



# Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

## FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

held from 7<sup>th</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> March 2025

HOTEL A plus

Celje, Slovenia

Final Version 10 April 2025

## Day 1, Friday 7 March 2025

### 1. Opening and General Matters

#### 1.1 Welcome and Roll Call

The meeting was opened by IGC President Peter Eriksen (PE) at 09:00 on 7 March 2025, who welcomed the delegates and guests. A special welcome to Marina Vigorito FAI Executive Vice-president and to Dr. John Warrington.

Mr. Eriksen also thanked the Slovenian hosts for and the meeting sponsors for their support to IGC.

A roll call was conducted by Visa-Matti Leinikki, FAI representative and Vladimir Foltin, IGC Secretary. A total of 33 delegates, including 5 proxies, were present. The required majority was 17 votes, with a two-thirds majority requiring 22 votes.

Day two clarification of two not recorded votes (Croatia and proxy from Ireland to the UK).

Proxies were noted from Argentina to Spain, Belgium to Switzerland, Canada to USA, Ireland to UK and Latvia to Lithuania.

The delegates welcomed the Croatian Delegate, Mr. Marko Herak, who joined the meeting for the first time.

#### 1.2 Administrative Matters

Vladimir Foltin provided information about meeting logistics, cloud access for documents, dinner arrangements, and informal sessions.

#### 1.3 Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

The following conflicts of interest were declared:

- Peter Szabo (Hungary) and Toni Sibanc (Slovenia) – LXNAV representative/partner
- Pilar Munoz Lopez (Spain) - Schempp-Hirth dealer
- Mandy Temple (Australia) - IGC Bid Manager
- Vladimir Foltin (Slovakia) – EASA staff

#### 1.4 Remembering Lost Friends

A minute of silence was held in memory of members of the gliding community who passed away during the past year.

### 2. Approval of the 2024 IGC Plenary Minutes

The draft [minutes](#) of the 2023 IGC Plenary meeting had been distributed before the meeting. There were no remarks at the meeting. Delegates were given until 31 March 2025 to submit comments.

*Post meeting note: No further comments were received.*

### 3. IGC President's Report

Peter Eriksen presented the IGC President's report, expressing gratitude to the Bureau, experts, and volunteers working tirelessly for the benefit of the wider gliding community. He referenced the [President's report document](#) and highlighted key achievements and challenges of the past year.

### 3.1 Bureau Decisions

The [Bureau decisions](#) taken since the last plenary requiring Plenary approval were presented. The Bureau was then discharged of responsibility for decisions made since the 2024 Plenary.

## 4. FAI Matters

### 4.1 FAI Report

FAI Representative Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki presented the FAI's report, referring to the supporting documents and a PowerPoint presentation available in the cloud. His presentation provides an overview of the FAI's activities and key developments and summarized major competitions and records set in various air sports disciplines over the past year. He outlined ongoing projects focused on improvements of IT infrastructure and website content management system, management of CAT 1 events and the process for international records. He informed about the updates to the whistle-blower process, which is now managed externally so that the whistle-blower identity is not disclosed. He presented the financial situation including special reserves managed by ASCs (Air Sport Commissions) and concluded with overview of the three-year membership situation at the time of the last FAI General Conference (GC), where five new members were welcomed (with one additional membership application rejected).

IGC Vice President Frouwke Kuijpers emphasised the need to send the news about gliding sport and from the IGC Championships to the FAI so that it could be included in the regular communications together with other air sports. The expectation is that the main content about individual air sports come from the ASCs.

The President informed about the IGC's ambition to create a project for a FAI's new secure flight recording system that should allow real-time scoring of gliding and other events.

More details can be found in full presentation in the cloud.

## 5. Finance

### 5.1 Treasurer's Report and 5.2 2024 Financial Statement and 2025 Budget

Patrick Pauwels, IGC Treasurer, presented the [financial report](#). He invited the delegates to raise any questions not only at the Plenary meeting but also throughout the year. He informed about a small financial surplus when compared to budgeted amounts for 2024. The meeting approved the [statement](#) of income and expenses over 2024. The [budget](#) for 2025 and a draft budget for 2026 and 2027 was presented. He highlighted the new 10.000 CHF budget set aside for investments in 2026 for the Flight Recorder project. The meeting approved the budgets. The latter will be submitted to the FAI for inclusion of the overall FAI budget ahead of the GC this year.

The President explained that the investment budget is part of the wider budgeting process of the FAI and that investments need approval by the FAI Executive Board based on an investment proposal made by the Air Sport Commission.

### 5.3 Sanction Fees 2026 - 2027

Mr. Pauwels presented the [proposal](#) for a 2,5 % annual increase in IGC sanction fees, based on the agreement of an annual CPI adjustment. The proposed increase was supported without objections.

## 6. Proposals Requiring Voting

### 6.1 Year-2 Proposals

#### 6.1.1 Change the Earth Model used in Scoring (IGC)

Rick Sheppe, SC Annex A Chairman, introduced the [proposal](#), noting a broad support of experts in favour.

The proposal was approved unanimously.

#### **6.1.2 GNSS Flight Recorder ID check (GER)**

Christof Geissler, (GER) introduced the [proposal](#) that had not changed since Year-1.

The proposal passed unanimously.

### **6.1 Year-1 Proposals**

Mr. Eriksen informed about the novelties related to Year-1 / Year-2 process, namely involvement of the new Safety Working Group in the evaluation of impact of Year-1 proposals of competition safety and Scoring Software Working Group in accessing potential implications on the competition scoring and the software.

#### **6.2.1 Mixed crew and rotation of crew in 20m two-seat class (HUN)**

Mr. Andras Gyöngyösi, (HUN) introduced the [proposal](#) including the rationale behind and emphasizing its importance for the future of the sport.

Mr. Reno Filla, (SWE) finds the principle proposed as a good idea.

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers (NED) welcomed the general idea of giving women the opportunity to participate in a two-seater in the sport but considered the proposal to be negative discrimination. It could be misused to allow an extra two-seater to compete in the 20-meter class. She proposed to introduce this as part of the Women Championships, where it could have a positive effect on the overall participation of women in CAT 1 competitions, with coaching as the primary goal.

Mr. Angel Casado, (ESP) likes the idea but is afraid it could be misused. There is a need to work on the detailed wording of a Year-2 proposal.

Mr. Christof Geisler, (GER) states that we already have initiatives where women have access to participate in unrestricted WGC. We also have a winning team in WGC with mixed crew. We should not make it more complicated at the WGC.

Mr. Brian Spreckley, (GBR) supported the proposal in general, but stated that it needed to be treated carefully. This may look patronising to women, forcing it into WGC may create a problem with acceptance. He supports idea of NED to test it at WWGC or lower category events and expand it to WGC once sufficient experience is gained.

Mr. Kristian Roine, (FIN) was worried about this leading to a female passenger participating. The only Finnish female competition glider pilot also strongly against.

Mr. Artur Rutkowski, (POL) supports more involvement of women in the sport, but shares the concerns presented by CG.

Mr. Peter Szabo, (HUN) emphasised the proposal came from Hungarian research, the only country where the number of women in the sport is rising. Why – youngster participating in 3–4-day gliding camps without diving into all details of the sport, then asking the participants to share their experience via social media which led to immediate increase of membership by young women. Mr. Szabo (HUN) welcomed the suggestions for improvement and pointed out the need to take the action now.

Mr. René Vidal, (CHL) was of the opinion that we need to carefully consider the impact on our rules.

Mr. Nobuo Sashida, (JPN) mentioned that it was important is to give young people in general the opportunity to raise their skills at the junior gliding competitions.

Mr. Petr Koutny, (CZE) welcomed the principle for more participation in the sport but warned about it potentially could impact on the ranking list rules.

