with this discussion, and proposed again to give the mandate to the Bureau to sort the problem out.

The Austrian Delegate was of the opinion that the Std. Cirrus and Hornet had the same performance and that the handicap should be the same, otherwise the Std. Cirrus would have an advantage.

The German Delegate agreed with the French viewpoint. The Bureau should deal with such technical discussion.

The President stopped the discussion and put the proposal up for vote.

17 delegates voted for, 9 voted against, 6 abstained. The proposal was carried.

The list of changed handicap factors is attached to these minutes as Appendix C.

The President noted that the Bureau would ensure that the way in which proposed handicap changes were handled at future IGC Meetings would be reviewed.

9.4 Sporting Code Section 3, New Annex D

9.4.1 Proposal from the Annex D Committee

a. Establishment of Sporting Code Annex D (Year 2)

Mr. Spreckley presented the new Annex D which was mainly a re-write of the existing Ranking List rules with some minor changes agreed by the Working Group.

Mr. Platzer thanked his fellow members of the group for the good and constructive debate within the group.

There were no further comments to the proposed Annex D to FAI Sporting Code Section 3, which was unanimously approved.

Mr. Spreckley then presented the proposal to mandate the Bureau to define rules for the inclusion of Sailplane Grand Prix in Annex D

The proposal was carried with 30 votes for, 1 vote against, 2 abstentions.

9.4.2 Proposals from Austria

a. Recalculation of the IGC Ranking List (Year 2)

The Austrian Delegate said that the proposal was meant as a clarification to find out how this should be tackled

The proposal was lost with 1 vote for, 30 votes against and 2 abstentions.

9.5 Proposals from GFAC

9.5.1 Establishment of a list of Approved IGC Definitions (Year 1)

The proposal was withdrawn, it was meant as supporting documentation to Agenda item 9.1.3.

10. Nominations for President

Only one of the proposed delegates, Mr. Bob Henderson, accepted the nomination, and was therefore re-elected president for 1 year.

Mr. Henderson thanked the meeting for the support.

Presentation on the FAI ATMOS project

This presentation, given by Mr Alvaro de Orleans Borbón, was added to the agenda shortly before the meeting in order to answer a number of questions that had been raised about the FAI ATMOS project.

“The primary objective of ATMOS is to collect evidence of sports aviation flights. This evidence can be used for different purposes such as, documentation of air space needs, like the recent discussions with the Spanish authorities about Madrid TMA, to support aviation history or scientific activities like analysis of glider performance and pilot behaviour, and of course also serve competitions, like the On Line Competition.

ATMOS is primarily an accessible world flight data base managed by FAI.

From an initial idea I had some years ago, it seemed right to me that FAI collect and store this information.

I first spoke to the former FAI President Wolfgang Weinreich about it, I then met several times with Mr. Reiner Rose, the manager of the On Line Contest, to understand how that was organised, and to look for synergies with existing initiatives. These discussions also included the President of the Ballooning Commission, Mr Jean-Claude Weber.

Our main concern was to assure that, if OLC stopped or Mr. Rose ceased his activities, FAI could take over the existing data and continue the activity. The fundamental question is: who should own the data in the longer term?

FAI is, and has always been, a data collecting machine. It should be an even better one in the future with the newly available technology.

The main reason for FAI to exist is to determine and publish rules and procedures agreed amongst competitors, and to legitimise records and competitions to determine the best pilot. Rules for international gliding come from FAI/IGC, and only from there, otherwise they are not valid. This rulemaking is based on voluntary effort, and has to go through a number of agreed formal processes.

The ATMOS project was finalised and adopted by the General Conference last October. We now have a project, but it will take some time before all the elements of ATMOS are complete.

When starting the project we analysed various candidates to undertake the technical aspects. The company NAVITER had the expertise, they had an air sports background, and they had the technology.

A first prototype was made available and tested by ballooning. A Beta version will become available for use by other air sports. We expect to be able to give limited public access from April 2008.

The system has a layered architecture, which will allow public access to the top layer (simple flight data, processed, analysed, and easy to understand). More advanced layers will include FAI On-line competitions, where pilots can store, access, and analyse their flights. Even deeper layers will allow for competition directors to run the scoring of competitions.

