

CIVL Plenary - Lausanne, 2010 - Annex 14

Proposals from Australia

Delegate: Heather Mull

1. Discussion proposal and Plenary Agenda item:

That the Pitch Stability/Sprog Settings WG be re-launched as a HG Safety WG to determine the areas to best achieve safety. This group needs to consist of competition pilots and technical experts.

2. Discussion proposal and Plenary Agenda item:

i) That whenever issues of a technical issue arise, working groups are to comprise both competition pilots and extra technical experts.

Recommendations from these working groups will be made to the delegates and CIVL Bureau.

ii) That regarding technical issues, CIVL follows the solutions provided by the technical working group.

iii) That any conflict of interest of WG and subcommittee members in CIVL are to be disclosed, and for CIVL to use an appropriate means to deal with conflicts that are disclosed.

3. Discussion proposal and Plenary Agenda item:

That with regard to small hang gliders there be a 2 year transition period during which time manufacturers will develop safe settings to apply to small gliders and allow any deficiencies in certification standards to be altered to accommodate the certification of new models of small gliders. There are to be no penalties applied to small gliders in competitions during this time. (see Scott Barrett letter below final proposal)

4. Discussion proposal and Plenary Agenda item:

That the CIVL Plenary supports the idea of requesting the FAI to make a change to the General Section regarding pilots flying for a nation other than the nation which issued their sporting licence. The proposed change is:

That pilots who have lived in a country other than where their sporting licence was issued for 5 or more years may compete for that country

without having to miss any major competitions as is now the case. A swap to compete in the team of another nation may occur once only.

The current General Section ruling is as follows:

8.1.3.6.4 Change of Representation - First Category Events. If a person has represented a country in a First Category event, that person must not represent another country in any First Category event during the entire two calendar years (1 January to 31 December) following the calendar year in which the person represented the preceding country. Also, see 8.1.3.2, which prevents the holding of two sporting licences at the same time

Background letters to accompany proposals 1- 3 – originally drafted by Australian pilot Scott Barrett, supported by the HGFA Competitions Committee and also sent to Max Bishop and Davis Straub's OzReport.

Equal access for smaller pilots



(Laragne-Montéglin, France)

Scott Barrett <scottbarrett4> writes:

Davis, following the discussion that you, Gerolf and I have had with Max Bishop, the FAI president at the Worlds, Max has requested a letter from the Australian pilot body to express our concerns. These concerns were primarily that there have been technical decisions made at a political level and the CIVL technical committee has made recommendations on equipment scrutinizing that have been overturned at a political level.

The Australian competition committee has allowed Heather (CIVL delegate) to send the letter re CIVL due process to CIVL where it has been well received by Dennis Pagan. Dennis has previously expressed his views and fully agrees with the points raised in the letter regarding small gliders and he has written about this before. I understand that the letter that Max requested has not yet found its way to him as yet.

On a technical level, the issues are that small gliders should have proportional pitch moment to larger gliders. The small gliders in DHV certified configuration have the washout set high, making pitch control (proportionally for small pilots) very strong and the sail locks on the washout struts to remarkably reduce the controllability of the glider. The consensus of experts, as per the design standard written by the manufacturers, is that pitching moments are treated proportional with glider size.

Pilots can do the following things to make the hang gliding world safer and fairer:

- Buy a HGMA certified glider, ask your favorite manufacturer for a HGMA certified glider.
- Ask your CIVL delegate to support the Australian proposal for equality for pilots of all sizes.

- Ask your CIVL delegate to support due process within CIVL and ensure that technical decisions are made at a technical level (by technical experts).

SCOTT'S LETTER:

Improving safety  (Laragne-Montéglin, France)

Scott Barrett sent along this letter to Max Bishop:

Dear Mr. Bishop,

This letter is provided as feedback on the actions taken by CIVL under the agenda of improving safety in hang gliding during 2009.

The following outlines the process that has been followed to date,;

CIVL, as a body, acted upon recommendations from DHV officials as well as CIVL delegates and EHGU members. This has occurred at a political/representative level, but not a technical level. We believe that the direction that has been taken by CIVL is not the most productive, the most cost effective, or the technically correct means to address safety issues.

