

**CIVL HG/PG JOINT Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**  
**19<sup>th</sup> February 2009, Hall in Tirol, Austria**

**Attendance:** See attached list

**Section I: Issues referred by CIVL Bureau**

**1. Flying Stewards: Review ruling on whether FAI Stewards should be allowed to fly during the task.**

Discussion resulted in agreement that a recommendation (rather than ruling) should be proposed for inclusion in the Jury & Steward Handbook. Overall view is that Stewards should be available to organiser at all times.

Action: Stéphane Malbos (FRA) & Scott Torkelsen (DNK) to propose wording by Part 2 of Meetings. Considerations include specifying when and where they can fly, ie not on course line, during the task, not launching while start gates are open, must land before check in time etc.

Proposed wording: “Stewards should be available as much as possible to the MD and SD. It is understood that he cannot be physically available at all times. Flying the task is not an option, but flying as an efficient means to reach goal or HQ, for example, is possible, but only in coordination with MD or SD.”

**2. Continental competitions: Should there be some flexibility in the year they can be held?**

Discussion resulted in overall agreement. Suggested proposal (JA+HM, amended YO+FA):

“European continental championships should stay on current schedule (alternate years to World Championships). In the interests of encouraging other continental championships these may be bid to be held in any convenient year, subject to normal acceptance procedure. Once established, the decision to run subsequent continental championships in the same year as the world championships will be considered on a case by case basis.”

Proposal recommended by Joint Subcommittees. Vote: In favour: 9 Against: 1

**3. Safety & Training: Revision of incident reporting form.**

Deferred to separate HG & PG sessions.

**4. Issues that will attract financial penalties for non-performance in 1<sup>st</sup> Category events. These must be measurable and provable.**

Discussion included points that Steward Report provides important criteria and that organisers should get pilots to complete a questionnaire to provide additional feedback.

Action: Working group appointed to report back to Bureau by October 2009. Led by John Aldriege and including Chris Burns (GBR), Rob in't Groen (NDL), Thomas Brandlehner (GER).

NB. Elsa Mai (Chinese Taipei) representing joint PG Accuracy & Aerobatics SCs subsequently requested to join WG.

**5. Provision for an extra visit by steward before Cat 1 event, to check recommendations are followed.**

Discussion concluded it is a good idea in specific circumstances, (Steward Report of test comp will determine). It need not be the Steward but a local appointed ‘expert’. Noted that required work may not be completed until close to the event.

Proposal (LG + ): To empower the Bureau to propose suitable wording.  
All Agreed

**Section II: Rule change proposals from Sporting Code Subcommittee**

**6. S7A, 1.6.7.7 Start Line** – add “or the boundary of the start cylinder specified for the task.”

No objections or comments.

**7. S7A, 2.4.2 The Total Period** – amend heading to read “**Duration of Championship**”, replace existing wording with “The total period of the championship shall not exceed 14 days, including the opening and closing ceremonies. Competitors are subject to all rules relating to championship flying throughout this period, whether flying a task or not. ”

No objections

However, CB pointed out that technically, the “duration” should include practice days, which should be after registration. 14 days is not long enough a period in this case. FA added that 14day restriction can mean running practice tasks on same days as ceremonies, causing timing/logistical problems. HM pointed out there should be a day between practice task & start of competition to prepare and resolve issues arising. JA clarified that 14 days can be extended, but it has been discussed before. Need to consider time pressure on pilots. Conclusion: This aspect needs further discussion and consideration during coming year.

Action: Add to next year’s SC Agenda if necessary.

**8. S7A, 2.4.3 Minimum Representation** - Clarify validation of Women's continental competition when part of overall open class Cat 1 meet.

Item disregarded as included on Agenda in error and incorrectly referenced.

**8. S7A, New paragraph 2.17.3 – All Flying Banned**

Both the Competition Director and the Safety Director have the power to ban flying from the site if a task or day is cancelled due to dangerous conditions.

Extended discussion with some voices wanting to retain existing system whereby MD/SD can ‘recommend’ rather than rule against flying if they deem conditions to be dangerous. Issues include: pilot safety (especially of less competent pilots); setting & enforcing penalties for contraventions.

SC recommends to accept rule change. Vote: For 7 Against 5 .

**9. S7A, New paragraph 2.17.6 – Pilot Competence**

Both the Competition Director and the Safety Director have the power to exclude from the championship pilots who do not demonstrate the necessary skills for safe launching, flight or landing.

2 proposed Amendments (RR + SM) as follows:

“The Competition Director and the Safety Director in agreement with the Steward, have the power to exclude from the championship pilots who demonstrate the lack of necessary skills for safe launching, flight or landing.”

SC recommends amended rule change. Vote: For 15 Against 0

**10. S7A, 2.17.7 Collision Avoidance**

Clarify the statement concerning “International rules of the air”.

Proposed (KdK+JA): to remove that specific line from Section 7, at this time.

