

CIVL Paragliding Subcommittee
Meeting Agenda – 19th and 20th February, 2009, Hall in Tirol, Austria

NB. Sections I, II, III and IV (excluding Aus1 proposal) are common to both HG and PG

Section I: Issues referred by CIVL Bureau

1. Flying Stewards: Review ruling on whether FAI Stewards should be allowed to fly during the task (consider difference between ‘flying the task’, ‘flying while task is underway’ (ie directly to the goalfield) and ‘task’ wording i.e. while start gates are open, until last pilot has left the hill, until last pilot has checked in. Recommendations to Plenary.

2. Continental competitions: Should there be some flexibility in the year they can be held? Currently in years alternate to World Championships. Should this be strictly adhered to? (CIVL IRs must be followed – no change to rule that bids should be received 60 days before the CIVL meeting two years ahead of the competition).

3. Safety & Training: A revised incident reporting form, circulated by the S&T Subcommittee (and included in the Agenda pack) should be reviewed and suggested modifications or amendments relevant to HG should be noted and returned to the S&T SSC. It is proposed to make the form mandatory for Cat 1s and recommended (later mandatory) for Cat 2 events.

4. S7A, B & C to specify the issues that will attract financial penalties for non-performance in 1st Category events. These must be measurable and provable.
Reason: FAI recommendations.

5. S7A, B & C and OA to include provision for an extra visit by the steward at a specified time before the event, at the organiser’s expense, when it is necessary to confirm that recommendations have been followed.

Reason: arising from Serbian PG Euros experience.

Discuss other checks and measures that could be implemented.

Section II: Rule change proposals from Sporting Code Subcommittee

6. S7B, 1.6.7.7 Start Line

Add “or the boundary of the start cylinder specified for the task.”

Reason: this type of start is already in common use – see 1.6.7.9 Start Sectors.

7. S7B, 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. ”

Reason: FAI advice to ensure the Competition and Safety Directors can exercise control throughout this period.

8. S7B, 2.5.5.1 Minimum Representation

Clarify validation of Women's continental comps when part of overall open class Cat 1 meet.

Reason: duplicates proposal for S7A for conformity.

9. S7B, 2.16.7 Collision Avoidance

Clarify this as there are no “International rules of the air”.

Reason: request to FAI: can you send me a copy of the "International rules of the air" mentioned in the SECTION 7C - Chapter 2.19.7 "Collision avoidance".

10. S7B, New paragraph 2.18.3 – 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.

Reason: FAI recommendation to aid safety.

11. S7B, New paragraph 2.18.5 – 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.

Reason: FAI recommendation to aid safety.

12. S7B, 2.27 Outlandings

Delete all after close of parenthesis in last sentence.

Reason: no longer required when GPS track log evidence is used.

13. S7B, 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.

Reason: to allow the competition director greater flexibility in dealing with these types of altitude limits.

14. S7B, 3.2.2 Host Nation Team

After “top nation” in the second line insert “except that they may not enter a male as a substitute for the female pilot place allocated in the base team size”. (*See also point 29 below*)

Reason: fairness to other nations.

15. S7B, 4.4 Results

Insert “any available” in front of “unofficial results” in 4th line.

Reason: these results are not always available.

Insert new paragraph “All results should have the CIVL ID number for each pilot recorded. The following formats are acceptable for input to the WPRS:

FSDB file from FS

The full RACE database

An Excel format (.xls or .csv) file with the results in the following order:

Name (First name followed by family name) Nation (IOC abbreviated codes)

Total (score) FAI_licence (number) CIVL_Pilot_ID

PDF files are not acceptable.”

Reason: these are the only formats that can be input to the WPRS database without manual reformatting by the CIVL Competition Coordinator.

16. S7B, 5.5.2 Calculation of Scores

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

Reason: scores should not be rounded twice.

17. S7B, 5.3.2 Times and Distances

Delete second paragraph and replace with:

5.3.4 Pilots Who Do Not Fly

5.5.4.1 DNF

A pilot who is present at the launch site for the task but decides not to fly scores zero and shall be indicated as DNF on the score sheet.