CIVL previously formed a working group of pilots (but with only one qualified technical expert). The working group was assigned to determine required measurements (and their error bands) and the specific penalties for violations to apply to pilots whose equipment exceeds those limits. CIVL officials then inappropriately intervened and overturned the decisions on penalties made by the working group.

At the 2009 Worlds the final rules promulgated by CIVL were withdrawn, given the fact that they were made too late, just prior to the World Championships. The actual penalties were then to be made at the discretion of the meet director which was an excellent result. It turned out that no penalties for equipment issues were required.

We believe that the effect of the new proposed rules (when and if they are implemented) will be:

- 1) Discrimination against women (our smaller pilots) flying gliders certified to DHV standards. The DHV standard is deficient for small gliders, resulting in a decreased level of safety for pilots flying in the DHV certified configuration and the decreased level of performance of small gliders.
- 2) Pilots and experts in the field have reported to the CIVL working group that small gliders tuned to DHV certification are unsafe due to a reduction in controllability.
- 3) The application of a manufacturers' safe setting to a small glider is problematic in the short term as the data often does not exist. There must be a path for small pilots to compete without the current rules exposing them to more danger as our first concern and secondly, to avoid handicapping them. Unfortunately, at present there are few small gliders that have used the parallel path of using the Hang Gliding Manufacturers Association or BHPA design standards

(these are fair to small gliders and result in small gliders with good pitch stability and controllability).

The scrutinizing procedures being applied does not guarantee safety as it does not guarantee the pitch stability of a glider. Certified settings for washout struts do not indicate that the pitching moments are also certified, as many other factors of tuning are involved. Pilot education is the most successful means of avoiding arbitrarily low strut settings or other dangerous adjustments.

There is plenty of motivation for pilots (of mid and large size gliders) to comply with the rules, (there is little performance advantage for anyone who does not comply) and it can be expected that educated pilots will do this as a matter of course regardless of penalties being applied or not.

The most effective way to achieve better safety is looking at the problem more holistically. The pilots understand what affects their safety the most and allow the recommendations to come from the pilots, this will indicate the most productive areas and methods to achieve better safety in competition.

Pilot technique has a huge impact on safety through pitch stability. Tumbling a certified glider is easily achieved through use of inappropriate technique. Due to the complexity of adjustments and the ineffectiveness of scrutinizing to determine actual pitch stability (not strut settings), the most effective way to address safety is by pilot education on technique and tuning. There are experts that have volunteered their time for free to achieve this and they have been quite successful in their education programs.

The Australian pilots request the following:

- 1) We want time for the manufacturers' safe settings to be developed and to be applied to small gliders. We want a two year transition period to be applied without penalties, to allow for the certification of new models of small gliders as a part of the certification process. This means that the DHV certification system, which does not allow for this, needs time to be changed. Or a parallel path needs to be made into European markets using technically elegant design standards such as the Hang Gliding Manufacturers Association design standard. A transition period will allow this to occur without losing our small pilots (who already include our minority of female pilots)
- 2) We want due process to be used in selecting the best pay-off activities to achieve safety. We recommend that CIVL form a working group to determine the areas to best achieve safety, this group needs to consist of competition pilots and technical experts.
- 3) We recommend that technical matters be dealt with by (qualified) technical committees within CIVL, as a part of due process the technical committee will make recommendations to the delegates.
- 4) We want due process to be used in CIVL, for CIVL to follow their own procedures, including following the recommendations of their working groups.
- 5) We want conflicts of interest of committee members in CIVL to be disclosed and for CIVL to use an appropriate means to deal with conflicts that are disclosed.

The aims of the recommendations made in this letter are to improve procedures within CIVL to avoid technical decisions being made at a political level (without technical validation). To ensure that the technical recommendations made from within the CIVL working groups are transitioned into rules (where those rules are accepted by the political level within CIVL).

Yours Sincerely

Australian CIVL Delegate