Mr. Uys Jonker, (RSA) would welcome combination with other proposal under 6.2.5.

Mr. Øjvind Frank, (DEN) found the proposal very detailed. In Year-1 proposals we should look at the subject and the proposed principle, not details.

Mr. Roine (FIN) was concerned about too many details and could accept the proposal if there was a more general wording.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) was worried about the process, if the proposal remained unchanged, it could fail due to wording.

The President proposed to pause the discussion and invited the interested parties to discuss with HUN with the aim to make a friendly amendment later in the meeting.

*The discussion on agenda item 6.2.1 was continued later in the meeting*

Mr. Gyöngyösi presented the [amended proposal](#).

Mr. Vladimir Foltin, (SVK) proposed friendly amendment to refer to restricted categories (incl. junior) instead of to women only, the proposed amendment was not seconded.

Mr. Jonker mentioned there may not be enough participants for a separate class.

The amended proposal was adopted by a majority of votes in favour (related to 6.2.5).

### **6.2.2 Change of 25th birthday date (IGC) – amended by IGC**

Mendi Temple, IGC Vice-president, introduced the [amended proposal](#) and presented the overview of what IGC tries to achieve in order to avoid Junior losing junior status in the middle of the competition season in the Southern Hemisphere. The wording needs improvement in the Year-2 proposal. (Link)

Mr. Geissler (GER) suggested to stop earlier e.g. in February.

Mr. Sylvain Gerbaud, (FRA) asked for clarification. Will someone born in January participate as 26-year-old?

Mr. Eriksen explained that the intention was to add three more months to those born in January, February and March.

The amended proposal passed almost unanimously.

The Bureau will work on the better wording for Year-2 proposal.

### **6.2.3 Requirement for operation of proximity awareness transceivers in tow planes (IGC)**

The IGC President introduced the [proposal](#) driven by too many incidents between the towplanes and gliders.

Mr. Sheppe, (USA) questioned if this will add any burden on the tow pilot.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) responded that no additional action by pilots is expected.

The Hungarian Delegate and the Swedish Delegate both confirmed their good experiences with FLARM in tow planes.

The Finnish Delegate asked if ad-hoc towplane without FLARM could be used.

Mr. Eriksen answered that this would not be the case but also mentioned that this is not with immediate effect, it's a Year-1 proposal.

The French Delegate referred to past incidents and made a plea to support the proposal

Mr. Casado (ESP) reiterated the need for proper FLARM setting.

The proposal was unanimously approved.

#### **6.2.4 Mandatory computer-based exam for Team Captain and Pilot (HUN)**

Mr. Gyöngyösi introduced the [proposal](#) based on the recent experience from Championships aiming to refresh knowledge about the championship specific procedures by participating pilots. This would save time currently used for clarification of the rules and procedures in place.

Mr. Rob Lyon, (NZL) asked about who will control the question databank and keep it up to date and valid.

The Hungarian Delegate stated that Hungary was volunteering to do the maintenance.

Mr. Geissler suggested to use refresher sessions instead of mandatory examination.

Mr. Szabo clarified this proposal is not replacing existing TC meetings etc. but adding an additional layer.

Mr. Gerbaud liked the idea, but wanted to clarify what would happen if pilots failed the exam?

Mr. Szabo responded that it will be designed in a way that no one should fail.

Mr. Rutkowski stated that such tests should be done during annual examination of pilots when giving the sporting licence, not at the time before the championships.

The Dutch Delegate did not like a mandatory examination but finds it a good idea to refresh the knowledge about the applicable rules and procedures. A survey might be a more effective tool than exam.

Mr. Leinikki commented that the FAI Sporting Licence is linked to the FAI SC General section, Air Sport Commissions do not have influence on it.

Mr. Vladas Motuza, (LTU) stated that there should be a described process included in the proposal.

The President clarified that this is Year-1 proposal, the details should not be discussed.

Mrs. Kuijpers was concerned about mandating a test.

The President reiterated that "mandatory" is part of the proposal.

Mr. Filla agreed with Mr. Motuza that we do not have the right to make such exams and further, that we do not have the right to refuse pilots who have been selected by their respective NAC's even though these pilots might not pass the knowledge test.

Mr. Sashida (JPN) agreed that Team Captains and pilots needed to catch up with the latest developments, but what about the competition organisers?

The President mentioned that there is a training for organisers in place already.

Mr. Spreckley was against adding another layer of bureaucracy without real value. It is the pilot's responsibility; we should leave it like that.

The Hungarian Delegate clarified that the idea was to refresh the knowledge. Some do not read bulletins. European organisers are required to verify knowledge of SERA from foreign pilots. Our CAA has asked for this.

Mr. Foltin said that the word "exam" in the proposal is a problem. A survey or quiz would be fine and inclusion of the organisers would be welcome. We do not ask pilots to pass exams when passing international borders.

Mrs. Temple said it worked for their team and proposed that it should be quiz rather than exam.

Mr. Eriksen highlighted the term "should" was used in the proposal which could make this proposal as option or a recommendation. The Year-2 should be more precise in that sense. The current text is broad enough to make it a quiz, a survey, or training.

Hungary confirmed that this was the intention.

Both Mr. Lyon and Mrs. Kuijpers highlighted the effort needed to implement this should not be underestimated.

Mr. Eriksen stated that the key to success would be to make it appealing and fun for participants to participate.

Mr. Spreckley clarified his understanding that the aim is this is not pass-fail free test.

This was confirmed by the proposer.

(The vote was repeated on day two due to wrong calculation of the quorum on day 1 affecting only this vote)

The proposal was adopted by a majority of votes in favour.

### **6.2.5 Allowing 2 entries with mixed crew at WGC in 20m Two-Seat class (HUN)**

Mr. Gyöngyösi informed that Hungary wished to propose an amendment to the original [proposal](#) based on the outcome of the discussion on proposal 6.2.1. Following that Mr. Eriksen proposed postponement of the discussion on this agenda item to discuss it during lunch break, and to allow Hungary to put forward their amendment in writing.

In the afternoon Mr. Gyöngyösi presented the amended proposal (see the cloud). This was now separated from the other proposal concerning the number of participants in the 20m class WGC.

Mr. Spreckley, (GBR) asked how this will work with the bids proposing only one pilot in the class.

Mr. Szabo (HUN) replied that this proposal leaves open the possibility for the Bureau to allow additional crew in the 20m class. This could be useful in situations where the current structure is not used and there is enough space on site to accommodate more gliders.

Mr. Geissler (GER) asked how teams can predict the actual number of entries.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) clarified that the intention is that the second team will be the mixed team.

Mr. Szabo (HUN) added that it may be a possibility.

Mr. Eriksen added that the best time to discuss such an idea would be when a change to the championship structure is proposed. He concluded from the perspective of the IGC Bureau that based on past and present and practice within the Bureau, it would not be comfortable for the Bureau to make such decisions.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) regretted that the gender issue was removed, as that was the goal, and now it would be open to decide individually for each championship. She added that it was also not the intention that this class should be affected by team flying and that the result could also affect safety.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) reminded delegates that the original proposal was for only one crew when the 20m two seat class was introduced and that the second crew and the possibility of using handicaps at Continental Championships only in this class was a compromise solution to gain support and to address some concerns about sufficient availability of gliders in this class.

Mr. Sibanc (SLO) said it was the safest class because there are four eyes in the cockpit. It is also the most successful class, and it would be a pity not to allow two entries.

Mr. Szabo (HUN) agreed with these views.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) asked if HUN could include a female crew member in the amended proposal, as this might encourage competition flying among women. Allowing only one more entry per NAC will not achieve this.

