



FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission (CIVL)

MINUTES - CIVL Plenary Meeting, **Lausanne 22nd - 25th February 2001**

Thursday 22nd February

Welcome and Roll Call

CIVL President Olivier Burghelle opened the meeting welcoming all the delegates and the FAI office staff.

The roll call of delegates followed with the following countries present or represented by proxy.

Australia, Austria, Brazil, Croatia, Czech Republic (proxy), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein (proxy), Netherlands, New Zealand (proxy), Norway, Portugal, Rumania, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK and USA.
26 Votes.

The FAI was represented by Max Bishop (Secretary General)

Approval of Agenda

Olivier Burghelle presented the revised agenda which was accepted unanimously.

Approval of the Minutes of the 2000 Plenary Meeting (Stges)

Dennis Pagen, USA, proposed that the Minutes were accepted, Paul Thomas, South Africa, seconded the motion which was carried unanimously.

President Report

President Olivier Burghelle presented his report which is **Annex A** to these minutes

FAI Report

Max Bishop present a report on the FAI's activities during 2000.

- New members have joined the FAI although not necessarily HG and PG members but there have been some resignations resulting in a net gain of four members.

- One level of management has been replaced within FAI with the removal of the FAI Council and replaced with a 7 member board. The board consists of a President and 6 directors responsible for separate areas of the organisation.
- There is also a Structural Working Group that has Olivier Burghelle and Pia Von Essen as representatives and is looking at further improvements in the structure and representation of members. It has a radical mandate to reform the association.
- The move to Lausanne has proved beneficial with the access to better facilities and closeness to the headquarters of the Olympic organisation.
- The FAI has been successful in promoting HG & PG to various TV stations and the programmes will soon be available on video.

Max Bishop announced that all bidders for Category 1 championships must sign the Organisers Agreement.

Working Group Regulations

Olivier Burghelle introduced the regulations for the running of Sub-Committees and Working Groups; There will be only one representative per country in every working group-the members should be individuals with knowledge of the agenda *See Annex 1*

Working Group Reports

Accuracy Working Group

Riikka Vilkkuna, Finland, presented the Accuracy WG report, outlining the problems of the type of canopy proposed to be flown. It was not possible to implement changes before the first World Championship but for the next World Championship only paragliding canopies will be eligible in the future.

During the World Championship there was a very positive discussion group formed and much work has been done since, driven in part by the Slovenians. There have been many new proposed rule changes that will be discussed during this years working group.

HG Competitions

Dennis Pagen presented a report on the pre-worlds. There were 99 pilots at Algodonales and the meet went well. There were a few minor (launch, local regulation) problems that will be discussed during this years sub-committee.

PG Competitions

Xavier Murrillo presented the report on the pre-worlds in Granada with 125 pilots. The competition was well organised and was won by a Japanese pilot. There were 5 tasks. Safety was a consideration because of the terrain.

There was also a successful European PG championships.

After 10 years of competition the standard of competition is such that pilots need to be selected because of the number of potential entrants.

This year the discussion will centre on the selection of pilots and team size to increase the safety levels. Also the local regulations need to be reviewed in light of problems with the combined use of photos and GPS.

Olivier Burghelle pointed out that it was the responsibility of the Safety & Training sub-committee to look at safety issues.

Safety & Training

Klaus Tanzler (Germany) presented his report which included details of European Hang Gliding and Paragliding Union (EHPU), see *Annex 2*.

Records & Badges

No report was presented

Section 7, Flight Verification & GPS

Michael Zupanc (Australia) presented the Sub-committee report. There are a number of different GPS verification programs in the world and we need to get these program developers together to share ideas and develop better programs.

This years work will be looking at the current rules and developing them in the light of experience and new developments. The results will be published on the Internet for review and comment before implementation, leaving meeting time free for further development.

Class Definition

Dennis Pagen presented the results of the years work and outlined the Bureau's action. This years WG will focus on fairings and the Vim paper.

CIVL Ranking Program

Sarah Fenwick (UK) presented the years report. After 4 years there are 2200 pilots, 70 competitions last year and already 40 competitions registered for this year. This year will look at addressing the current perceived problems as posted on the FAI website.

