

**CIVL Paragliding (ONLY) Subcommittee**  
**Meeting Minutes 20<sup>th</sup> February, 2009, Hall in Tirol, Austria**

**Attendance:** See attached list

**Conflict of Interests**

The SC Chair (CB) reported a conflict of interest in the Spanish bid and Leonard Grigorescu will take the chair during discussion of the bids

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

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.

The form was reviewed YO suggested using metric measures on the form

Action: LG KK to amend the template to be suitable for paragliding competitions

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

**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.*

*Recommended to the plenary*

**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.*

*A wide ranging discussion on pilot eligibility concluded that the 3 year limit should be retained. AG suggested that the distance qualification is retained but it must be limited to comps with a large number of participants (to ensure gaggle flying experience). AG said 9 pilots in Mexico qualified via the 2 flight rule*

*MS suggests WPRS only*

*FA suggested there should be different criteria for women.*

*MS said if we do not tighten qualifications then within 2 years we will have more than 150 pilots will be qualifying for meets.*

**Section IV: Plenary Proposals**

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

This was carried over from the previous Plenary meeting. There is interest in both Cat 2 and Cat 1 meets. AG reported that a women’s pilot meeting at the Mexico Worlds showed strong interest. There are possible plans for a Cat 2 in 2010

SC to review after a Cat 2 meet is run.

## **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.

*A discussion concluded that a change could reduce pressure on team scoring pilots. FA felt this would favour bigger nations not smaller.*

*Motion proposed by Norway seconded by Switzerland to replace 5.2.5 with:*

*“The team score calculation is the daily sum of the 2 best pilot scores from the entire team on each task”*

*12 in favour and 1 against recommending this proposal.*

*NB If passed, the next proposal can be ignored*

### **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.”*

*Various discussions covered issues such as if a doctor is required.*

*Motion proposed: to amend 5.2.5 to allow the previously unfit pilot to fly later in the competition.*

*Vote: For 10 and 3 against. NB recommended to the plenary if 29 fails.*

### **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) –

*Vote: Recommended with no objections*

### **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.

*This issue not discussed specifically, ongoing*

*But setting up a Glider Safety Technical WG was raised. A discussion of scope followed. MS asked if we want to restrict or influence glider design – to be discussed in WG.*

*Agreed to set up WG. Volunteers include: HB, Goran D, CB, KK, ST*

*Goals of WG are to discover ways of improving the safety of gliders. WG to report back to the SC with details of their brief.*

*Equipment discussion extended to harnesses. MS suggested checking pilot weight at rego and back protection can be checked at the same time. Also random checks at TO.*

Goran suggested that many back protectors are made from different materials and construction. Thickness is not the only criterion. Do we want to move towards certification of the equipment?

Motion proposed by MS seconded by ST:

“For CIVL to fund a tripod for the purpose of weight control and harness checking.”

Vote: 8 for and none against

NB: The Plenary subsequently proposed and agreed that the WG report back with its findings before the October 2009 Bureau Meeting.

### 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

ST asked if this could be air marshals

MS suggested that pilots have to a radio on the SF

DM suggested it is hard for pilots to use 2 radios

Motion as stated was proposed by ST, seconded by MS.

Vote: 0 for and 5 against. Motion not accepted

Second motion proposed by MS and seconded by LG:

“It is mandatory for all pilots to be able to receive and transmit on the pilot safety frequency.”

Vote: 6 for and 1 against. Recommendation accepted.

Air marshals were also discussed. should they be qualified the same as pilots checked by bureau/screening committee?

Motion proposed by MS seconded by ST to be added to section 7

“The eligibility for air marshals shall be the same as for pilots.”

Vote: 9 for and none against

### 34. Scoring: Leading points on clock start lapsed 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?

Discussion covered fairness, difficulty of small takeoffs, ordered launch

Motion proposed by FA; seconded by TB

“In exceptional circumstances, with regard to restricted take-offs and poor flying conditions, to ensure that the task is fair for 2/3rds of the pilots, the task may be run without leading/departure points. This is to be declared at the task briefing

Vote: For 10 and none against. Recommended

### 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?

Discussion on safety. Goran believes it should be 0 time points if you don't make goal.

Proposal to include in S7 by MKE and seconded by Finland:

“Pilots should receive no time points if they do not make goal.”

Vote: For 10 and 2 against

### 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.

Suggestion to award a pilot his average points and update average each day

## No Change

### 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.

MS Introduced his penalties based on loss of Rank in competition.  
Ongoing. To be carried forward

### 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.

FA points that a NAC would not select the World champion in order to boost the number of pilots in the team.

XM added also true for women's world champion

Motion proposed by MS seconded by ST

"That current champions male and female (world & continental) be allowed a discretionary place to defend their title if not selected by their NAC but they would not score for their nation."

Vote: For 11 and none against. Recommended

## **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.*

Agreed

### **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.*

agreed

### **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.*

*Vote: For 7 and 4 against. Recommended*

#### **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:

**Not discussed.**

#### **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.*

**agreed**

#### **Section VII: Competition bids**

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

Italy, Spain and Turkey

**The SC has reviewed the bids and recommends all of them to the Plenary as suitable.**

**CIVL PG Subcommittee Attendance,  
20 February 2009, Hall in Tirol**

Chris (Calvo) Burns – UK Alternate Delegate – PG SC Chair  
Agust Gudmundsson – Iceland Delegate  
Brian Harris – France – CIVL Comps Coordinator  
Didier Mathurin – France  
Dietrich Munchmeyer – Germany  
Dimca Serbam – Romania Observer  
Elsa Mai – Chinese Taipei Delegate  
Esa Alaraudansoki – Finland Delegate  
Fernando Amaral – Portugal Delegate  
Goran Dimistovski – FYR Macedonia – PWC chair  
Harry Buntz – Germany Alternate Delegate  
Karolina Kociecka – Poland  
Klaus Tanzler – Germany Delegate  
Knut K Nygard – Norway Delegate  
Leonard Grigorescu – Romania Delegate  
Martin Scheel – Switzerland Delegate  
Ovuku Zeljko- Serbian Delegate  
Scott Torkelsen – Denmark Delegate – Safety & Training SC Chair  
Stein-Tore Erdal – Norway  
Stéphane Malbos – France Delegate  
Thomas Brandlehner – Austria Alternate Delegate  
Thomas Senac – France – Environment WG chair  
Xavier Murillo – France – PWC Secretary  
Yoshiki Oka – Japan Delegate