**CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE**
**HANG GLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA**

## PART 1 – SAFETY ISSUES

1. **Pitch Stability/Sprog Measurements Working Groups (Report in Annex )**
   - Planning the next steps for measurement and education

2. **Australian Proposal 1** – See Annex 14
   New HG Safety Working Group – to look at best ways of achieving safety

3. **Australia Proposal 3** – See Annex 14
   2year transition period for safe settings for small gliders

4. **Helmets – Agree with decision:**
   *"Introduction of a rule mandating that from 1 January 2010, pilots competing in Category 1 events wear a helmet approved to EN966."*
   Consider: Are there other equivalent EN standards that would be just as acceptable? Is this EN standard appropriate to mandate worldwide?

## PART 2 – COMBINED HG/PG ISSUES

1. **Clarifying the definition of a prototype**
   See Sporting Code SC Agenda, Chapter 12 of S7A.
   Consider **Netherlands Proposal 2** (See Annex 15)– banning prototypes in HG XC Cat 1 competitions. (NB Also speed gliding?)
2. **Task setting at Cat 1 events**
   i) Procedure for selecting task advisory members
   **France Proposal 1** (See Annex 12) – new wording proposed for S7A. Also for S7B?
   ii) **Spain Proposal 1** (See Annex 18) – widening range of types of tasks that can be set – open distance with goal
   iii) **US Proposal 2** Open distance contests – establishing the rules in S7 for Cat 1 & Cat 2 competitions
3. **Use of Tracking Devices in FAI competitions**
   Consider whether use of these systems by teams/TLs constitutes an infringement of Section 7A 2.19 or Section 7B 2.20 (external aids). If so, does S7 require amending to avoid problems if protest is made? Benefits of these systems (scoring, altitude verification, safety, media/spectator interest) will be discussed in Software WG meeting. Consider inplications of competitor's flight progress information being available to other competitors or teams (and the public).

*Following should be short items*

4. **Sporting Code proposal** to give greater scoring flexibility
   **S7A & B, 5.2.2 Local Regulations** – delete this paragraph entirely.
   "The scoring system must be consistent with local regulations, which must specify in detail the way in which any variable within a formula is to be determined. It is also important that the design of the competition, especially the task and local factors complements the scoring system."

*Reason: No longer required as approved scoring systems are listed in 5.2.1 & 5.2.3 and it is not considered appropriate to restrict the task setting flexibility of an MD by setting out in the LRs exactly how the scoring system and formula will be used; this should be decided in the light of the conditions prevailing on the day.*

5. **Sporting Code Subcommittee proposal:**
   **S7B, 5.7.2 Application of Penalties** – add sentence detailing how progressive penalties are to be used when a pilot infringes the same rule on more than one occasion in a single flight e.g. in cases of cloud flying or altitude infringement. PG SSC to be consulted on this.
   *Reason: this has happened in recent championships and the rules are not clear about the application of progressive penalties.*
6. **France Proposal 2: setting GAP parameters** See Annex 12
   GAP parameters to be discussed & announced at 1st TL briefing – S7A: Also relevant to S7B?
7. **Continental championships as Test Event for World Championships**
   Discussion: The question has been asked whether a continental championship held in one year could also be the Test Event for a World championship to be held the following year (in the same place and organised by the same team). Rules do not specifically exclude this. In FAI terms, a Test Event is held to test the organisation, it is not normally considered to be a qualifier or test event for the pilots, although in practice this is often the case.

*Following can be discussed, time permitting, or later during Plenary*

8. **Australia Proposal 2 :** See Annex 14
   Revise set up and operation of CIVL Working Groups

## PART 3 – HANG GLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE

1. **Germany Proposals**: See Annex 13
   i) Women's HG class 1 – 2 to score for team
   ii) Women's HG class 1 – stopped task scored after 1h
   iii) Women's HG class 1 – team size to be increased to 6

2. **Australia Proposal 1:** - See Annex 14
   Establish new HG Safety WG

3. **Australia Proposal 3:** See Annex 14
   2 year transition for safe settings for small gliders

4. **Netherlands Proposal 3:** See Annex 15
   Discussion Proposal to introduce an additional pilot requirement for entering a Category 1 event. A minimum number of WPRS points in the 6 months before the event. See Annex 16 for discussion document.

5. **France Proposal 3:** See Annex 12
   Reduced weight limit for all equipment, excluding glider

6. **France Proposal 4:** See Annex 12
   Change to scoring stopped task rule

**4. Proposals from Sporting Code Subcommittee**

See Annex 9 for full information. Key points listed below:

i) **S7A, new paragraph 4.3.3 Tasks** – All competitors shall be set the same tasks, from the same sites on the same days.

*Reason: to regulate attempts to fudge minimum numbers and also stop applications to sanction XC league events where pilots do not even fly from the same sites.*

ii) **S7A, 4.3.1 -** Add the minimum numbers for Sport Class to be not less than 6.