All agreed

Action: Safety & Training committee is tasked to set out an international convention of rules of the air document, which can be put back into Section 7 next year.

NB Since the meeting it was subsequently pointed out that an International Rules of the Air document exists at: [http://www.icao.int/icao/net/anx/info/annexes\\_booklet\\_en.pdf](http://www.icao.int/icao/net/anx/info/annexes_booklet_en.pdf)

**11. S7A, 2.27 Outlandings** – in second paragraph delete all after “and if”

No objections.

**12. S7A, 2.28.2.1 – Altitude Limits**

Delete “that have either been specified at task briefing or” from the first line and add at the end “For infringement of altitude limits that have been specified in the Local Regulations or during the task briefing the penalty shall be specified in the Local Regulations.

JA clarified that measuring altitude limits is a separate discussion. This rule change proposal gives greater flexibility on penalties for infringements of competition limits. Penalties for legal limits are unchanged.

Japan + Portugal strongly believe the same (zero points) penalties should be applied for infringements of both legal and competition limits.

Joint SCs recommend to accept. Vote: For 13, Against 2

**13. S7A, 3.2.2 Host Nation Team**

Not a HG issue. Defer to PG SCmeeting

**14. S7A, 4.4 Results**

No objections.

**15. S7A, 5.5.2 Calculation of Scores**

Should say that any rounding up is done after the application of penalties.

No objections

**16. S7A, 5.5.4 Pilots Who Do Not Fly**

Replace existing wording for DNF, DSQ and ABS.

Some discussion about whether DNF should specify ‘setting up for launch’ rather than just ‘on launch’.

No objections.

**17. S7A, 7.1.3 Method and Timing of Payment** [sanction fees]

No objections

**18. Chapter 13** - Move remaining paragraphs (about goals) into Chapter 2

No objections

**19. S7A & B, Chapt 16** - include statement that track logs become the property of the FAI and may be published. In second line of second paragraph delete “must” and insert “should”.

No objections

**Section III: Discussion/Recommendations requested by Sporting Code SSC**

**20. S7A & B 3.4.2 Eligibility to Compete**

The meeting had not strong views to discuss or change this.  
Deferred to separate HG & PG SC meetings

### **21. S7A - 2.28.2.1 – Altitude limits**

Background discussion: DP referenced a technical paper written by UK HG pilot, Bruce Kavanagh covering instrumentation measurement method differences. This paper can serve as a base, and further comments and contributions from others, in US and Europe are being gathered. Discussion of different methods of determining altitude (GPS triangulation, pressure transducer, corrected for standard pressure). Some units record values based on both GPS & pressure transducers. Scoring programs download & use tracks differently.

GD: Instrument manufacturers are reacting quickly to the problem. Some instruments are proving to be unsuitable (Garmins).

JA: In some units, pressure readings can be manipulated as they are user adjustable. Instruments can be set to pressure of the day, or standard pressure.

DP confirmed that the SCs agree that we feel it is important to have a standard approach to measuring altitude consistently. Apart from HG Worlds in 2009, we have 18 months before next Cat 1 to sort it out.

DP further confirmed that we will be setting altitude limits at certain Cat 1 competitions. The implication is that pilots will have to invest in new instruments.

Proposal for next stage (OE+KdK): To determine method to set altitude limits.

“The HG Worlds, Laragne will be employing an altitude limit system. We will collect data on all the instruments used and try to make a fair assessment of potential infringements. With this information, the MD will determine whether altitude limits can be fairly imposed.”

Recommendation of proposal for HG Worlds accepted with no objections.

BH: For Laragne, we should be able to extrapolate information from known good instruments to those that cannot or do not yet make correct measurements. Any help or guidelines welcome.

Next stage: Discussion of forward plan.

JA/DP: Need a better specification of instruments to be used: ie 3D GPS not sufficient.

MS: There will always be differences between instruments. In long term, should provide a standard black box unit to all pilots – all should fly with the same units.

Goran D: Ask manufacturers to make instruments to our requirements. Should use GPS measurements until then, to be fair to pilots.

Harry Buntz + AG: We have data from Mexico also, which will be useful.

Action: Formation of an Altitude Limits Working Group: AG (chair), KdK, Thomas B, MS, Oyvind, BH, Dieter Munchmeyer, FA.

Briefing (to include): Produce a brief for pilots with basic information so they can make informed decisions on flight instruments. Communicate with instrument manufacturers. Determine/propose process to produce a report by 20 May 2009.

Discussion on whether we need a rule change to insist on a continuous track log for some instruments to eliminate possibility of trickery. Concluded that with 3D backup and other rules already in place (including 16.5.7), no rule change needed at this time. But WG might recommend rule changes later.

Discussion on penalties. HM: Trialled a sliding scale of penalties at Bogong Cup.

