



CIVL 2014 PLENARY – ANNEX 16A HANG GLIDING COMMITTEE'S PROPOSALS

1- Safety equipment

Aim:

The CIVL needs to make a political decision and statement as a base for rules about personal safety equipment for pilots. Ref. recent helmet debates.

Proposal for statement in S7:

CIVL recognize that some pilots will choose to trade performance, cost, comfort, convenience, etc. over safety in their choice of personal safety equipment. The results of accidents and injuries affect not just the pilots that may injure themselves due to lack of protection, but friends and family of pilots and the sport as a whole. History shows us that injuries could have been prevented with simple means of better personal protection. E.g. crushable foam in helmets.

CIVL also recognize the fact that pilots are personally responsible for their and others safety at all times, both in competition and free flying. No rules or equipment can prevent accidents when human factors are involved in decision making. However certain safety equipment can in some cases prevent severe injuries without incurring major negative factors for pilots. E.g. parachutes.

CIVL will therefore mandate use of some personal safety equipment, and will set minimum standards of that equipment where needed.

Comment:

The other option is that CIVL should only mandate safety gear when the lack of appropriate gear could confer a competitive advantage to a pilot. E.g. by being more aerodynamic. This option leaves the choice of equipment up to the pilot, and we trust them to pick the best equipment available to them. In this case history is very likely to repeat itself.

2- Airspace restrictions

Aim and comment:

The purpose of listing pilots close to airspace is to leave no uncertainty that the flights are being checked for these violations, and pilots close to airspace are made aware that they must concentrate on their navigation, hopefully before they commit an offence. 30m is a margin for measurement error, so that there can be no doubt that the glider has passed the boundary and an offence has been committed. The previous margin of 100m allowed pilots to gain a one time advantage, with no margin for measurement error allowed on a second offence. This new rule allows no proven airspace offence to occur without a penalty.

Openair.txt files are readily available for most relevant airspace, this is what is used for sailplane competitions. They simple to understand and create from coordinate information.

The last line removes any ambiguity about track logs before the race start, after the race finish and after a task has been stopped.

Existing rule:

2.29.2 Controlled Airspace

The organisers shall specify in the local regulations or at briefing, controlled airspace or other areas where flight by competing gliders is prohibited or restricted. Such areas shall be precisely marked on published maps.

The penalty for violation of published airspace restrictions shall be a warning for the first infringement of less than 100m by a pilot. For infringements greater than this or for subsequent infringements the pilot shall score zero for the day. For infringements of airspace boundaries that have been specified in the Local Regulations or during the task briefing the penalty shall be specified in the Local Regulations.

Replace with:

The organisers shall specify in the local regulations or at briefing, controlled airspace or other areas where flight by competing gliders is prohibited or restricted. Such areas shall be precisely marked on published maps and provided as openair.txt format files for display on instruments and scoring check.

Pilots who's recorded track comes closer than 100m vertically or horizontally to prohibited airspace shall be listed in the scores for each task without penalty.

Where the pilots track log is recorded more than 30m inside prohibited airspace, vertically or horizontally, the pilot shall score zero for the day.

The entire flight from launch to landing will be considered for such violations irrespective of task being active or stopped, the course started or finished.

3- Helmet

Aim:

Allow pilots access to the most current technology, best selection and value in helmets by including standards that are broadly equivalent. Recent research has shown that a significant proportion of the brain damage from impacts is from rotational forces, from which currently allowed helmets offer no protection. Technologies such as M.I.P.S. are available today in snow sports helmets.

To offer the certified level of protection, helmets must be replaced regularly. The availability of lower cost helmets in a greater selection of sizes and models will encourage pilots do this. Having a helmet that fits well and securely is critical. Expanding the selection of helmets available will make that possible for many more pilots.

Instead of:

12.6.3

All pilots competing in 1st Category events must wear a helmet certified to EN966 (HPG) at all times whilst flying.

New text:

12.6.3

All pilots competing in 1st Category events must wear a helmet certified to either EN966 (HPG), EN1077-A and -B (Snow Sports), ASTM 2040 (Snow Sports) or SNELL rs98 (Snow Sports) at all times while flying.

4- Scoring stopped task

Aim:

The reasoning is to make it fairer to pilots whenever a task is stopped, thus making it easier for the safety director to stop a task.

We propose to adapt the current PG rule and altitude bonus for stopped task in HG.
See 12.3 of Annex 24b.

5- Scoring Category 1 events

Proposal done jointly with the Software Working Group.

Aim:

Simplify.

Chapter 5 is reorganized:

All rules are now included in new document called "CIVL GAP 2014 – Centralized Cross-Country Competition Scoring System for Hang-Gliding and Paragliding" (Annex 24b and c).

Other chapters of Section 7 will be updated accordingly to the new document.

In case of imperfect updates and conflicts between Section 7 and the new document, the new document will be the reference.

6- Risk assessment workflow and reporting

Aim:

We propose to introduce a pre-defined risk assessment workflow, with evaluation forms and reporting into S7, for use by the organizer and safety committee at competitions.

The goal of the workflow is to increase risk awareness, utilize a standardized risk assessment to increase the safety for pilots by improving the decision process for the safety committee and safety director, and add feedback and transparency to further improve the safety work during a competition and for future events.

Proposed workflow to be introduced as new rule in S7A :

See Annex xx (to be created) for related forms, examples and explanations.

Risk assessment workflow, repeated for every task :

Safety committee and safety director get the planned task for the day, along with official forecast and current weather data.

The weather data is plotted into the risk assessment form, along with the safety committee and safety director's view of the task risk factors in the form.

In case of disagreement the majority vote wins, all committee members have one vote each, safety director has one vote.

If the results are level 3 on one or more of the first 5 weather conditions, safety committee should ask for postponement of the task/new task, or cancellation if no improvement is expected.

If the results are level 3 on one or more of the task conditions, safety committee should ask the task committee to remake the task so that risks can be reduced.

In case of any level 2 risks, the number of level 2 risk factors should never be higher than 3, and whenever possible the task must be changed to reduce the active level 2 risks down to level 1.

The completed task risk assessment from the safety committee **MUST** be posted on the task board every day, and be part of the task briefing every day, where any level 2 risks are described in detail.

Pilots **MUST** give feedback each day with the track log, this feedback is to be collected by scorer, anonymized, and summarized to be posted along with the scores and pre-task risk assessment each day.

Next day the safety committee and safety director evaluate the results and feedback from pilots to see if they missed something, or something can be improved.

The risk assessment results and feedback are also to be reported back to CIVL along with the steward report.