Treasurer's Report

Jim Bowyer (UK) presented the annual result with the following comments;

IPPI Cards

Accounts show an income of 25,226 CHF for IPPI cards. This figure includes sales for 1999 of 8,752 CHF. Do we need to reopen the 1999 accounts to adjust then or just add a note to this years accounts? The Plenary unanimously answered "no but add a remark on the accounts"

Cat 1 Sanction Fees

Below budget because of lower than expected attendance at the Women Worlds, Speed Gliding Worlds and Paragliding Accuracy Worlds.

Administrative Expenses

Much higher than budget owing to the loss of a voluntary secretary. Balanced by the increase in income from Category 2 Sanction Fees. But this is an area that I will be focussing on in the 2002 Budget.

Medals for 2001

Will be less than budget because of changes in the amount of medals to be awarded.

Duration of Category 1 Events

After a varied discussion on the length of championships, Paul Thomas proposed that there should be no change, seconded by John Aldridge (UK). This was lost by 17 votes against, 1 abstention and 8 votes for.

The debate then continued on the duration of the competition. It was decided to vote on either 15, 14 or 12 days.

Proposals:	15 days	Votes :	8 for	8 for
	14 days		11 for	15 for
	12 days		7 for	

After two rounds of voting it was agreed on 14 days duration, **to be implemented from January 1st 2004.**

Friday 23rd

Roll Call

The roll call of delegates followed with the following countries present or represented by proxy. Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Czech Republic (proxy), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein (proxy), Netherlands, New Zealand (proxy), Norway, Portugal, Rumania, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK and USA. **27 Votes.**

HG Competitions Sub Committee Report

Dennis Pagen presented the committee report – *See Annex 3*

The Plenary voted 25 for, 0 against with 1 abstention to accept the report including all the proposals.

PG Competitions Sub Committee Report

Xavier Murrillo presented the committee report – *See Annex 4*

After much discussion on the team size it was deferred to Olivier Burghelle to organise a timetable of entry deadlines inline with the team size proposal.

The Plenary voted 14 for, 11 against with 2 abstentions to accept the proposal.
on team scoring.

Presentation of Bids

The bidding countries presented their bids in the following order;

Accuracy	Paragliding	Hang Gliding
Slovenia	Portugal	USA
Turkey	France	Brazil

Safety & Training Sub Committee Report

Klaus Tanzler presented the committee report – *See Annex 5*

Germany proposed an amendment to the rule that external compression struts thinner than 20mm should be prohibited in Cat 1 events for Class 1 & 2

Seconded by South Africa

10 For
10 Against
2 Abstentions

The President ruled to reject the amendment.

Item 1.2 of Annex 5 was passed by a majority of 19 to 0 with 1 abstention.

Revision of Section 7 5.11 (2/3 rule) was deferred until after the WPRS reports

WPRS Working Group Report

Sarah Fenwick & Michael Zupanc presented the WG report – *See Annex 6*

The following proposals in Annex 6 was carried unanimously;

It was unanimously agreed that Sarah Fenwick, Michael Zupanc & Jim Bowyer would co-ordinate activities throughout the year.

Martin Brunn presented his ideas on how the new ranking system should be scored.

The Plenary session closed at 5.30 without completing this topic and it was re-scheduled for Saturday morning.

Saturday 24th February

Roll Call

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Czech Republic (proxy), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Japan, Liechtenstein (proxy), Netherlands, New Zealand (proxy), Norway, Portugal, Rumania, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK and USA. **27 Votes.**

WPRS Working Group Report – continued

WPRS PG Working Group

The proposal included in the WPRS PG Working Group report was carried unanimously.

WPRS HG Working Group

Michael Zupanc outlined the groups proposals *See Annex 7*

There was much discussion on the proposals for Continental Championships and the French amendment to change a negative rule to a positive one.

The working groups proposals were accepted by;

For	20
Against	0
Abstentions	5

Safety & Training Sub Committee Report - continued

Revision of Section 7 5.11 (2/3 rule)

The proposal to revise this rule was postpone to the next CIVL meeting after the experience of the WPRS WG work next season.

Report on Bid Evaluation

Stephane Vieilledent, Riikka Vilkkuna & Stefan Mast presented their reports on the evaluation of the bids for 2003 championships.

All bids were acceptable.

Championship Vote

Accuracy World Championship

Slovenia	Awarded Championship
Turkey	

Paragliding World Championship

France	10
Portugal	17 – Awarded Championship

Hang Gliding World Championship

Brazil	14 – Awarded Championship
USA	13

Accuracy Working Group

Riikka Vilkkuna presented the groups report outlining the changes in Annex 18 of Section 7 this was accepted by;

20 votes for, 0 against with 5 abstentions.