Mr Spreckley (GBR) stated that he was not in favour of the Bureau being asked to overturn a decision that had already been made by the IGC Plenary.

Mr. Szabo (HUN) indicated that Hungary would be willing to accept any kind of friendly amendment aimed at a mixed class.

Mr. Rutkowski questioned the wording of point B, which could be eliminated by a bid application (the intention must be clearly stated) and then it would be subject to negotiation with the Bureau. Regarding the second crew, he proposed a friendly amendment to allow the Bureau to decide on the second crew only if it is mixed gender.

Mr. Eriksen confirmed that it was important to keep the mixed gender element, otherwise it would be a new proposal.

Vote on the friendly amendment that a female pilot must be in the second crew passed with a large majority of votes in favour.

Discussion was suspended to allow Hungary to submit a consolidated amendment reflecting delegates' input.

The next item was 6.2.7.

On the second day of the meeting, Mr. Gyöngyösi presented the [proposal as amended](#) on the basis of the discussions on the first day.

Mr. Spreckley, (GBR) if we pass this, we do not have discussion about the best ways how to involve more women in the sport.

The President continued that GBR was right, but we intend anyway to discuss the future structure of Championships. This proposal is a clear indication we want more women in the sport.

The amended proposal was adopted by a majority of votes in favour (related to 6.2.1).



## 6.2.6 Pilot's responsibility to ensure compliance with MTOM (HUN)

Mr. Gyöngyösi (HUN) introduced the [proposal](#) by clarifying it related to classes where glider configuration can change during the contest period. This is to clarify the roles and responsibilities vis-a-vis the configuration of the glider. The consequence would be that if the configuration at the check point is in breach of airworthiness limits. This should be considered cheating.

Mr. Sheppe (Annex A Com. Chairman) stated that the committee's understanding is that this is already in place.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) asked for clarification where non-observing such limitations are to be considered automatically as cheating.

Mr. Eriksen stated that it depends on circumstances, the SC defined what could be considered as cheating and what should not. One of the factors is whether it is intentional or not.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) clarified the relation legal airworthiness requirements.

The proposal was subsequently withdrawn.

## 6.2.7 External Antenna Requirement (IGC)

Mr. Casado (IGC Bureau) introduced the [proposal](#) by referring to OGN data, indicating that vast majority of gliders transmit below minimum performance required for traffic awareness systems to enhance pilots' situational awareness. This could lead to false impression of safety protection that in fact is not available to pilots. Based on SGP experience external antenna can significantly enhance the performance of those systems. This proposal was developed on request of IGC to make it mandatory for CAT 1 events. One of the positive consequences would be help to SAR efforts in need as more positions fixes could be utilized.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) stated that this proposal was in line with EU regulatory developments and could help avoiding mandates or imposing other and more expensive devices.

Mr. Filla (SWE) supported the proposal and said it was sometimes very hard for internal antenna to achieve required performance.

Mr. Geissler (GER) the direction is good, but we need a good practical approach.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) had concerns requiring installation of an external antenna on rented gliders. Installation itself could also be a problem. We should regulate the effect not how to do it.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) In the Sailplane Grand Prix we introduced this requirement and got fair amount of pushback, but it allowed maximum freedom, and we receive no complaints anymore. The details of how to do this will come in the Year-2 proposal.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) wanted to know if this is for the tracker or FLARM? He fully agrees with FLARM. But can it be separate devices. This needs to be clarified.

Mr. Casado said this will be clarified in the Year-2 proposal. Same antenna could be used for both.

Mr. Zoran French (SRB) agreed with France, this may be implemented without external antennas using the existing ones.

Mr. Roine (FIN) agreed, we should require what the requirements are and not how this is achieved.

Mr. Casado said that one of the requirements would be to present satisfactory performance of the system.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) said we should allow also devices that are originally installed by sailplane manufacturers to be used. Agreed in general.

Mr. Casado said performance was very complex topic for discussion. Reach of 40 km but which direction. About same antenna, both receiving and transmitting at the same time. Pilots may be unhappy, but the SGP experience is good. The tracker has no effect on FLARM using the same antenna.

The President was certain this would be solved in the future when we start using real-time scoring.

Mr. Foltin clarified that installation approvals are practical and echoed AC comments about complexity. (signal obscuration)

On day two, Mr. Casado introduced the [amended proposal](#), now covering also FLARM.

Mr. Jonker felt it was a good idea as the 'drag' penalty is equal for all pilots.

The amended proposal was adopted by a majority of votes in favour.

### **6.2.8 Maximum AAT time (HUN)**

Hungary introduced the [proposal](#) and its positive impact on pilots reducing their fatigue especially at competitions with many long flying days. It should also minimise the random factor and thus improve fairness.

Sweden said that AAT allows enough flexibility already, we should not add additional layer of complexity for task setters that may not be necessary.

Mr. Sheppe asked if this actually means introducing a maximum minimum time.

Hungary confirmed this.

Mr. Lyon (NZL) felt it was wrong to restrict task time, but okay to restrict min task time. This needs to be clarified.

Mr. Roine (FIN) stated that we should not refer to AAT being introduced due to bad weather; this is true but not the reality anymore. Totally against the limitation. Usually, 2,5 to 3,5 hours are used.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) did not see a positive outcome for fairness of the competition, the CD and task setters should be able to use the AAT features to set a good contest day.

Mr. Filla said we should be careful with referring to weather, perception of which is individual.

Mr. Frenc (SRB) said this will help only if properly used. At the last WGC some pilots were limited by sunset.

The President clarified this is maximum minimum time for AAT.

Mr. Lyon said the problem is task setting and that could be resolved by better guidance.

The proposal did not pass.

Hungary supported the idea of task setting guidelines.

### 6.2.9 Removal of Energy Control at the Start Option (IGC)

Mr. Sheppe (Annex A) presented the [proposal](#) and outlined the history of this procedure, initially mandatory because of expectations, but later changed to optional. Since then, not used at all.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) said this never was intended to be mandatory.

The President clarified that the current wording in Annex A was mandatory, but there was a waiver for optional use decided by the Bureau. This waiver had been extended several times.

France said that they wanted to use it at their championships and having it in Annex A would be appreciated.

Mr. Frank (DEN) noted that there were two strong opposing opinions here, this procedure if not properly practised may be to detriment of safety.

Germany stated that they have used it for a long time, it has also been used in France. We would like to continue to limit near to cloud flying at the competitions. We echo the request from France to have the procedure in the Annex.

Mr. Lyon (NZL) said deleting the procedure should not be due to unpopularity but safety concerns.

The President highlighted possible safety consequence.

Mr. Sheppe (USA) proposed to keep it in the rules but make it optional

Mr. Foltin (IGC secretary) this is noted as a friendly amendment to make it immediately applicable, accepted.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) we should have altitude limitation for fairness.

Mr. Eriksen said there is another rule for that (altitude before start)

Mr. Jonker said this highlights importance of guidelines for task setting.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) said we need to distinguish competition reasons or safety reasons, why do some pilots fly close to clouds? Because of the perceived sporting advantage. We should not mix these two. This needs to be considered. Agree with optionality.

Mr. Gerbaud said cloud flying is an issue, but similarly it is the hard altitude limit before the start where many gliders are in the same altitude. It was already used in past due to problems.

The President reminded the delegates that we only discussed the amendment.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) asked why the procedure was not used, probably because it is an unsafe procedure. I do not think it should be optional.

Mr. Frank (DEN) said that immediate application could create confusion.

Mr. Foltin clarified that this aligns the rule with practice (several waivers until the end of 2024).

The amendment on optional use with immediate effect passed with large majority votes in favour.

See proposal 6.2.19 for the amended proposal.