“The penalty (in points) shall be the square of your maximum height above the airspace floor or altitude limitation in meters divided by 200, summed for each incident (up and above and then down below of airspace floor or altitude limitation)

during a task. For violations less than one minute, no penalty will be applied. For violations over three minutes a second incident shall start and so on for every 3 minutes.”

HM stated that pilots liked it. JD: Also tried for paragliders. Time limit scale worked as gave pilot benefit of the doubt, if inadvertently drifted in etc.

Goran D: Disagreed strongly. PWC looking at buffer zone then zero tolerance of infringements.

#### **Section IV: Plenary Proposals**

##### **22. Australia Discussion/Proposal 3: Cloud Flying penalties – zero = too harsh**

Discussion:

FA: Proof of infringement is the key. If it can be proved, zero is not too harsh.

HM: Pilots do not report infringements. They might do if penalties are less.

Organisers hesitant to give zero, but they would penalise if less severe options.

SM: Agrees with FA.

CB: In Mexico, organisers could not prove accusations – there was reasonable doubt.

JA: Rules state obligation on pilot to prove he was not in cloud.

Motion (HM + NA): Allow MD to have discretion and some flexibility to set penalties for cloud flying.

Recommendation approved: In favour: 9 Against: 4

SM stated that this is a bad rule if passed, as it can be against National laws, and can send the wrong message to pilots.

It was noted that the motion did not state whether to specify changes in Section 7 or in Local Regulations.

##### **23. Netherlands Proposal 1: Protest Guidelines to avoid cancelling a task**

KdK: It can be unfair to other pilots to cancel a task as an outcome to a protest. Juries should be empowered to try to find an alternative to cancelling a task.

No objections.

Committee recommends that this guidance is put in to the Jury & Steward Handbook and Section 7.

Action item to Sporting Code SC to include this proposal.

##### **24. Netherlands Proposal 2: WXC as a World/Continental Championship**

Idea still needs more discussion and more concrete proposal. AG should be consulted.

JA advised on need to make sure compliance with existing FAI rules (prize-giving, medals, titles etc)

No objections to idea in principle. Action: KdK to continue developing.

##### **25. Austria Proposal: Reduced costs of Cat 1 Competitions**

Discussion highlighted some objections to the idea: Different costs in different countries. Different sponsorship opportunities in different countries.

JA highlighted that delegates are directed to assess bids, to consider value for money, what is included in package, and ask questions of potential organisers.

Joint SCs NOT in favour of supporting this proposal: For 3 Against 8

FA suggested it can be discussed again at HG SC as not an issue for PG competitions.

##### **26. Spain Proposal: Review Cat 2 application: permission from host country**

Proposer not present.

PS: Difficult to enforce when a local representative signs the sanction application form, and it is not always clear if this person has the authority to sign on behalf of the NAC, or sometimes, if it is technically a 'foreign' organiser at all.

JA: SC should empower the Bureau to ensure that delegates follow the rules that are already in place.

All agreed.

### **CIVL HG & PG JOINT SC Attendance, 19 February 2009, Hall in Tirol**

Chris (Calvo) Burns – UK Alternate Delegate – PG SC Chair

Dennis Pagen – US Delegate – HG SC Chair

Agust Gudmundsson – Iceland Delegate

Brian Harris – France – CIVL Comps Coordinator

Corinna Schwiegershausen – Germany

Didier Mathurin – France

Dietrich Munchmeyer – Germany

Elsa Mai – Chinese Taipei Delegate

Esa Alaraudansoki – Finland Delegate

Fernando Amaral – Portugal Delegate

Goran Dimistovski – FYR Macedonia – PWC chair

Hakan Cici – Turkey Delegate

Harry Buntz – Germany Alternate Delegate

Heather Mull – Australia Delegate

John Aldridge – UK Delegate – Sporting Code SC Chair

Jonny Durand – Australia

Karolina Kociecka – Poland

Klaus Tanzler – Germany Delegate

Knut K Nygard – Norway Delegate

Koos de Keijzer – Netherlands Delegate

Leonard Grigorescu – Romania Delegate

Louise Joselyn – UK – CIVL Secretary

Martin Scheel – Switzerland Delegate

Murat Baygora – Turkey Alternate Delegate

Niels J Askirk – Denmark Alternate Delegate

Oyvind Ellefsen – Norway Alternate Delegate

Paula Sayer – UK – CIVL Comps Coordinator

Raimund Kaiser – Austria Alternate Delegate

Rasmus Rohlff – Denmark

Raymond Caux – France

Regina Glas – Germany

Rob in't Groen – Netherlands

Scott Torkelsen – Denmark Delegate – Safety & Training SC Chair

Stein-Tore Erdal – Norway

Stéphane Malbos – France Delegate

Thomas Brandlehner – Austria Alternate Delegate

Thomas Senac – France – Environment WG chair

Vicki Cain – Australia

Wayne Sayer – US

Xavier Murillo – France – PWC Secretary

Yoshiki Oka – Japan Delegate