ATMOS is a working name. FAI invites you to help us find a real name for it”

The President thanked Alvaro for his presentation, and opened the floor for questions, by asking the first two:

“I understand that there will be a new FAI file format (.fai). Will that format be compatible with the IGC files (.igc), and how much had been paid to NAVITER?”

Mr de Orleans Borbón answered that the *.igc file format would be the basis of the new file system and would be compatible with the planned *.fai system and that there was a budget of 70.000 Euro, but until now only 10.000 had been paid to purchase a server belonging to FAI and to cover travel costs.

The Finnish Delegate had understood that the focus of the project was two things, the database and the data-mining. He mentioned that these were not the most important items for IGC. The most important was the competitions and the rules that allowed us to compete.

Mr de Orleans Borbón answered that he knew that there had been a lot of discussion between glider pilots about this. He made it clear that ATMOS was not fighting the OLC. He was disappointed that OLC saw the FAI ATMOS as a threat as the OLC could continue to exist separately.

He continued that FAI would develop applications for all air sports that could support other things than On-Line-Contests. Eventually it would be up to the pilots to decide. Hopefully they would enter their flights in both systems. He insisted however that rules for gliding competitions should come from IGC, not from OLC. IGC was the democratic body that made gliding rules.

Mr Ramseyer mentioned that data right protection was an issue. The pilot had the intellectual property right of his flight data. This should be taken into consideration in the project.

Mr. Strahan suggested that a committee should be formed to manage the activity.

Mr. Reich regretted that IGC not had been directly involved earlier. Such an involvement could have solved the conflict between ATMOS and OLC and made a plea that the ATMOS system and the on-line competition would be simple for pilots to use and understand.

Mr. Sheppe supported the view of Mr. Reich.

Mr. Danevid was worried that ATMOS had been developed too late: “We will have a problem with the grassroots. They already have a good system with OLC, why should they change?”

The Dutch Delegate asked how it was intended to upload and download the files to and from ATMOS and if there would be public access? For OLC most files were downloaded through flight analysis applications, which was fast and easy. He hoped the same could be done for ATMOS.

Mr Mozer was disappointed to see this turned into a conflict between OLC and ATMOS. He suggested a step back to better reconsider the way forward: “If we elect to make it available, its IGC’s decision. If we choose to get into forms of on-line competitions, it’s our choice.”

The President closed the debate and thanked Mr. de Orleans Borbón for coming and for giving the update on the ATMOS project.

11. IGC Strategy

11.1 Presentation of IGCs strategy for the future followed by discussion (B. Henderson)

Mr. Henderson gave a detailed presentation on the activities related to the IGC strategy. The strategy is divided into six main areas: Participation in IGC Meetings, Communication, Quality of Sporting Events, Expansion of IGC, Safety and Economy.

For each of the six areas, performance indicators have been identified, and performance targets set. A number of specific activities will now be initiated by the Bureau to try to reach the performance targets. The Bureau will report against these targets at the next IGC Meeting.

11.2 Guest Speaker, Eugenio Gellona Vial, President of Santiago Gliding Club, Chile

Mr Eugenio Gellona Vial explained how the Santiago Gliding Club some years ago was threatened by the expansion of the city, and in particular the construction of a highway right through the gliding field.

The club decided to try to solve the problem by turning the club and the airfield into an asset for the town, and show that there were more advantages than disadvantages of having a gliding club.

A key strategy in the protection and development of the airfield was the deliberate decision by the club members to use the services of a professional lobbyist to argue their case for them with the city.

This had been a difficult task, but the club had managed to reach its goal, including re-planning the highway to circumnavigate the airfield, undertaking a number of activities that supported the local administration, and by creating a green oasis close to the town open for the local citizens, supporting education sport and recreation.

More than 35 gliders, 50 powered aircraft and 16 helicopters are based on the airfield. The operations are self-restricted to reduce nuisance to the city.

Mr Johannessen added to the presentation that he had had the chance to visit the club during the FAI General Conference. He mentioned that all the visitors were immensely impressed by the club, the facilities and the appearance of the entire area.

Mr Mozer added that one of the more intriguing points is the way the club had turned the environmental problems into cooperation with the city. An airport with a gliding club is now seen as green and a positive asset for the community

Mr Gellona replied that the mayor was proud of having the club there and that the club had also helped with air transport in crisis situations like earth crakes and accidents. This was not something that happened often, only if there were a special event or something really serious.