### **6.2.10 Not allowing use of stealth mode before start (HUN)**

Hungary introduced the [proposal](#) driven by potential safety implication caused by reduced situational awareness. Additionally, some instruments visualisation can lower the situational awareness.

Mr. Filla (SWE) asked for more clarification about the term Stealth mode.

Hungary clarified.

Mr. Casado, IGC Vice-president said that the idea is nice but hard to implement. Some instruments do not allow it.

Mr. Peter Szabo (HUN) There is no need to go to details. The Year-2 proposal can address comments. Examples of bubbles if stealth.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) clarified that this is about how pilots should set the instruments to what they receive and see. Current rules ensure each pilots transmits position and altitude, and that information is available to all.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) agreed with SVK. Pilot feedback indicates better awareness if using stealth mode (less information better comprehension)

Mr. Geissler (GER) the intention you mention to allow to fly based on detecting other gliders behind a cloud without visual reference scares me.

Mr. Szabo responded, the visualisation on the instrument screen would help in describing the problem.

Mr. Filla (SWE) said, today we have principle that pilots can set the equipment as they want. This is actually a problem of instrument visualisation rather than what is transmitted i.e. the reason that pilots get a cluttered FLARM radar display is because they themselves have opted to turn on "Stealth mode". Any proposals for better visualisation should be addressed to the supplier of their flight instrument, rather than the rule maker IGC.

Mr. Casado agreed with Sweden, plus in stealth mode no vector is transmitted.

Aldo Cernezzi noted that FLARM should not be used for separation from other gliders but as a tool for avoidance of collisions.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) said that stealth mode is a manufacturer setting, it would need to be specified in the rules what is meant.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) noted that this may have implications we do not know about, our pilots do not like the displayed bubbles.

Mr. Lyon (NZL) noted that there is lack of information to make an informed decision.

The proposal was lost.

### **6.2.11 Turn point geometry (R500m + 90Deg, 20km) for Racing Task (FRA, GER)**

France introduced the [proposal](#).

Sweden had published the [Position Paper](#).

The proposal was discussed 11 years ago, but now the situation is different. The aim is not to change philosophy of racing tasks. The problem is that sometimes weather creates unfair or unsafe situation

when a turn point is unreachable due to weather. This was the case at the last World Championships in Uvalde.

Mr. Geissler stated that this is joint proposal from GER and FRA. We use it for a long time with only positive feedback.

Italy was in favour; another situation is when a Turn Point is unreachable due to high elevation.

Mr. Filla (SWE) referred to the Position Paper – this changes the racing task and if flexibility is sought then it can already be found in the AAT.

The President clarified that a similar proposal failed 11 years ago because not all equipment supported this type of turn point.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) noted that airspace complexity combined with weather and terrain could pose an additional challenge.

Mrs. Temple (AUS) was certain that more pilots would like racing task if this is used.

Mr. Sheppe (USA) stated that this is rules to solve poor task setting.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) said that there are many high-level competition pilots here. They agree this is making competitions safer. If no other option exists, they do what they must do, fly to the beer can. This rule should be extended also to SGP.

Mr. Koutny (CZE) liked the proposal because it brings more safety, suggested to limit radius to maximum 30 km.

Mr. Lyon (NZL) asked if this will be an option for task setter?

This was confirmed.

Mr. Motuza (LTU) referred to the old photo cameras procedure which was similar.

The proposal was adopted by a large majority of votes in favour.

#### **6.2.12 Virtual outlanding using event marker (HUN)**

Hungary introduced the [proposal](#) by highlighting its positive safety implications in situations with limited outlanding options.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) asked if the intention was to gain speed.

Hungary responded that it was not, only the distance is impacted.

Mr. Lyon (NZL) asked about the impact on the AAT?

Mr. Szabo (HUN) answered that it would be addressed in the Year-2 proposal

Mr. Geissler (GER) asked about how the height limit will be implemented in the mountains?

Mr. Szabo answered that also this should be addressed in Year-2

Mr. Filla (SWE) was intrigued to see the Year-2 development, although he understood the complexity, of which proper performance attribution might be one. The proposal was too interesting not to continue now.

Mr. Richter-Trummer (AUT) welcomed the possibility of declared outlanding, but unsure about the use of PEV because of lack of clarity (what digital model will be used etc) and possible higher workload due to monitoring of height AGL in low altitudes.

Mr. Motuza, (LTU) stated that the proposal does not make sense in situation when most of others will finish the task.

The proposal was lost.

### **6.2.13 Contest sunset (USA)**

Mr. Sheppe (USA) introduced the [proposal](#) and the rationale behind.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) asked whether two penalties (outlanding and sunset) could be applied simultaneously. This was confirmed.

Mr. Filla (SWE) worried about risk pilots might anyway take to avoid getting outlanded, thus losing speed points. This proposal does not remove the incentive to rush a landing due to the near deadline.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) failed to see any positive influence this may have on safety.

Mr. Frank (DEN) stated that we are about to make a rule based on one flight that was not the smartest. One reaction based on the new rule could be speeding up to low altitude to get more distance which is unsafe.

Mr. Koutny (CZE) suggested to refer to legal sunset as the termination of flight. This would allow to land legally during the civil twilight time in many places.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) said that the definition of sporting distance in the rules is not time restricted.

Mr. Szabo felt that this is to solve poor task setting.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) said that the challenge at the last WGC was to calculate the time to start glide to land before sunset due to the local conditions.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) said that this was not a problem until the WGC organisers realised flying after sunset was illegal.

Mr. Sheppe confirmed that this is what he had heard as well.

Mr. Gyöngyösi said there were two root causes at the WGC, task setting related to specific tropical weather conditions and legal sunset issue.

The proposal was lost.

### **6.2.14 Adjustment of calculation of Cumulative Scores Cumulative and Final Scores (HUN)**

Hungary introduced the [proposal](#).

The President commented that this in reality was two separate proposals, drop a day and scoring.

Mr. Sheppe (Annex A Comm.) said it was a good idea, but the proposal was badly written.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) noted that the proposal penalises those who fly inconsistently. The culture of consistency is embedded in our rules. If we want to reward risk taking, we will need other changes to the rules.

Mr. Motuza (LTU) was afraid this would change the behaviour of pilots, especially on the last days.

Mr. Casado (SSWG) was afraid this would be tricky to implement but likely possible. Echoed GBRs comments about consistency.

Mr. Sheppe acknowledged that he agreed that the proposed rule could cause a safety issue on the last day.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) believed this could improve safety if regulated properly as this may convince people not to wait for too long just to fly with gaggle.

Mr. Szabo (HUN) said the disadvantage of the current system is that penalty is higher with higher average speeds.

Mr. Richter-Trummer (AUT) did not agree this improves safety and most competitions are not with very high speeds.

Mr. Szabo suggested an amendment – we could drop one or more (worst) individual day out of all days. This could be a possible way to implement the proposal.

The proposal was lost.

#### **6.2.15 Club Class - No impact of winglets on handicap (FRA)**

France introduced the [proposal](#) – This is not to penalise gliders if using winglets (contrary to current rule). Positives, winglets provide for better manoeuvring and lower stall speed = safety plus modernisation of club class.

Mr. Geissler (Chair of the Handicap Committee) reported that the IGC Bureau asked for technical opinion. Discussion of handicaps is always fun, great committee. The members of the committee were very enthusiastic about the proposal. All are real experts in the field, they assess the performance based on research data and fact. No major impact at slow speed due to the low wing loading. Availability of winglets, sometimes approved, but not always. The conclusion can be found in the report from the committee.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) asked for clarification about whether there is performance increase and whether the glider with winglets is more stable.

Mr. Geissler said that there were no statistics to prove that.

Mr. Cernezzi (ITA) asked if there were any intention to test all club class gliders with winglets?

