

CIVL PLENARY 2011 – LAUSANNE
Minutes
for the Paragliding Subcommittee Meeting
Thursday/Friday, 24th / 25th February, 2011
Chairman: Rob Aarts

1) Safety Issues:

i) Issues arising from the combined meeting

Discussion: A smaller group needs to volunteer to discuss and further the following issues within the PG SC and liaise with the Safety Subcommittee:

Volunteers: Calvo Burns, Leonard Grigorescu, Karolina Kociecka (incident form)

Safety Group Action: Determine the key relevant safety issues & how to further them (See lists from combined meeting & OCTWG)

Safety Group Action: Consider safety material that could be made available via the website to pilots, organisers etc. (EG FFVL safety briefing notice could be more widely distributed. Equipment listings, videos of lectures, safety demos etc) NB See what HG SC has done already.

SC Recommendation to S7 SC: Following the suggestion from Combined Meeting to mandate the SD report after each Cat 1 event. PG SC recommends that S7b Ch 2.7.2.2 second paragraph, is the place for this. Suggested rewording (NB 'accident' replaces 'incident')

The Safety Director should collect incident reports and discuss the incidents with the Steward, present the conclusions at the next pilot briefing and shall submit a consolidated and detailed report to CIVL within a month of the end of the competition.

Safety Group Action: A report template for the Safety Director should be compiled by the Safety group (to be approved/agreed by the Safety SC, before the next Cat 1 takes place).

SC Recommendation to S7 SC: It was agreed, following the suggestion of the Combined Safety meeting, that new wording should be introduced to S7 to highlight flexibility of pilots attending Safety Briefing: S7b Ch17.1 last sentence needs to be more concise, and seems in conflict with MSB rule written elsewhere.

Existing wording:

It is suggested that this meeting be presented on two different evenings before the competition starts to allow for individual schedule variations. Furthermore, even though it is mandatory, a pilot with a very reasonable excuse may be exempted as long as he or she reads an outline of the course and signs an affidavit stating that all points are well understood. Examples of such an excuse are a delayed or cancelled airplane flight or the rescue of a fellow pilot on the day of the meeting.

New suggested wording:

The meeting could be scheduled at two different times before the competition starts, to allow some flexibility in individual schedules. In exceptional circumstances, the Safety Director may brief a pilot individually, providing it is before the opening of the first task window.

Safety Group Action: Topics for Mandatory Safety Briefing Agenda in S7B. No new topics suggested. But it was noticed that 17.2.1.4 needs reviewing. And probably others need re-wording. Action for Safety Group for coming year.

SC Recommendation to S7 SC: Landing verification forms:S7b Ch15.6.3 recommendation to remove the end of last sentence: “that they expect to have verified by their track log”. Following Combined Safety Meeting, PG SC recommends that S7 SC produces new wording to ensure forms are completed for stopped tasks where pilots have flown part of the task.

ii) Harness & back protectors:

Discussion:

IE clarified that 'or equivalent' can remain for back protectors, but is not relevant for harness standard.

Do we need a list? How will it be checked? IE working on a list. It can be easily maintained, and it is believed that manufacturers will soon learn to send in updates (as with helmets).

Action: IE to finalise list ready for publication as soon as possible after Plenary.

It was further noted that currently the rules do not mandate that back protection must be worn by pilots.

Recommendation to S7 SC: Change harness rule 12.3.1 to:

All pilots in Category 1 events must fly with a harness certified to EN1651 and back protector certified to LTF09 or equivalent.

Add same statement also to 2.18.4.

ST: Q to PWC chair, GD, about helmets & harnesses. GD: Advisory to pilots, not mandatory.

2) Rule improvements:

i) **Virtual goals:** Steward report from the 2nd Asian PG Championship suggests we should add the line in italic/green to S7b

2.28.3 Without A Physical Line

The virtual line is 200m long each side of the GPS goal coordinates and perpendicular to the previous turn-point.

The virtual line could also be a cylinder around the GPS coordinates.

The pilot's goal time is only taken from his GPS tracklog when he crosses the virtual line.

Discussion: It was not realised that this was not in rules. PWC likes flexibility in setting goals, virtual & physical. Good to provide a cylinder option for a virtual goal.

Decision: SC recommends that S7 SC add to S7b the rule suggested.

ii) **Section 7 SC proposals:** Review changes proposed by S7 SC

RA ran through the changes proposed in S7 SC Agenda:

4.2.1 Add 'written' proof of this authorisation must be.....

4.2.4 Reserve dates for Cat 2 sanctioning

Discussion on whether there could be some flexibility on how much is refunded. Some don't want to leave it open to organisers. Also on whether organiser should be allowed to postpone before start of the competition.