*Reason: several organisers have run a Sport class competition this year yet none of them were validated as they did not have the minimum number of participants.*

Consider **Netherlands Proposal 1** – to backdate implementation to 1 January 2009.

iii) **S7A, Chapter 9**

**Annex B to Sample Local Regulations** – Certified glider statement: remove existing document and append to Chapter 12 with revisions as agreed by HG SSC.

*Reason: existing document is badly worded and cannot be signed in honesty by many pilots. It is also not necessary to publish it with LRs and Chapter 12 is a more appropriate place.*

Review other proposed changes in Annex 9.

5. **Bid reviews**

European HG championships for 2012 – Bid received from Turkey.

**6. Discussion topics**

i) Long time windows cause additional stress and contribute pilots getting tired sooner on a long task. The time window between launch opening and the first start gate should be minimised, and should be less than 2h. Ideas:

It can be calculated as a function of nuumber of pilots, number of ramps and giving 1.5mins per pilot to launch.

And/or, if conditions are difficult, consider setting more start times, and not extending the time window.

If not all (or say, less than 20%) pilots have the opportunity to launch in the first start gate, then no leading (bonus) points should be awarded.

ii) Altitude limits at goals – discussion/proposal from Juaki (Spain). See below.

**CIVL Plenary, February 2010, Lausanne – Switzerland**

## SPAIN DISCUSSION/PROPOSAL 1: ALTITUDE LIMITS AT GOAL

**Goal physical lines** have a few arguments that play in their **favour**.

1. A visual reference is always of a great help. A soon as a pilot gliding to goal sees the goal line, no need to keep on looking at the GPS or flight instrument.
2. They produce spectacular arrivals; pilots reach goals at 100 km/h or more. This is fantastic for media coverage.
3. Some pilots hold, that if you have a visual goal line, you can keep one eye on the goal line and another on you opponents. Thing that doesn't happen if you have a virtual goal and you are permanently looking at your flight instrument.
4. Physical goal lines help calculating glide ratios to goal.

But goal lines also have a few arguments that play **against**

1. Goal arrivals at such speed are dangerous. Pilots normally arrive in huge groups in category 1 competitions and even from different paths. They cross the goal line and turn; some do it to the right and some to the left. This can produce very hard collisions.
2. Goal lines are also a limit to the type of goal fields that you can set in a competition. If you are going to use a physical line, you will need a huge landing field with no hazardous elements in the surroundings (trees, electric wires, buildings, roads, and so on). Competition organizers know, that you can't always find good fields or maybe those that have been selected have crops or maybe the landowners don't allow you to use the field.
3. Goal marshals have to be very accurate setting the physical line, perpendicular to the path from the last turn point. This doesn't always happen.
4. Wind, dust devils and other factors blow the line and give problems to fix it correctly.
5. The weather also plays an important roll. Before the start of the competition you have located, let's say 4 or 5 possible goal fields in all the possible route lines. But suddenly the wind doesn't help and you have to set the flying route in an unusual area, but we don't know the state of the possible landing fields in that area.

These type of problems can be solved with **virtual goals** and even better if we use cylinders.

1. You can easily check for goal fields looking on Google Earth or with orthographic maps and find fields in new ore unusual areas.
2. It is also very helpful in smaller competitions, because you don't need goal marshals

But even with this, we can find problems, we have checked a possible goal field on a map, but we don't know accurately if it is safe enough, it could be a down slope, have hazardous lines and so..

In previous competitions were the organizers opt for this, they increase the goal cylinder, but this is never a valid solution, pilots will dive in final glides to the perimeter of the cylinder, and in occasions this can be more dangerous even than the centre of the cylinder.

So finally here comes my proposal:

**What about setting a virtual cylinder or virtual goal line as goal but with a height safety limit?**

We know the coordinates of the field and the altitude, so we set a 200 meters or higher altitude as a grant. With this pilots will dive on a glide ratio to the perimeter of the cylinder as before, but they are reaching the goal 200 meters higher.

**Which are the benefits of this?**

1. First of all and most important, it's much **safer**; we will separate the race from the landing. Pilots race until they cross the line and after this is achieved they can gently soar around looking for a suitable landing field or even follow the landing traffic pattern (if any has been set). This isn't new it's been used in sailplanes from long ago.
2. With this you can set a goal in almost any place. This doesn't mean to set goals in unlandable areas. Look always for surrounding landable areas. But we can play with the altitude grant.
3. In special days, you can cross the line and follow for a record flight or maybe even return to launch if possible.

**What happens to those who get to goal under the altitude limit?**

1. It would be exactly the same as when you get to the goal field but land short, you will get the distance points but not the speed points
2. But in this case you can still fight to gain enough altitude to cross at the correct altitude.

Obviously this will need of changes implemented to the scoring software programs, as well as the use of 3D GPS, and setting the barometric altitude of the day on the task board, but this is something that has already been accepted by CIVL for different uses