Class Definition

Dennis Pagen presented the groups report, *See Annex 8*

There was much debate on the issues raised and an amendment was moved by USA and seconded by UK to amend the Lucas Hang cage proposal and to remove it from the report.

The amendment failed by 12 votes against, 4 for and 10 abstentions.

A second amendment was proposed;

Proposed UK

Seconded Austria

Request organisers of future Class 2 meets to also run Open Class meets provided normal safety parameters can be met.

For 10

Against 1

Abstention 12

There was some confusion on the voting rules and while the CIVL documents were being consulted the President of the FAI arrived and was introduced to the Plenary.

He outlined his desire for all commission to work together on joint environmental issues.

Amendment is rejected because it does not have a majority but Dennis Pagen proposed a re-vote.

Followed by a reworded version

Proposed Germany

Seconded Austria

Encourage bidders for Class 2 championships to also run Open Class championships in conjunction with the Class 2 competitive field, at the same site with the same task, provided normal safety parameters can be met.

Vote

For 19

Against 1

Abstentions 5

PG Competition Sub Committee Report - continued

Xavier Murrillo reported on the discussions about;

Team Size

The proposal was accepted by a majority of 23 for, 0 against with 3 abstentions.

Championship Validation

It was proposed to replace the number of tasks by the number of points scored and that the championship is validated when the total points allocated to the winners of each task is reaching either 1500 or 1800 points. The sub-committee recommended 1800. USA proposed and Liechtenstein seconded an amendment to the report to use 1500 points. This was carried by a vote of 15 for, 9 against with 1 abstentions.

This report was carried by a vote of 22 for, 5 against with 0 abstentions.

Championship Reports

Speed Gliding Worlds

Zlato Vanic present a report with comments on safety and with recommendations on judging and the number of video cameras available. Also on the meteo/no of pilots.

PG Europeans

Olivier Burghelle reported that the weather had been poor for a week after only 2 tasks. The organiser considered moving the competition in an attempt to validate the championship. In the event this was not necessary and a total of six tasks were flown by 125 pilots.

The organisation was excellent with a small number of officials but this was not a problem because of their efficiency.

Unfortunately there was one fatality despite the implementation of the 2/3rds rule.

HG Europeans

Riikka Vilkkuna reported that the organisers did their best but the weather was poor. By the end of the competition 6 tasks were flown by 99 pilots.

There were several pilots trying to enter who were not qualified under the new rules. This was resolved by negotiation with the relevant NAC's.

Safety and rescue systems were good and dealt with the two accidents efficiently.

There was a problem with the use of GPS and cameras and this was not a good idea.

There were also problems at launch with the launch lanes and the push system.

Environmental Sun-committee

Olli Borg presented an environmental report. *See Annex 9*

WAG Report

Olivier Burghelle reported that things were progressing well for the 2001 WAG.

The Spanish WAG representative reported that the programme for opening and closing ceremonies had not yet been finalised, but the dates were as previously published. Austria raised concerns as to the accessibility of the events to the public. The WAG representative explained that there will be very intense media coverage.

UK asked for clarification of the team size. Olivier Burghelle explained that the WAG team size was the same as the WC size for Class 3. For Class 1 & 2 the girls were included in the WAG team but not the WC team.

There is only one bid for the next WAG 2005, namely Slovenia. It is not thought necessary to visit the sites as they are well known.

However, there is a question as to whether other Classes of events, Class 2, speed gliding and accuracy. Also the cost of the entry fees.

It was then proposed by South Africa and seconded by Switzerland to hold the WAG in Slovenia in 2005, this was carried by 20 for, 0 against and 1 abstention.

CIVL Goals

Olivier Burghelle presented the proposed goals of CIVL. *See Annex 10*

Switzerland proposed the following amendment to items 17 & 18.

The Bureau shall present a project at the next Plenary meeting for improving the way in which the Commission functions.

Proposed by Switzerland

Seconded by Austria

For	22
Against	0
Abstentions	1

The amendment was carried

Martin Brunn then presented his ideas for reforming the Commission.

South Africa proposed that Martins proposal was added to the Goal Proposal, France seconded. The motion was carried by 24 votes for, 0 against with 1 abstention.