Recommendation (not unanimous): that proposal is amended to specify a refund of at least 80% should be offered to pilots who cannot make the reserve dates, rather than insist on a full refund.

No other issues raised on S7 SC Agenda items.

iii) **Allocation deadline:**

Discussion: 60 days before start of competition is considered better than current 30 day deadline, particularly for some countries.

Recommendation: Majority agreement to change the rule that specifies that allocation should be completed 60 days prior.

Note: Application to Piedrahita World Championships will be discussed later.

iv) **Scoring a stopped task with no pilots in goal:**

Discussion:

This was discussed in depth in the SW WG meeting. In summary, it was recognised that the GAP formula is not ideal when there is no pilot in goal, as the results are skewed. One solution is to manually devalue the day (ie 80% of DQ). The general view was that if this could be done, then members would be inclined to accept a proposal.

CB: Proposes a scoreback time factor in addition to devaluing the day, as above.

DM: PWC has been trialling a system for one year, that takes altitude into account.

AG: Can include GAP parameters as conditional factors.

CB: Look also at HG ruling on this.

Recommendation to Plenary for rule change:

A small group developed the following proposal to be added to S7b Scoring chapter.

Scoring with no pilot in goal

In case of no pilot in goal a task shall be scored with the Day Quality reduced to 80% of the calculated DQ for the task

Scoring a stopped task

When a task is stopped, the stop time must also be announced.

In case of no pilot in goal at stop time, the task shall be scored with the Day Quality reduced to 70% of the calculated DQ for the task.

The pilots will be scored from their GPS track log position of the stop time.

Pilots will get additional distance to the GPS position of two times their altitude above goal height at stop time.

Action: A more detailed explanation of this rule should be incorporated into the Organisers Handbook.

3) Upcoming Category 1 Championships

Spain wants to add to the Plenary Agenda a request to increase the pilot fee for Piedrahita.

SH: Outlined the rationale behind original bid budget and entry fee. The bid relied on institutional sponsorship, which is no longer forthcoming. Even by trimming back the budget, there is a substantial shortfall. To recover an acceptable level of this shortfall, the organiser is requesting an increase of 7€/pilot/day. The implication is that if the request is refused, the future of the championships is at risk.

AG: Bureau did not agree to an increase as original bid material received stated that no sponsorship was necessary. It seems the paper bid available at the Plenary was different to the electronic bid that had been studied. The low cost was an attractive element of the bid. Other members agreed that it is not fair to increase the fees now. But, conversely, the bid was accepted, time is running and now we must support the event for the sake of the pilots. One suggestion was to compromise on the amount requested to help pilots.

GD: Pointed out that going to a competition that has cut its budgets to the bone is horrible for pilots. It happened in Serbia.

Vote: In favour of allowing an increase: 10 Against 4. Abstentions 2.

LJ agreed to look at the budgets to see if further cuts could be made and to consider other ideas to help balance the budgets.

4) Approval of LRs for Piedrahita

Changes and modifications have been made. Details will need to be finalised after the Plenary as several rules will be dependent on the outcome of Plenary Proposals. The latest version was circulated with this report.

5) Local Regulations template:

A draft Local Regulations template has been prepared for S7b, but requires a thorough review.

Action: AG, CB and LG, have agreed to work on this immediately after the Plenary, liaising with the equivalent group in the HG SC. The final version should be ready to publish in S7 and as a downloadable document by 1 May 2011.

6) Open Class Technical Working Group

Report/presentation by Martin Scheel about the work and outcome, as per Annex 13:

Discussion:

Bending test at 14G load is important, especially for new line technology, and should be added into the proposal.

Vote: In favour of adding this test: 10 ; Against: 1

Concern over checking procedures. MS suggested someone from organisation goes for training at test house, or get someone from the test house to come to the event. Looking only at comparison of lines with line scheme supplied by test house. Not difficult. SH agreed it looked straightforward. MS suggested that the organiser does not have to check gliders at registration, or that the proposed procedures have been complied with by pilots or manufacturers. Only 2 gliders in top 10 need to be checked each day. JA pointed out that responsibility lies with organiser that rules are being complied with.

SM confirmed that pilots can upload more than one glider/photo. But, as per existing rules (S7b Ch12.1.3), the organiser decides if a pilot can change a glider for any exceptional reason, within the 30 day period.

The pilot experience sheet will be completed by all pilots and will help change the mindset of the pilots. Statistics can be gathered ie average experience of top 10 pilots, etc.

Concern that manufacturers will not be prepared. SM stated that manufacturers have been following the work since the start, and the PMA has stated it agrees with the OCTWG proposals (for this year). Old gliders will need a new line set anyway, so should also be compliant.

