APPENDIX G – CIVL PLENARY 2012 – MINUTES – CHINESE TAIPEI

CIVL Open Class Technical Working Group Report – February 2012

A short, personal overview about my work with OCTWG
Martin Scheel
****

The original OCTWG mandate had been to introduce technical limitations in glider construction such as aspect ratio, amount of attachment points, speed and other. Before and during the big meeting in Abtenau the manufacturer did convince me and the group, that this is not the right measure to enhance safety (almost 2 years later, after EnZo came out, a lot of specialists (such as Hannes Papesh and members of the Task Force) think, that it would have been a good solution).

In succession OCTWG focused on the raising of awareness of the pilots and on a kind of self homologation by the manufacturers. Furthermore better line-strength requirements have been defined for this Comp Class. These requirements were safer and easier to perform. As they based on a 23-G calculation without including the bending tests, Dyneema disappeared.

The rules had been written in time and accepted almost unanimously by the sub-commission and plenary in Feb 2011. Some manufacturers complained, that the time between CIVL-plenary and worlds where too short, but they had been informed several times before the plenary, that it will happen. Finally most manufacturers managed to deliver the gliders in time (2 month prior the comp) to the pilots. I know only from one who was cheating seriously.

In my opinion the self homologation did not work and the manufacturers did go over the limit with the 2011-models. Furthermore some did copy the flight-report from others. Probably the main problem has been, that the 2011-models felt very stable and easy even in high speed - but where almost impossible to recover after a collapse. In succession the tragic accidents in Piedrahita did happen.

There were rumors, that OCTWG did force pilots to fly with 2-liners. In my opinion it is not true for different reasons:
1) manufacturers would have only to calculate and produce a new line set according to 23G rule for older wings (no flight tests);
2) Nobody would fly a 2009-model in a serious competition against 140 2-liner;
3) The latest EN-D wings had about the same performance as the comp models of 2009. Everybody has been free to fly such a Serial Model.

After the "suspension of Comp Class models" things went on and the manufacturers proved, that they are able to push Comp-Gliders in to EN. I think many of the "Serial Lobbyists" were shocked. The Task force made the proposal to Split EN-D (with technical limitations) and PMA under the lead of Hannes Papesh discussed this seriously as well.

After the accident of Alain Zoller testing such a model a test stop has been decided. Two meetings with PMA, test centers and federations at a "round table" brought out, what OCTWG, some federations and specialists did ask since a long time: It is important to develop a Comp Class.

OCTWG did try to do it before. It has not been possible to establish fast and perfect. 2011 was a transition year. I am happy if PMA takes the lead now. It will be difficult, because the line between

EN-D and "not seriously testable" is extremely small. And I believe, that some manufacturers complain, that it is too expensive to pay a whole homologation price for the Comp Class. But we will see. It is the way to go.

What could be used from OCTWG
****
The line calculation.
I think everybody did agree, that this calculation is better, easier and safer as the normal EN-requirement. The most important is: No bending test. The bending test favorites Dyneema, which is in reality a big (safety) problem with shrinking. This line calculations should be used for a Comp Class.

The 2-month rule:
Even with EN-D gliders it makes sense to fly a glider prior to a comp. It could stay in the rules. Some work for CIVL. Cheating is possible with criminal action only.

The pilots experience form:
It should stay for sure. It should be combined with a incident database.

Martin Scheel
February 2012