Mr. Geissler responded that there were no intentions, as it would not be possible.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) emphasised that handicaps are to level the gliders, not to encourage to buy anything. Pilots prefer better handling gliders – this already happens.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) echoed Poland and asked Mr. Geissler if measurement data could be ready for the next year.

Mr. Geissler responded that this would not be possible.

The proposal was lost.

#### **6.2.16 20m Two-Seat class ranking for Cat 1 events (FRA)**

France introduced the [proposal](#). The aim is to improve fairness.

Mr. Filla (Annex D Comm.) Stated that it is a Year-1 proposal, on principle this suggestion was already on the table several times. We have always struggled with it. It is agreed it is unfair. The answer so far was that it will be impossible to implement bar a complete rewrite of the code and database. However, the principle is valid, so we came up with a way to shoehorn it into the existing structure. The result is encouraging, it appears to be possible, but a lot of work (though not horribly lot as we previously thought), not sure if this could be ready by next year's plenary. If the delegates vote yes to this proposal, then we have at least a year to study the issue, describe and quantify the work needed and try to determine the required resources.

Mr. Foltin (SVK) asked whether there could be a proposal with timeline for implementation ready next year.

Mr. Filla confirmed, this is what I wanted to say.

Mr. Casado (ESP) said that the consequence on scoring should be assessed (variable part and access to data about pilots actual ranking).

Mr. Filla confirmed that this is recognised

Mr. Cernezzi (ITA) asked if 50% value of quality factor is based on the actual ranking.

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) confirmed it and added that the quality factor should ensure that it has no major impact on the RL score.

Mr. Spreckley said that this has come up ever since we introduced two seat class. Do you believe this is a good idea?

Mr. Filla agreed that this was a fair question, the way it was implemented in POL probably the best way, but this needs to be studied. But he was not satisfied with how it is handled today (i.e. only the highest-ranked pilot in the team gets the points), thus it is not a bad idea to look at it.

Mr. Rutkowski said that one point is that the current system is not completely fair and suggested to discuss the principle and develop the details for discussion next year.

Mr. Filla agreed to this.

France and Poland agreed that the way the proposal is written should open discussion on how to best make it.

The proposal was adopted with all votes in favour except one abstention.

#### **6.2.17 Method of breaking ties in IGC Ranking List (IGC)**

The President noted that Stefan Langer whose ranking position could be affected by this was in the room.

Mr. Filla introduced the two related proposals (6.2.17 and 6.2.18). The second proposal should be implemented immediately.

The proposal was accepted unanimously.

#### **6.2.18 Consistency of rounding of intermediate and final results in IGC Ranking List (IGC)**

Mr. Filla (Annex D chair) presented the rationale behind the [proposal](#) under agenda item 6.2.17.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.



### **6.2.19 Energy Controlled start procedure as optional (IGC Bureau)**

The discussion is reflected under agenda item 6.2.9. The [proposal](#) passed unanimously.

## **6.2 Other Proposals**

### **6.3.1 Increase of max number of entries at WGC 2025, Tabor, Czech Republic (CZE)**

Mr. Koutny (CZE) presented the [proposal](#). Based on the actual number of entries, he asked for the amendment of the proposal to request an increase of participants from 120+3 to 125 in total.

The proposal was adopted by acclamation.

### **6.3.2 Change of Bid Schedule (IGC)**

Mrs. Temple (AUS) introduced the [proposal](#), which was a combination of the two proposals for AUS and GER that were withdrawn in 2024.

Mr. Geissler asked if an additional championship outside Europe would affect the schedule.

Mrs. Temple responded no to the question.

Mr. Rutkowski asked whether this replaces the current rule.

MT clarified this is merely the adjustment and synchronisation of Championships calendar without changing the existing rule.

The proposal passed almost unanimously.

## **7. Bids**

### **7.1 Bids for Future Championships**

Mrs. Mandy Temple (Bid manager) moderated the session. Each presenter was given up to 10 minutes for the presentation of their bid. All presentations are available in the Cloud.

#### **7.1.1 24th FAI World Gliding Championships 2028 (18m, 20m and Open)**

[Hungary](#) informed about withdrawal of their bid. [France](#) and [South Africa](#) presented their bids.

The presentations were followed by Q&A session:

Mr. Radespiel (OSTIV president) asked both bidders whether they are ready to host the OSTIV congress on the airfield for up to 60 people. Both bidders responded positively.

Mr. Frank (DEN) asked France how they would manage access to airport for participants through the gates?

The bidder answered that there are code-locks on the gates. This is not a problem as it used to be.

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) asked if the IGC sanction fee part was of the entry fee.

Mrs. Temple clarified the sanction fee is always on top of the entry fee.

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) asked about the proposed entry fee in the bid from South Africa.

Mr. Jonker confirmed it is 1600€.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) asked about the space and max number participants.

France responded that space is no issue. It is an old military airfield with a lot of space for operations and parking of gliders.

### **7.1.2 25th FAI European Gliding Championships 2027 (18m, 20m and Open)**

France presented their bid.

Mr. Rutkowski asked what towplanes are available?

The bidder responded that there are enough towplanes available on site and on nearby airfields ranging from microlights to more powerful planes. Also, the military will support with towplanes.

### **7.1.3 8th FAI Junior European Gliding Championships 2027 (Club, Std.)**

Lithuania presented their bid.

The presentations were followed by Q&A session:

The President and Mr. Rutkowski both asked why the month of June had been chosen? This is in the school year.

Lithuania responded that they were flexible. Dates were selected as the best weather conditions normally are in June.

### **7.1.4 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2027 (Club, Handicapped)**

USA presented the bid from Canada.

The presentations were followed by Q&A session:

Mr. Sheppe mentioned that non-American pilots are invited to participate as guests.

### **The first day concluded by Informal Session where:**

"The future broadband equipped glider cockpit" – Keynote by Peter Eriksen followed by panel discussion with Andrej Kolar of Naviter, Erazem Polutnik of LXNAV and Nik Salej of LX Navigation about possible impacts this new technology may have on the future IGC Championships. The discussion was followed by lively Q&A session.

## **Day 2, Saturday 8 March 2025**

The second day of the meeting, on 8 March 2025, began with the roll call (see item 1.1) and the administrative update (see item 1.2), and continued with the discussion of the following agenda items.

## **9. Votes on Bids**

### **9.1 24th FAI World Gliding Championships 2028 (18m, 20m and Open)**

The Championships was awarded to France after a secret ballot.

### **9.2 25th FAI European Gliding Championships 2027 (18m, 20m and Open)**

The Championships was awarded to France by acclamation.

### **9.3 8th FAI Junior European Gliding Championships 2027 (Club, Std.)**

The Championships was awarded to Lithuania by acclamation.

### **9.4 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2027 (18m, Handicapped)**

The Championships was awarded to Canada by acclamation.

## **10. Reports from Committees and Working Groups**

### **10.1 OSTIV report**

Dr. Rolf Radespiel referred to the written [report](#) and emphasised the work of the definition of sailplane, which has been prompted by the most recent technical developments.

Based on the [OSTIV Paper](#) he presented the topic „Definition of sailplane and assessment of advanced soaring technologies“.

OSTIV Proposed to form a standing Committee to monitor technology developments. The Bureau will work on this for the next plenary.

Mr. Jonker said, this is a fantastic presentation, 4 kW energy is needed today to sustain horizontal flight. How much energy does the suction system need?

Dr. Radespiel responded that residual power of existing batteries can allow 8 hours sustained flight of such sailplane.

Mr. Jonker continued, more philosophically, what can make gliding grow. One could be introducing new products to market, which are expensive and can be afforded usually by older people. But we need young pilots for gliding to sustain or grow. Referred to production cost increase over the years. Planes affordable to young pilots are disappearing.