The President thanked Mr. Gellona and his colleagues for their enlightening presentation and wished them continuing success.

11.3 Australian Approach to declining membership (Terry Cubley)

The Australian Delegate Terry Cubley presented the Australian initiative to increase the membership, called the 'Water Tank' model.

“The gliding site needs to have access to a significant population size in order to draw new members. Clubs close to a capital or regional city obviously have greater potential to attract people to the airfield. Those in more remote areas have to consider alternate solutions.

As a rule of thumb, a club has the potential for 1 member for each 2500 people in the population pool.

You need to find out how you get the people in your pool of potential members to come to the airfield to experience gliding flight? Do people know you exist? Where you are? How to get in touch? What are the most effective ways to promote your club?

Encouraging passengers to take the step to becoming a member is one of the more difficult but important steps.

Why do members leave? Research shows that members leave for a whole host of legitimate reasons. The underpinning issue is that the sport no longer offers the benefits and value that the member wants. Much of this is to do with how the club/organisation treats the membership and the value that it provides.

The long term members have been described as the sludge in the bottom of this Water Tank model. What keeps these people committed to your club? How can you continue their involvement? Someone who has been a member for three years or more can be classified in this group. If more members become long term then the chances of future growth are high.

Basically you can start by asking the following questions:

Membership pool: Often a major issue for country clubs. How can you encourage people to travel further to access your operation? Is there a particular target audience?

Passenger flights. Do you get enough visitors? Do you need to advertise?

New members: How do you perform in turning passengers into members? What do you do to excite and encourage people to fly?

Members leaving: People leave because you no longer offer something that they desire or enjoy”

The President thanked Mr Cubley for his presentation, and opened the floor for debate on all the presentations.

11.4 Debate on IGC’s strategy, visions and goals

Alvaro: “IGC should publish a newsletter for the glider pilots and clubs. It is not enough to communicate with the gliding federations”

Mr Mozer: “We are finally starting to understand marketing. We should spend more time on self-examination and find out what we as a sport can give to people and if we really welcome new people interested in our sport”

Mr Stuck: “The French Federation made a survey some years ago called Vario+. We realised that members were lost right after the first solo flight, probably because there is no clear goal anymore. We needed to change the way we are acting after solo. I will translate this survey and publish it on the web”

Mr Cubley: “Do you have a survey about why people are leaving? I think it often is because the club not is providing enough service, not enough value for the money”

Mr. Danevid: “I know why the birds are singing, but it takes many years for a new pilot to find out. We must break it down in smaller steps, make it fun right from the start, and make it easy. We have too many rules”

Mr Macintyre: “You have to make arrangements so that you spend less time on the airfield waiting. In my club we have started booking of training lessons in advance. This have given us more members”

Mr Cernezzi: “We get many pilots from other air sports, but we also lose many. One of the main reasons for leaving is when a poor human environment develops in the club. When members start to argue, many will leave the club. They don’t want to spend their time there. Safety is also a problem. Too many accidents make people quit. I don’t know if this is an Italian problem more than a general problem?”

Mr Henderson: “We discuss this often. We (IGC) are as guilty as the clubs. We need to find ways to help the clubs. Bringing a new way into gliding is important”

Mr Stuck: “Mr Cernezzi is right. We underestimate the negative effect the accidents have. Many people fear accidents, but will not admit it, and simply quit gliding”

Mr Leinikki: “There are many reasons, accidents, yes, and Mr Danevid is right. It is too difficult. Medical examination and theoretical course are major problems. We shall work on reducing this. When a youngster comes to a club, get him in the glider immediately. That is the most important”

Mr Ramseyer: “Gliding suffers from outside issues such as regulations and environment. The clubs are fire fighting. Club leaders are too busy and have no time to deal with new members”

Mr Henderson rounded the debate off by stating that we probably are our own worst enemies. We know what the problems are but we continue keeping obstacles in front of ourselves instead of challenging them. We need to look at the positive challenges that gliding offers as a sport – a challenge to understand and master flight; a challenge to understand and master the weather to be able to soar cross-country, etc. At IGC level we also need to collect and provide examples of “best practice” for national organisations to provide to their clubs.