It was overwhelmingly agreed to remove items 11 & 12.

The proposal was adopted with the above amendments.

Race 2000

Martin Brunn reviewed the history of the Race scoring program. It is now considered that the program is complete and proposed that it should be handed over to CIVL and Achim Muller steps down as Chief Developer and Martin Brunn steps down as Project Co-ordinator

Further requirements suggested;

Open source program

Set up a discussion forum around RACE and GPS

Create working group to develop the program in future years

Appoint a working group co-ordinator

Sunday 25th February

Roll Call

Australia, Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic (proxy), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Japan, Liechtenstein (proxy), Netherlands, New Zealand (proxy), Norway, Portugal, Rumania, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, UK and USA. **24 Votes.**

Bid for the 2nd Speed gliding World Championship

Dennis reported that he just received a bid for a speed gliding world championship, to be held at lookout mountain in Georgia. Since we had no bid during the normal 2 years time the Bureau will decide after evaluation.

PR Report

Sarah Fenwick outlined the work undertaken throughout the year and presented a job description to aid the finding of her replacement. *See Annex 11*

Awards

Lillian Leblanc was awarded the FAI Airsport medal for her untiring efforts in volunteer organisation of two World Championships (Women's Worlds and Speed Gliding Worlds.)

Budget 2002 & Sanction Fees Increase

Jim Bowyer presented the budget for 2002 and outlined the need for an increase in sanction fees. *See Annex 12.*

Spain proposed an amendment to Cat 2 sanction fee charges that after some debate was withdrawn.

France proposed to include WAG in Cat 1 events, this was passed by 16 votes for, 8 against with 0 abstentions.

The vote for Sanction Fees increase: 11 votes for so the proposed was rejected for not having the majority.

Proposal for media support

From the HG subcommittee report, it appears that it is difficult for a hangglider pilot to accept all the equipment fixed on a glider so Olivier Burghelle moved with Spain secondant that the draft will have a guide line status for the moment and be included in the Organiser's guide lines.

Section 7 Michael Zupanc report

Urs Dubach (CH) started a discussion regarding the allocation of medals to all the members of a team. In reply Max Bishop explained that FAI can't allow decided not to allow more than one medal per team since they are medals for individuals that cannot be given to a team member who have not achieved good results for his team.

Following a large debate France moved the following proposal seconded by Denmark:

During the coming year CIVL President will ask the Air Sport Commission president group and CASI to investigate the possibility of allocating further medals to team members

The proposal was carried with 21 votes and 1 abstention.

SA Move a proposal to vote the Section 7 report USA seconded; and the report was voted unanimously.

It has been agreed that the section 7 draft including the accepted changes will be circulated among the delegates for comments before being officially published. Implementation date; 1st of May 2001.

GPS Group Report *See Annex 13*

Propose that these rules (in annex 13) are accepted Aldrige (UK) moved, seconded Thomas (SA)
Vote: 24 in favour, unanimous.

Election of Officers

Vice President Tomoko Kobayashi resigned and the Secretary post was left open since last year after Noel's retirement

To fill the post bellow, the correct nomination procedures were observed. There were 5 candidates for 4 vice president posts:

The results are:

President: Olivier Burghelle

Vice President (4):

Dennis Pagen (USA)

Michael Zupanc (Australia)

Riikka Vilkkuna (Finland)

Leonard Grigorescu (Romania)

Treasurer :

Jim Bowyer (UK)

Secretary

Leonard Grigorescu (Romania)

Date and venue of the next meeting

Romania bid for the next Plenary meeting but didn't reach 2/3 votes so the next Plenary meeting will be in Lausanne, date 21-24 February 2002.

President closing remarks

President Burghelle commented on the open minded to criticism of the Bureau and stated that with a new organization of the working groups, things will improve.

The meeting closed with thanks to everyone present.

Annex A

PRESIDENT REPORT TO CIVL PLENARY MEETING

LAUSANNE February 2001

Bureau and Officers activities.

In May 2000 I spent a week in Lausanne for the Council meeting. That was the last one since we decided in Linköping to get rid of this FAI Council. Max will report on this issue.

The Season has been very busy with

- The World female championship
- The first Speed gliding World Championship
- The first accuracy PG Championship
- The Euro HG
- The Euro PG
- The test WAG in HG and in PG

All these meets had to be staffed with Juries and Stewards and I would like to thank all the officials for the good job they have done.