5.5.4.2 DSQ

A pilot who is disqualified is to score zero and be indicated as DSQ on the score sheet for that task and all subsequent tasks.

5.5.4.3 ABS

A pilot who withdraws due to illness or accident shall be marked as ABS (absent) for all subsequent tasks and no longer counted in the group or class for the purposes of scoring for each task that he or she remains unfit to fly. A pilot who withdraws due to an equipment problem may also be marked as ABS subject to approval by the Safety Director; any such pilot is to continue to be shown as ABS for subsequent tasks until the Safety Director has approved repaired or replacement equipment.

18. S7B, 7.1.3 Method and Timing of Payment [sanction fees]

In third paragraph delete wording after “announced” and insert “in the CIVL approved local regulations for the event”

Reason: current wording does not reflect what actually happens; LRs are often approved by the Bureau to meet deadlines specified in other S7A rules.

At end of third paragraph add “Any unpaid sanction fees, FAI officials’ expenses and any performance financial penalties may be deducted from these entry fees.”

Reason: to include the reason this measure was introduced and to provide for the introduction of performance penalties.

19. S7B, Chapter 13 - Move remaining paragraphs (about goals) into Chapter 2, perhaps under HEADER 2 "Goals in Soaring Competition".

Reason: housekeeping.

20. S7B, Chapter 16 - include statement that track logs become the property of the FAI and may be published.

Reason: often requested in the interests of openness – refer to PG SC.

In second line of second paragraph delete “must” and insert “should”.

Reason: this is rarely considered necessary so should not be mandatory.

Section III: Discussion/Recommendations requested by Sporting Code SSC

21. S7A & B 3.4.2 Eligibility to Compete

Both sections require that a pilot should have placed at a certain level in the 3 years before the meet. They might not have flown a comp since. Is this a sensible qualification? *Recommendations from SSC to Sporting Code SSC please.*

22. S7A - 2.28.2.1 – Altitude limits

Consider splitting airspace and ‘briefed’ altitude limits - with less draconian penalties for infringements of the latter. See also HG ideas using ‘briefed’ altitude limits to set a start line altitude to avoid cloud flying.

Especially consider how altitude limits can be policed effectively and fairly with differing 3D GPS units. (Also relevant to Australia Proposal/discussion 3: Cloud flying)

Section IV: Plenary Proposals

23. Australia Discussion/Proposal 3: Cloud Flying penalties – zero = too harsh

24. Netherlands Proposal 1: Protest Guidelines to avoid cancelling a task

25. Netherlands Proposal 2: WXC as a World/Continental Championship

26. Austria Proposal: Reduced costs of Cat 1 Competitions

27. Spain Proposal: Review Cat 2 application: permission from host country

28. Australia Proposal 1: Introduce PG Women’s World Championship (deferred from 2008 Plenary, for discussion and feedback)

Section V: Items raised by PG Subcommittee members

29. Team size and Team scoring:

It is a fact that all the countries present at the Europeans felt that the system required improving to make it more sporting and involve all team members. As it stands at the moment the rule is flawed and needs discussing.

Review in conjunction with S7 proposed rule change in 36. below.

30. Reserve Pilot Nomination:

Currently the reserve pilot has to be nominated and once that pilot has substituted the original scoring team member they are no longer allowed to fly in the competition.

There are a number of situations where this would be completely unfair and could also lead to a pilot who is unfit to fly continuing to fly. This requires discussing.

From Jury Report: *“Also, the reserve pilot has to be nominated in the beginning along with the 3 pilots scoring for the team. If this pilot gets injured or ill and one of the 3 also becomes incapacitated, what options does the team have to replace him? The Jury requests that this point should be revised and clarified at the next plenary meeting.”*

31. Female place:

The Current rule in section 7 does not state that if a country is not taking a female they cannot take an extra male. The majority of countries are of the opinion that the place is gender specific so the rule should state this. ie: if a country is not taking a female they may not take an extra male (to be discussed then forwarded to SC7 group) – *See also 14. above – covers host nation only?*

32. Safety: Reduced entry

It has been suggested that if the pilot numbers are reduced (130 or 120 max) this would improve safety and reduce the pressure on take off size. Discuss.