12. Votes on Bids (E. Mozer) 12.1 2010 World Gliding Championships,

12.1.1 15-meter, 18-meter and Open Class

Finland 14 votes,

Hungary 19 votes

The competition was awarded to Hungary

12.1.2 World, Club, and Standard Class

The competition was unanimously awarded to the Slovak Republic.

12.2 2009 European Gliding Championships, Club, Standard, World, and 20-meter multi-seat class

The competition was awarded to Russia with 25 votes for, 4 votes against and 4 abstentions.

12.3 South American Championships

The Bureau was unanimously mandated to support Argentina to organise South American Championships in 2009.

13. IGC awards

The President recalled the procedures that required firstly a vote to determine if there were a worthy candidate for the award, and secondly a vote to decide on the award

Proxies are not allowed to vote for medals and diplomas.

13.1 Lilienthal Medal

The Lilienthal Medal was awarded to Alan Patching, Australia

13.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma

Two Pirat Gehriger Diplomas were awarded

1. Loek Boermans. The Netherlands

2. Brian Spreckley and Keith Nicholson - UK

13.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal

The Pelagia Majewska Medal was awarded to Ghislaine Facon, France

14. Elections of Officers (B. Henderson/E. Mozer)

14.1 President;

Mr. Bob Henderson, New Zealand

14.2 1st Vice President

Mr. Eric Mozer, USA

14.3 Other Vice Presidents

Mr Göran Ax, Sweden

Mr. Vladimir Foltin, Slovak Republic

Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki, Finland

Mr. Brian Spreckley, UK

Mr. Roland Stuck, France

14.4 Secretary

Mr. Peter Eriksen, Denmark

15. Date and place for 2008 IGC Plenary Meeting

15.1 Proposal from Italy to hold the meeting in Rome

Italy presented their bid to hold the 2008 IGC meeting in Rome.

The proposal was carried with 30 votes for, 1 abstention.

The meeting will be Friday 29th February and Saturday 1st March

16. Closure

IGC president Bob Henderson thanked the Bureau for their work during the last year. He then closed the meeting and wished everyone a safe journey home.

Peter Eriksen

IGC Secretary

Appendix A: IGC 2006 Finance Report and 2007 budget

	Actual 2005	Budget 2006	Actual YTD 2006	Budget 2007
Opening Balance of Funds	44453.57	49899.11	49899.11	58515.19
Income: €				
1. Total Income	11934.99	15996.79	18752.47	28080.00
1.1				
Championships Income - Sanction Fees	10265.75	14714.74	16748.96	27080.00
Continental Championships			3818.15	13500.00
World Championships	1928.53	5448.72	3172.75	5250.00
QGP and GP		2625.00		200.00
BHC	1304.51		1211.65	0.00
Ranking System	6062.26	6000.00	7919.16	7500.00
OLC	970.45	641.03	627.25	630.00
Protest Fee				
1.2				
Sales	1669.24	1282.05	1961.51	1000.00
FR Certification	1669.24	1282.05	1961.51	1000.00
1.3				
Miscellaneous Income	0.00	0.00	42.00	0.00

Expenditure: €				
2. Total Expenditures	6489.45	6615.00	10136.39	32147.00
2.1				
Travel and Administration	0.00			0.00
2.2				
Meetings	4241.02	4500.00	6846.01	7000.00
IGC President's attendance at Meetings	4241.02	4500.00	6623.01	7000.00
IGC Other Officials Expenses			223	
2.3				
Stock Purchases	0.00		1279.54	0.00
2.4				
Championship Expenses	1135.20	1515.00	1301.38	24447.00
Medals	1135.20	615.00	606.00	1242.00
Officials Expenses WGC and CGC				20080.00
Officials Expenses GP			695.38	1250.00
Ranking List		900.00		1875.00
2.5				
Miscellaneous Expences	1113.23	600.00	709.46	700.00
GFAC	562.14	600.00	693.46	700.00
Sundry			16.00	
Special Travel	551.09			

Total Income	11934.99	15996.79	18752.47	28080.00
Total Expenditures	6489.45	6615.00	10136.39	32147.00
Retained Income	5445.54	9381.79	8616.08	-4067.00
Closing Balance	49899.11	59280.90	58515.19	54448.19