As WAG LO I have been in Spain for the test competitions and with the help of Xavier in Sierra Nevada and Dennis in Algodonales we made a good job with the local organisers to insure a good WAG competition.

In September I attended the FAI General conference: one week.

In October we had a 3 days Bureau meeting to prepare the Agenda of this Plenary meeting.

Of course with the help of the electronic mail all the Sub committees and working groups have been working intensively all over the year.

I have been very pleased to meet Pia Von Essen in Lausanne for the last council meeting and Riikka and Pia were present at the FAI General Conference in Linköping.

Safety :

Last year we made a huge amount of changes in section 7 with regards to Safety. Some of them have been so controversial that the Bureau decided to postpone their implementation for one year and to reopen the debate.

The 2/3 Rule has been applied for the Euro HG in Austria with very few exemptions. It has been strictly applied for the Euro PG and in spite of that we still had a fatality.

This lead me in agreement with the Bureau, Juan the organiser and Xavier the Steward to put additional requirements for the Sierra Nevada event where the conditions could be very strong. The Gold Eagle badge and its 100ks requirement or the 2/3 PWC rule have been controversial, but that was the only tools we could reasonably find to show the NACs the level of competition experience required and not to check all the pilots competition experience. What we want is to have a contact with the Team Leaders to convince them that sending not enough experienced pilots is not acceptable. I know that we don't play marbles and that the risk Zero does not exist but I would like to have a WAG without fatality.

My feeling is that the 2/3 rule without minimum standards for a Cat 2 event is not enough to be sure that all pilots have the necessary competition experience to participate safely to a Cat 1 meet and I urge the Safety and training sub Committee to make proposals to improve this rule.

During the Euro HG Klaus and Martin Jursa tried, as it has been decided during the last CIVL meeting to make some pitch stability tests on some prototype gliders, but this has not been possible since it would have been necessary to carry the gliders to an other place with a necessary runway to use the DHV test vehicle. The pilots refused to take the risk to have their glider damaged during the transport.

Word Air Games

The 2nd WAG in Spain this year are on the tracks now and the details that still remain to be improved will be decided during this meeting.

The 3rd WAG for 2005 has to be awarded this year. There is only one bid: Slovenia and all the Air Sport Commissions are requested to give their advice on this bid. This is one of our tasks for this meeting.

Free movement of pilots

You can find on the web site a list of countries who answered the questionnaire with regards to IPPI card recognition and the Insurance questions.

We are still waiting for replies from those countries who are not listed in this document. Please note that a non-reply does not indicate non-acceptance of IPPI card or no insurance requirements!

On a Canada's request we will add to the questionnaire the following question:

“What radio's and radio frequencies are permitted for hang gliding and paragliding in your country?”

May I ask you to answer these questions which are of a great interest for pilots who wish to travel.

PWCA

2000 has been a normal season with half of the potential tasks flown. The results are available on the PWC web site.

2000 has been the GPS year. We started using GPS for flight verification. Thanks to Christian Quest who developed Check in we could finish the year with something that works well. We made mistakes as usual by allowing both systems GPS and photos and we experienced big disadvantages that even resulted once in Brazil in a good task cancelled.

For the next season we decided to use only the GPS except in certain areas like Basano where for various reasons the GPS doesn't work.

In 2000 we carried on the Serial Class experience. I must confess that we never had 20% of pilots flying Serial Class and only 2 pilots competed seriously for the title. This is the reason why the PWC committee decided to give up the serial class experience for the next year.

New formats of competition

The first accuracy World Championship has been run with success. Riikka will report; I just would mention that for the future it is intended to make the necessary change in the rules to run Paragliding competitions and not Parachuting competitions. It's a bit frustrating to award a CIVL Champion title to a parachutist. Note that for 2003 we have 2 bids.

Beach soaring: last year in Israel a competition took place, Noel Whittall has been invited as CIVL official. I heard that they intend to have an other event in 2001.

The first speed gliding World championship has been run successfully in Greece. Dennis will report. The Austrian organiser of the 2000 Speed Run wished to apply for a world championship, but they finally decided to go on running an on invitation event only for safety reasons because of lack of selection procedures. The Safety and Training sub committee should consider this matter in association with the WHGS.

Aerobatics: Aerobatics in HG exists since a long time. Aerobatics in PG started developing a couple of years ago with events like Aspen or Vertigo.