Action: Some clarification needed of exactly what has to be sent where – issues of delayed paperwork, for example. Also documentation from all test houses must be consistent

Amendments to OCTWG proposal:

- Added line to Annex X1 to add bending test

Timetable for implementing OCTWG proposal to be added to Piedrahita Local Regulations 12.1.1.3 Proof of Airworthiness

Deadline for manufacturers to register gliders is 6 May 2011

Competition Class Paraglider pilots

Pilots accreditation deadline, including photo upload with signature and serial number is 5 June 2011

First competition day is 5.7

7) UK Proposal 1: Certified gliders only for Cat 1s

CB: From 2012, certified gliders only in Cat 1s. Details in the Annex.

MS: How to test tension on the sail in certified gliders? Need a technical expert.

Hba: How much will it cost to have a scrutineer for certified glider checking?

8) France proposal to extend the OCTWG remit

Extensive discussion resulted in realisation that the French proposal was not worded sufficiently clearly.

France will propose the following amendment:

France Amended Proposal

For Cat 1 competitions, at least until the end of 2012, France proposes that the Plenary adopt the short term solution suggested by the OCTWG: the implementation of requirements for gliders with no EN or LTF certification. The OCTWG will be extended for the same period of time so it can work on the long term solutions: the introduction of a new certification (eventually EN)

KT: Summarised that both the France & UK proposals are supporting a move to certified gliders only in the future. The difference is the level of certification. UK says go now (2012) with EN-D. OCTWG/France says develop a higher level of certification for Competition class. This may not initially be EN, as it takes some years to develop.

France confirmed that the aim of its proposal is to ensure that some form of higher certification or regulation is in place before adopting a 'certified only' glider policy. GD confirmed that PWC supports French proposal and would like to see certification of competition gliders.

KT pointed out that this will mean pilots will still be forced to fly open class gliders in competitions for many years to come, and that there is a large group of pilots who wish to compete on certified gliders. The ideas of multi-class championships or multiple (certified/open) championships were raised.

IE pointed out that OCTWG has not yet moved forward with its own aim to develop a new standard. It was agreed that it should probably join the EN 926 working group. JA said that there are already representatives from major nations participating, but there is no input from the OCTWG.

Action: An action plan (to include becoming involved with the EN standards working group) and timescales and budget implications to be developed by MS as soon as possible.

Members gave an indicative vote on the three proposals:

Vote 1: OCTWG proposal: 16 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions

Vote 2: French proposal: 15 in favour, 0 against, 5 abstentions

Vote 3: UK proposal: 8 in favour, 9 against, 4 abstentions

9) Bid Reviews

2013 PG World Championships: Bids received from Bulgaria, Portugal, Turkey

Turkey – more info needed on internet access

Bulgaria – internet access

Portugal – How much for accommodation? airspace issues? Radio licences? Weather forecasting sufficient?

Entry fees for each are around 450€

All three bids are recommended to the Plenary.

10) Summing up

Need more proactive communication from subcommittee members. Discussion during the year could have reduced the workload at this meeting.

What actions are going to be taken forward in the year to come?

Safety group has some actions

Others must become more motivated and respond, consider what needs to be done.

RA warned that he may not stand again as SC chair, and if he did, his NAC could not fund him for travel outside Europe.

Attendance List PG SC			
Barker	Hamish	Australia	HBA
Brandlehner	Thomas	Austria	TB
Han	Zhaofan	China	HZ
Konecny	Kamil	Czech R	KKo
Rohlf	Rasmus	Denmark	RR
Torkelsen	Scott	Denmark	ST
Aarts	Robert	Finland	RA
Joselyn	Louise	France	LJ

Malbos	Stéphane	France	SM
Mathurin	Didier	France	DM
Buntz	Harry	Germany	HBU
Tanzler	Klaus	Germany	KT
Gudmundsson	Agust	Iceland	AG
Oka	Yoshiki	Japan	OY
Masteikeine	Violeta	Lithuania	VM
Dimiskovski	Goran	FYR of Macedonia	GD
Nygaard	Knut Kastad	Norway	NKK
Jaxa-rozn	Jedrzej	Poland	JJ
Kociecka	Karolina	Poland	KK
Fernandes	Antonio	Portugal	AF
Grigorescu	Leonard	Romania	LG
Ovuka	Zeljko	Serbia	ZO
Erzen	Igor	Slovenia	IE
Ham	Steve	Spain	SH
Scheel	Martin	Switzerland	MS
Baycora	Murat	Turkey	MB
Aldridge	John	UK	JA
Burns	Chris	UK	CB
Pagen	Dennis	USA	DP
Sheldon	Jamie	USA	JS