Dr. Radespiel's presentation focused on technology, it may not contribute to e.g. development of the Standard Class.

Mr. Foltin added that technology, also in older gliders like winglets, avionics play a role, it is wider than that – pilot + sailplane + tools like avionics.

Mr. Szabo said that a one design class can help in having an affordable opportunity for a wider community of pilots to fly competitions.

Mr. Jonker concluded that gliding needs wealth to stimulate developments that can translate to improvements for all.

The IGC President thanked Dr. Radespiel and OSTIV for their work and looks forward to an even stronger cooperation in the future.

### **10.2 Standing Committees**

#### **10.2.1 Sporting Code Section 3D Report**

Howard Mills (Sporting Code Comm. Chair) referred to the written [report](#) and presented „Why I like claim check?“.

Mr. Leinikki (FAI) said that once the claim tool has been updated, it could be made available to the NACs.

Mr. Mills responded that the tool is not available yet, there are problems restoring it.

Mr. Lyon offered to help restoring the tool.

Mr. Casado asked how we could check airspace violations in claims?

Mr. Mills responded that only local knowledge could be used, but it is difficult. It is the task of the Official Observer (OO).

Mr. Leinikki confirmed that it is the OOs role, and they need to be trusted.

Mr. Jonker asked if we could convey some of our demands to SeeYou so these tools could be used by OOs.

Mr. Eriksen repeated what was said already, SSWG will make a connection and see how we best can cooperate.

### **10.2.2 a. Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A**

Mr. Sheppe referred to the written [report](#) and added explanation about the Common Procedures referred to in the Annex to the report. Mr. Sheppe asked for the Plenary approval to empower the Bureau to maintain and approve changes to this Common Procedure document.

There were no remarks from the Delegates. The Bureau will update and approve the Common Procedures

### **10.2.2 b. Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex A Handicaps**

Mr. Christof Geissler referred to the written [report](#). There were no questions.

### **10.2.2 c. External Aid, Discussion Paper from HUN**

Mr. Szabo presented the [Discussion paper](#) from Hungary about external aid.

The President commented on the document that we, in his view, have a clear list what is not allowed. Information needs to be publicly available.

Mr. Filla (SWE) asked if also data/services that require a payment/subscription are considered as "publicly available".

This was confirmed by the President.

Mr. Jonker (RSA) felt it was unclear. Some bigger team can deploy monitoring tool in support to the team. We should allow those things if we cannot control them.

Mr. Frenc (SRB) referred to the example where reception of information through electronic means is allowed but receiving help from a local pilot is not.

Mr. Gyöngyösi (HUN) referred to other similar examples. Maybe it is better not to regulate if we cannot control it.

Mrs. Kuijpers (NED) said that communication is important for safety, why block it?

Mr. Ulrich Messmer (SUI) what about a pilot using a different country frequency? That proved to be very useful in certain situations especially in difficult circumstances.

Mr. Frank (DEN) accepted the argumentation of Mrs. Kuijpers about safety, but we need to distinguish safety and advantage (help).

Mr. Spreckley (GBR) referred to the situation many years ago in Paderborn, where motorbike observers were sent out to the turn points. We need to distinguish between well organised teams and other types of external help. There were in his opinion no problem with the current rules.

Mr. Filla stated that the best way of handling this would be Annex A having a list of what is allowed and anything not there is not allowed. If something new appears, it could be allowed by the bureau in a timely manner.

Mr. Eriksen concluded that this discussion could be driving future updates of the rules and thanked HUN for initiating the discussion.

### **10.2.3 Sporting Code Section 3D, Annex D**

Mr. Filla referred to the written [report](#) as well as the change of the rounding, that will be incorporated.

### **10.2.4 a. Air Traffic, Navigation, Display Systems (ANDS) Report**

Rick Sheppe referred to the written [report](#) and thanked the members of the Committee for their individual projects. There had been a lot of work during the last year.

### **10.2.4 b. GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Sub-Committee Report**

Peter Purdie (GFAC Chair) referred to the written [report](#) and requested delegates to vote on the proposal Annex B.

The new version (2025) of [Annex B](#) was approved unanimously.

## **10.3 Working Groups**

### **10.3.1 Championship Management Committee**

The President noted that the establishment of the Championship Management Committee was a success. Things work much smoother for the Bureau.

Mrs. Temple referred to the written [report](#) and informed about the new glider acceptance check template that was improved based on the feedback from the recent Championships to include the section for the scorer to collect GNSS Flight Recorder and FLARM data.

### **10.3.2 Safety**

The IGC President briefed about the joint IGC-OSTIV-EASA activity on gliding competition safety.

The Bureau had decided that IGC Competition Safety Project that was started two years ago with a Risk Assessment of competition gliding should become a Working Group.

The WG will incorporate the existing safety function led by Rene Vidal, and the team of experts involved in the joint IGC-OSTIV-EASA project on gliding competition safety.

Mr. Eriksen presented the current safety matrix and reported on completed, ongoing and pending mitigation actions, which will be managed by the work group (see ppt). He strongly recommended reading the paper by Wolfgang Janowitsch about safety. He concluded by saying that safety is a very high priority for IGC.

Rene Vidal referred to [safety analysis](#) and difficulties to collect incident data. More and better data collection could be done today.

Mr. John Warrington asked if there are there any archives?

Mr. Foltin explained that all Steward Reports are analysed and stored and the Proximity Analysis Tool (PAT) and other tools like flight analysis looking at e.g. airspace infringements are monitored carefully.

Hungary then presented a [Discussion Paper](#) suggesting more variation of penalties for hazardous flying. The suggestion is to have less stringent penalty than 100 pts for first offence.

Mr. Sheppe (Annex A Comm.) thought this was good point and should be clarified in the rules.

Mr. Foltin said that this was already possible. Hazardous and dangerous flying for competitors is already covered by Cheating and Unsporting Behaviour in 8.6.5.b.i. The penalty table should be synchronised with the text.

Mr. Frank (DEN) said that the Competition Director already today has the possibility to modulate penalties.

Mr. Eriksen said we need to work on more open discussions about unsafe events at the Championships for the benefit of learning from them for all (one example is the coloured balls in glasses at briefing that has been used at a number of events).

Mr. Szabo (HUN) said that stating hazardous flying in the results was counterproductive if we want an open discussion. Aviation professionals did not like that.

Mr. Foltin suggested to refer to the para of the Sporting Code instead.

Mrs. Kuijpers mentioned that the principle of having a safety committee formed of pilots at championships is very old fashioned. We have online tools available now that we could use to collect safety feedback. If the committee is good, actions are taken, but there is no feedback. This data should be collected in deidentified way.

Mr. Vidal said that negative feedback to pilots from other pilots can help to change behaviour (I am your friend, but I do not want to fly with you).

Mr. Gerbaud (FRA) was of the opinion that the PAT does not represent what you feel in the glider. I sometimes have had the feeling that it was a close call but nothing on PAT.

Mr. Eriksen said that this will be discussed this and further developments of PAT as a tool in a separate session.

### **10.3.3 Scoring Software**

Angel Casado informed there were no issues with the scoring software, but several requests for help have been supported.

### **10.3.4 History**

Nothing was reported.

### **10.3.6 FAI Virtual Gliding**

Peter Eriksen referred to the written [report](#) and added that this sport together with drones racing was proposed to the Olympic committee for consideration for future E-Games. The next will take place in 2027.

### **10.3.7 IGC Media**

Brian Spreckley referring to the written [report](#) presented a brief overview of various IGC managed news items dedicated to gliding sport. An area for improvement is to get more news to be provided by the Championships organisers (no success despite numerous attempts).