Appendix B: IGC Competition Officials for competition in 2007 and 2008

2007 Junior WGC – Rieti, Italy, 28th July to 11th August

Chief Steward – Roland Stuck

Steward – Visa-Matti Leinekki

Jury President – Tor Johannessen

Jury Members – Alvaro de Orleans (remote), Ross McIntyre

2007 Women’s WGC – Romorantin, France, 10th to 22nd July

Chief Steward – Peter Ryder

Steward – Gill Van den Broeck, Angela Sheard

Jury President – Bruno Ramseyer

Jury Members – Janusz Szczupak, Michel Fache (remote)

2007 EGC – Issoudun, France, 2nd to 18th August

Chief Steward – Patrick Pauwels

Steward – Angela Sheard

Jury President – Goran Ax

Jurors – Peter Eriksen (remote), Fred Gai

2007 EGC – Pociunai, 28th July to 12th August

Chief Steward – Jiri Dodal,

Steward - Raimo Huoviala

Jury President – Hannes Linke

Jurors – Petras Beta, Axel Reich (remote)

2008 World/Standard/Club WGC – Rieti, Italy, 6th to 20th July

Chief Steward – Brian Spreckley

Steward – Robert Danewid

Jury President – Tor Johannessen

Jury Members – Peter Eriksen (remote), TBD

2008 Open/15m/18m WGC – Luesse, Germany, 26th July to 9th August

Chief Steward – Dick Bradley

Steward – Hannes Linke, Janusz Szczupak

Jury President – Bob Henderson

Jury Members – Roland Stuck, TBD

Appendix C: Changes to the IGC-Handicap list applied from 1. October 2007

1.) The Maximum value of the IGC-Handicap List is changed to 109, to include more older Standard and FAI 15m gliders

2.) Inclusion of Discus A/B/CS, 108 (with winglets 109)

3.) Inclusion of DG 400, 108

4.) ASW 24 WL, 108

ASW 24B, 108

5.) Pik 20 D 104

PIK 20 B 103

6.) Std. Cirrus, 100 (with winglets 101)

7.) ASW 20 108 (with winglets 109)

The reference weights will be determined according to the TCDS Non-lifting weight of the relevant gliders.

Appendix D: IGC World Gliding Championships Calendar - 2007 -2014

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010
Event	<p>WGC – Juniors <i>Rieti, Italy</i></p> <p>WGC - Women’s <i>Romarantin, France</i></p> <p>EGC - Open, 18, 15 <i>Issoudun, France</i> EGC - Std, Club, World <i>Pociunai, Lithuania</i></p> <p>World Sailplane Grand Prix <i>To be decided by IGC Bureau</i></p>	<p>WGC - 15 Meter, 18 Meter, Open <i>Luesse, Germany</i></p> <p>WGC - Standard, Club, World <i>Rieti, Italy</i></p> <p>Qualifying Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2007</p>	<p>WGC – Juniors <i>Rayskala, Finland</i></p> <p>WGC - Women’s <i>Szeged, Hungary</i></p> <p>Alternative Events EGC - Std, Club, World <i>Orel, Russia</i></p> <p>World Sailplane Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2008</p>	<p>WGC - 15 Meter, 18 Meter, Open <i>Szeged, Hungary</i></p> <p>WGC - Standard, Club, World <i>Prievidza, Slovakia</i></p> <p>Qualifying Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2009</p>
Year	2011	2012	2013	2014
Event	<p>WGC – Juniors Bid selection = 2008</p> <p>WGC - Women’s Bid Selection = 2008</p> <p>Alternative Events Bid Selection = 2010</p> <p>World Sailplane Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2010</p>	<p>WGC - 15 Meter, 18 Meter, Open Bid selection = 2009</p> <p>WGC - Standard, Club, World Bid selection = 2009</p> <p>Qualifying Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2011</p>	<p>WGC – Juniors Bid selection = 2010</p> <p>WGC - Women’s Bid Selection = 2010</p> <p>Alternative Events Bid Selection = 2012</p> <p>World Sailplane Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2012</p>	<p>WGC - 15 Meter, 18 Meter, Open Bid selection = 2011</p> <p>WGC - Standard, Club, World Bid selection = 2011</p> <p>Qualifying Grand Prix Bid Selection = 2013</p>

NOTE: This calendar is shown as running through 2014 for illustrative purposes only. The calendar and structure of the World Gliding Championships will continue on as shown after 2014 (until changed or modified by the IGC Plenum).