33. Safety: Flying Safety committee

Suggested proposal that there is a separate flying safety committee on a separate radio frequency communicating with the Meet/Safety director on the conditions on course

34. Scoring: Leading points on clock start elapsed time race:

Is it fair to have leading points on such a task as only a limited number of pilots can use the first start time?

35. Scoring: 80% of time points for achieving end of speed section but not goal:

Does this not contradict the principle of safety in having a separate speed section to goal so as not to have pilots on full accelerator close to the ground?

36. Pilot landing to assist a crashed pilot:

We need a better way of rewarding a pilot in this situation that is clear to all pilots and can be shown in the scoring each day.

37. Penalties:

At the moment we have penalties where the pilots are punished with zero for the task. If the task is cancelled this penalty is zero. We need to make this fair but effective. For instance: if a pilot fails to report back he scores zero for the task. If he won the task the penalty could be 1000 points, if he bombed out it would be more like 70 points. This is obviously not fair.

38. It has been suggested that the defending champion (world, continental or European) be allowed a discretionary place to defend his/her title if not selected by his/her respective country.

Section VI: PG-specific Rule Changes proposed by Sporting Code SSC

39. S7B, 1.6.7.3 Start Point/Departure point:

Delete “or a ground feature photographed from the correct photo sector” in the first sentence.

Reason: Photo evidence no longer permitted in 1st Category events.

40. S7B, 2.4.6 Practice Event – add new paragraph:

Organisers of all practice events (including Pre-WAG) are to apply for Category 2 status for these events (Chapter 4).

Reason: to clarify responsibility.

41. S7B, 2.23.4 Re-Launch

When permitted a re-launch, pilots will not take priority over other pilots who have not yet launched at all.

Reason: A fairness issue raised in the Serbian Europeans Steward & Jury reports: “Launch priority. Currently in S7b it is stated that the top 15 male and 5 women have priority and they can enter the launching area at any time (if there is ordered launch), but there is nothing stated about the priority in case of re-launches (the priority is

applying also in such cases or not – a pilot from top 15 or 5 could take off in front of a pilot low ranked who didn't take off yet at least once?)”

“Section 7 B 2.24.3, ORDERED LAUNCH, it needs to be specified if this rule is also applied to the top 15 male and 5 female in case of a second re-launch.

It was also suggested that order should be according to the competition rankings only after reaching 1500 points (so after two good tasks or more if they are weak), as results of just one task could be very random.”

42. S7B, 5.2.5 Team Scoring

After “illness or injury” in the 5th line insert “but he may not be scored as a team member in a task where the injured team pilot has already attempted any part of the task.”

Reason: A fairness issue raised by the Jury at the Serbian Europeans.

“We discovered an inadequacy in the Section 7 B, 5.2.5 that may lead to miss interpretation and needs to be clarified: According to the actual text, it is possible to presume that in case of an injured pilot the reserve one will only be able to score for the team from the next task on; however what if the pilot was injured during the attempt to take off after the window was open but did not fly at all, can then at that moment be replaced by the reserve in the very same task? In such situation the reserve pilot automatically takes place or is it necessary for the Team Leader to notify the Meet Director? If so, by what via must be made? (oral or in writing) and what is the time limit for the request?”

See also point 27 above:

43. S7B, 6.6 Forms and briefing notes

Delete penultimate bullet point “Official outlanding map” and all detail.

Reason: no longer used in 1st Category events.

Section VII: Competition bids

44. Review three bids received for 2011 World PG Championships from:

Italy, Spain and Turkey

No bids for 2011 Pan American Continental championships – consider options.

Reminder:

SSC Written Report to Plenary should include (brief) review of activity during the year, as well as Minutes from this SSC Meeting.

SSC Verbal Report should focus on proposals & decisions not covered in other reports (ie Sporting Code, Safety & Training), highlighting issues that require a vote of approval, plus comments/recommendations on Plenary proposals and Championship bids. NO NEED to read out whole report at Plenary.