### **10.3.8 Country Development**

Mandy Temple informed that the focus is on collection of fresh data, same as collected in 2021.

### **10.3.9 Sailplane Grand Prix Management**

Brian Spreckley referred to the written [report](#) and informed that additional update on this topic will be covered by presentation under the agenda item 11.3.

### **10.3.10 E-Gliding Low emission**

Brian Spreckley presented how this will be handled in the near future. The focus of the working group will be to keep the rules updated instead of trying to organise championships. He shared the invitation to the E6 Glide event to be organised in 2025. No objections were raised against this new approach.

## **10.4 IGC Specialists**

### **10.4.1 Bid Manager**

Mrs. Temple referred to the written [report](#) and informed that the topic was covered under the agenda item 10.3.1. She showed the table with overview of all Championships.

The President had a remark to FAI. He understands why the event is not published in the FAI calendar before OA is signed, but this creates problems for the IGC, we really request our Championships to be published, be it in a different form (tentative or provisional) so that all events are published as soon as allocated to the organisers.

Mr. Spreckley said that a copy of future bidding is on media website.

### **10.4.2 Trophy Management**

Mrs. Gisela Weinreich (Trophy Manager) referred to the written [report](#). She informed about problems with management of the IGC Trophies, maintenance of cups and their and care when in possession of winners, their return to the next championships venue in time so that these could be awarded to next winners. She pointed out the documents attached to the agenda form a basis for the work of history working group.

Mrs. Weinreich expressed appreciation and thanks to the group and its chair.

Mr. Eriksen said that the calculation of the IGC Champion Pilot of the Year score will be done by Trophy Manager supported by Mr. Peter Ryder in the future instead of the local organisers.

Mr. Foltin informed that that the IGC Champion Pilot of the Year award of the year will be removed from the FAI By-Laws and this award will be managed by IGC. The main reason is that the award is not subject to nominations by NACs but calculation of score based on the result of WGC. The positive consequence is that the award ceremony again will be at the IGC Plenary meeting.

### **10.4.3 Decentralized Competitions**

Mr. Eriksen informed about a review of Organiser Agreements to all interested parties, but with new conditions that will contribute to safety.

IGC is happy to have agreements with national and international decentralized competition on the condition that the competition make data available for OGN Search and Rescue operations. Every year, missing gliders are found after analysis of compiled FLARM data.

## **10.5 IGC Representatives**

### **10.5.1 FAI Air Sport General Commission - CASI (Peter Eriksen)**

The IGC President gave a short introduction to CASI and its responsibilities to maintain the Sporting Code General Section.

### **10.5.2 European Gliding Union - EGU**

Mr. Eriksen participated in the recent EGU Annual Congress and presented the main outcomes. One was the establishment of the joint EGU-IGC-EASA work on sailplane safety. Another outcome was the initiation of a new "Inclusiveness project" for promoting glider flying activity among women (see ppt).

### **10.5.3 FAI Medico-physiological Commission - CIMP**

There was nothing reported under this agenda item.

## **11. Championships (Mandy Temple)**

### **11.1 Reports from Past Championships**

Mrs. Temple introduced the agenda item and recalled that for previous championships, the reports were submitted to the relevant IGC bodies. The reports will not be presented, but they will be available to delegates on request. She informed about the feedback collected after the championships and asked the delegates to promote it among their pilots.

There were no questions from meeting participants about the past Championships listed here below.

11.1.1 39th FAI World Gliding Championships 2024, Uvalde, Texas, USA (18m, 20m, Open)

11.1.2 13th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2024, Ostrow Wielkopolski, Poland (Club, Std.)

11.1.3 23rd FAI European Gliding Championships 2024 (Club, Standard and 15m), Tabor (LKTA), Czechia

### **11.2 Reports about Future Championships**

Mrs. Temple introduced the item, reminding that for future Championships, general information will be available through the Bulletins; only items requiring action or special attention from the meeting should be presented.

The following was presented in relation to the future championships listed below.

11.2.1 40th FAI World Gliding Championships 2026 (18m, 20m, Open), Czestochowa, Poland

Mr. Rutkowski (POL) informed the delegates that the dates in 2026 of Ostrow and Czestochowa have swapped.

11.2.2 14th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2026, Aalen-Elchingen, Germany (Club, Std.)

Nothing to report.



11.2.3 24th FAI European Gliding Championships 2026 (Club, Standard and 15m), Ostrow Wielkopolski, Poland

See 11.2.1

11.2.4 41st FAI World Gliding Championships 2027 (Club, Standard and 15m), Rieti, Italy

Mr. Cernezzi (ITA) reported about the plans and the initial work for additional grass runway is underway, several million € budgeted for this work.

The IGC President would like to be informed about any problem that may affect the plans presented in the bid last year.

11.2.5 14th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2028 (Club, Standard and 18m), Celje, Slovenia

Nothing to report.

11.2.6 15th FAI Junior World Gliding Championships 2028 (Club, Std.), Lake Keepit, Australia

Nothing to report.

11.2.7 39th FAI World Gliding Championships 2025 (Club, Standard and 15m), Tabor (LKTA), Czechia

Nothing to report.

11.2.8 13th FAI Women World Gliding Championships 2025 (Club, Standard and 18m), Zbraslavice (LKZB), Czechia

Nothing to report.

11.2.9 23rd FAI European Gliding Championships 2025, Békéscsaba, Hungary (18m, 20m, Open)

Mr. Szabo reported that a huge runway maintenance project had been carried out, some part having new grass. Open and 18m Classes will use concrete. Nationals are planned just before EGC thus all works should be ready by then.

11.2.10 7th FAI Junior European Gliding Championships 2025, Prievidza, Slovakia (Std., Club)

Nothing to report.

### **11.3 FAI World Sailplane Grand Prix Championships**

Brian Spreckley referred to the written report and presented update about 12th Series SGP Qualifying event and the Final event in St. Aubain in August.

The 13th Series Final to be held in Vitacura Santiago, Chile in 2027. The best two pilots from each Qualifying event will get free shipment of gliders to Chile. Mr. Spreckley encouraged organisers in smaller countries to get engaged in SGP events organisation in their places, the management team is ready to support them.

The President thanked the SGP Team and was happy to see the interest to fly Grand Prix is growing.

#### **Guest Speaker**

"What's next with PAT" – John Warrington from Australia spoke about the latest improvements of the IGC's Proximity Analysis Tool.

Mr Filla (SWE) thanked Mr. Warrington for his great work and asked if it has been considered to calculate with fuzzy numbers and appropriate membership functions instead of sharp yes/no criteria.

Mr. Warrington agreed, it needs to be implemented particularly when breaking down scenarios,

Mr. Eriksen also suggested that identification of the phase of flight would be interesting (starting, enroute, circling, membership in gaggles

Mr. Foltin suggested to collect pilots' feedback on their encounters during the contest to compare with PAT.

Mr. Warrington felt it was a great idea and will follow it up.

Mr. Jonker asked if, with the current computer power it would be possible to correlate time to impact versus the current bubble?

Mr. Warrington responded that analysis takes 2 seconds. At the moment only the bubble is implemented, but there is a background calculation of time to impact.

Mr. Jonker continued that with Galileo, features will provide much greater precision down to a few cm, this should make results more reliable.

Mr. Sheppe wanted to hear more about escape routes, especially if more than two gliders are involved.

Mr. Warrington responded that anything within 1km radius is included in the calculation.

Mr. Rutkowski referred to the ACAS logic (egg shaped spheroid), have something like this been considered to replace the bubble. This could improve risk calculation.

Mr. Warrington responded that this is a good idea, the tool needs to evolve in similar direction. There is also a cultural dimension that needs to be overcome. ACAS and all other relevant sources are being looked at with aim of improve collision avoidance technology.

Mr. Frank said that what we see now is primarily the distance between gliders. He hoped a new version will provide more risk perspective. This would really help IGC, pilots, as well as organisers.

Mr. Spreckley mentioned that two seminars were organised this year. A limited number of people will have access to the tool to be used at their competition. The purpose is to find good ways to use the tool.

Mr. Richter-Trummer asked if every second is calculated? When in a really close proximity, would it be beneficial to consider flight attitude and other effect into the calculation.

Mr. Warrington confirmed that some of these data are retrieved, but when really close, it might be too late. Also, some really close flights may not be captured by the bubble, two steady side-by-side flight of two open class gliders may actually have their wingtips outside the bubble. To Mr. Jonker, a higher resolution model may provide solution.

Mr. Casado concluded that it is a great tool to be used with SilentWings, it provides much better visualisation of the actual situation. He thanked John Warrington; it was great working together.

The IGC President thanked John Warrington for this important work to develop the Proximity Analysis Tool.

## 12. IGC Officials (Peter Eriksen)

### 12.1 – 12.4 Election of Officers

The following persons were elected for a two-year period:

President:	Peter Eriksen (DEN)
1st Vice-president:	Rick Sheppe (USA)
Vice-presidents:	Reno Filla (SWE)
	Silvain Gerbaud (FRA)
	Frouwke Kuijpers (NED)
	Brian Spreckley (GBR)
	Mandy Temple (AUS)
Treasurer:	Patrick Pauwels (BEL)
Secretary:	Vladimir Foltin (SVK)

### 12.5 Confirmation of Committees and Working Groups (incl. Chairs), Representatives and Specialists

Peter Eriksen proposed the updated the membership approved by the Bureau to be attached to the minutes and published on the FAI website.

*Note: The list of members of the IGC committees and working groups, representatives and experts is annexed to the minutes.*

### 12.6 Confirmation of 2025 Competition Officials

The President presented the list of officials for the 2025 Championships.

					Jury President	Chief Steward	Steward
39th	WGC	Czech Rep	Tabor	Club, Std, 15m	Rick Sheppe	Ojvind Frank	John Godfrey
13th	WWGC	Czech Rep	Zbraslavice	Club, Std., 15/18m	Lasse Virtanen	Mandy Temple	Robert Danewid
7th	JEGC	Slovakia	Prievidza	Club, Std	Marina Vigorito	Patrick Pauwels	xx
23rd	EGC	Hungary	Bekescsaba	18m, 20m, Open	Eric Mozer	Frouwke Kuijpers	tba

## 13. IGC Awards

Not a single award nomination was received by FAI.

The President could not comprehend there are no persons out there that would be worthy of nominations. There are so many persons doing a fantastic job for gliding.

**13.1 Lilienthal Medal** was not awarded.

**13.2 Pirat Gehriger Diploma** was not awarded.

**13.3 Pelagia Majewska Medal** was not awarded.

**13.4 IGC Champion Pilot of the Year 2024** was awarded to Stefan Langer (Germany).

## **14. 2026 IGC Plenary Meeting**

### **14.1 Announcement of the dates and place of the 2026 IGC Plenary meeting**

The meeting next year will take place on 6 - 7 March. The President proposed to hold it in Lausanne, Switzerland. The Bureau will confirm the venue if no acceptable offer is received from a NAC by 31 March 2025.

### **14.2 Useful dates and other practical information**

Vladimir Foltin informed the Delegates about the following important deadlines for the 2026 IGC Plenary meeting:

Deadline for notification of proposals and bids:	30 September
Deadline for final bids, final proposals, and reports:	31 December
Deadline for nominations for awards:	31 December
Award nominations by NACs:	60 days before the next IGC Plenary
All material available for delegates:	45 days before the next IGC Plenary
Notification of amendments to IGC:	30 days before the next IGC Plenary
Publication of amendments to Delegates:	ASAP but not later than 15 days before the next IGC Plenary

### **15. Any Other Business (AOB)**

None

### **16. Meeting Wrap-up and Closure**

Mr. Eriksen extended gratitude to Toni Sibanc and Aeroklub Celje for their outstanding support and excellent hosting of the meeting. He thanked all participants for attending in person and expressed appreciation to the Bureau, Commissions, Experts, and Representatives for their contributions.

### **References:**

- All meeting materials, presentations, and reports are available either on the meeting website or in the IGC Cloud.

*Annex to the minutes of the 2025 IGC Plenary meeting*

Committees	Membership
Sporting Code Section 3D (SC3D) (Main Section and Annex C)	Howard Mills (Chair) Tony Burton Beryl Hartley Jean Michel Horrenberger Luke Walker Wojciech Scigala
SC3D, Annex A	Rick Sheppe (Chair) Axel Reich Aldo Cernezzi Reno Filla Øjvind Frank
Handicap Sub-Committee (SC3D, Annex A - Index Lists)	Christof Geissler (Chair) Kai Rohde-Brandenburger Russell Cheetham Denis Guerin Tobias Geiger
Air Traffic, Navigation, Display Systems (ANDS)	Rick Sheppe (Chair) Angel Casado Lars Rune Bjørnevik Peter Purdie Peter Ryder
GNSS Flight Recorder Approval Committee (SC3D, Annex B)	Peter Purdie (Chair) Angel Casado Andrej Fijavz Miguel Madinabeitia Klaus Rheinwald Hans Trautenberg Ian Strachan John Wharington

<b>Committees</b>	<b>Membership</b>
IGC Ranking List (SC3D, Annex D)	Reno Filla (Chair) Brian Spreckley Keith Nicholson Lars Rune Bjørnevik
Championship Management	Mandy Temple (Chair) Frouwke Kuijpers Peter Eriksen Rick Sheppe
<b>Work Groups</b>	<b>Membership</b>
Safety	Peter Eriksen (Chair) Rene Vidal Erik Borgmann Frouwke Kuijpers Henrik Svensson Karol Staryszak Mandy Temple Richard Carlson Robert Danewid Rolf Radespiel Russell Cheetham Wolfgang Janowitsch
Scoring Software	Angel Casado (Chair) Lars Rune Bjornevik Reno Filla Alexander Georgas John Godfrey Rick Sheppe Tim Shirley Hans Trautenberg

Work Groups	Membership
History	Peter Selinger (Chair) Frauke Elber Stefanie Gester Dr. Jürgen Knüppel Roland Stuck Gisela Weinreich Wolfgang Weinreich Dr. Evelyn Crellin Peter Purdie
FAI Virtual Gliding	Peter Eriksen (Chair) Antoine Havet Brian Spreckley
IGC Media	Brian Spreckley (Chair) Rick Sheppe Alexander Georgas Sean Young
Country Development	Mandy Temple (Chair) Sushil Bajpai Valeria Maria Caselato Eduardo Toselli
Sailplane Grand Prix Management	Brian Spreckley (Chair) Alexander Georgas Rene Vidal Angel Casado Claire Heliot Benjamin Neglais Antoine Havet Sebastien Chaumontet Issabelle Jodin

<b>Work Groups</b>	<b>Membership</b>
E-Gliding	Brian Spreckley (Chair) Peter Eriksen Sebastien Chaumontet Luka Znidarsic Matthew Scutter Benjamin Neglais, Morten Hugo Bennick Andrej Kolar
<b>Specialists</b>	
Bids Manager	Mandy Temple
Trophy Manager	Gisela Weinreich
Decentralized Competitions	Christof Geissler
<b>Representatives</b>	
FAI General Section (CASI)	Peter Eriksen
European Gliding Union (EGU)	Arild Solbakken
FAI Medico-physiological Commission (CIMP)	Jürgen Knüppel MD AvMed
OSTIV	Dr. Rolf Radespiel