The PWCA studied as well the possibility of associating aerobatics events to the XC PWC events. They even drafted some standards for organisers with regards to safety and competition rules. Recently the Vertigo organiser wished to organise the first aerobatic world championship in 2002. Since a world championship has to be organised by a NAC, I asked the Swiss federation to study the project and recently during a central European federation Presidents meeting this format of competition has been raised and discussed. Unanimously the 8 federations Presidents stated that it was not possible by the time being to think of organising such a world championship for 3 main reasons:

- lack of equipment: the manufacturers are prohibiting aerobatics with their product.
- None of the present associations have organised yet any training courses for aerobatics to insure a safe participation of their teams to a world championship and there in no selection criteria.
- Associated insurance problem.

However they admit that this format of competition exists but it can only be an on invitation competition.

You can understand that with such a statement from a good part of our members I cannot promote by the time being world championships in that format . However since these format are media friendly and that there is a demand, I created an aerobatics Working Group. Alain Zoller accepted to chair this working group with the task to solve the identified problems.

Flight verification

During the last century we were using photos for competitions and photos and barograph plus observers for records. It seems that this old fashioned technology is over.

GPS for flight verification is now usually accepted in competition.

Last year we accepted the Data logger developed by the IGC for record flight evidence and very recently I could see an e mail from Ales Sustar (Slovenia) advocating this equipment. Davis Straub (USA) who got one of this data logger pointed out a couple of drawbacks, among them, the cost 900 USD and the energy consumption.

In the same way Peter Von Kaenel (Switzerland) is developing a new data logger on a voluntary basis, according to the last news, it's ready for testing during the next season. The aim being to give this software for free to any manufacturer willing to produce this kind of data logger. The equipment should be much cheaper something in comparison with a GPS cost.

The flight verification subcommittee should now take care of :

- updating the RACE program that should include an automatic production of WPRS
- approval of the software used in Category one competition to make sure that they meet the Section 7 rule.
- Help developing the Peter software to allow its use for record verification.
- Approval of barograph if this technology is still developing.

Martin Brunn and Achim Muller announced that RACE 2000 is now finished and they they cannot continue updating this software

Jose Luiz Moura Velloso (Brazil) expressed his wish to work on RACE 2000

Christian Quest already made the interface between Check in and RACE 2000 to produce directly the results when downloading the GPS that means only one operator for the organiser. Note that the PWCA decided to use RACE from now on.

Christian who is going to join us on Saturday accepted to chair a working group to approve the software used for cat 1 competitions but he wishes for evident competition reasons to be given some one else to assist him.

This is the end of my report, thank you for your attention.

Olivier Burghelle
CIVL President

Annex 1

Guidelines for Sub-Committees and Working Groups

The Chairman is appointed by the President

Members:

The members, after consulting the Chairman, join the Sub-committee (SC) / Working Group (WG) of their own wish. The chairman may restrict the number of members to 7 + himself. Committee members should be individuals with expertise in and historical knowledge of the committee's agenda items. There will only be one committee member per country in each SC / WG. Additional observers may be allowed to contribute at the discretion of the SC / WG Chairman

Each country has only one vote in the SC / WG

The SC / WG should take care of urgent matters communicated by the President and prepare papers for submission to the Plenary.

The chairman has to prepare an agenda and make a written report to the CIVL Plenary including decisions and recommendations.

All SC / WG decisions and recommendations are subject to approval by the CIVL Plenary

The minutes of the votes should be included in the Chairman's written report.

The Chairman will present his report to the Plenary in written form.

Annex 2

Report of Chairman of Safety and Training

Last year CIVL decided new safety standards for hang gliders in FAI competitions but we have it on the agenda again. The CIVL bureau did cancel the rule concerning the hang glider uprights and now a new proposal from Michael Zupanc is on the table. We will deal with it this afternoon. The problem of pitch stability of competition hang gliders is not solved. During the last Hang Gliding Europeans the DHV was prepared to do pitch tests. But the competition pilots did not like the idea to put their gliders on a test car. We made clear that the results of these test will not be published and no penalties will be applied for failing stability tests at this time. But the pilots did not like it anyway and so no testing has been done and no efforts to get pitch stability measurements.

We also decided in our last meeting that pilots in all FAI 1-category events have to meet minimum pilots qualification standards. There are doubts whether we have done enough and therefore we have this topic again on the agenda of the subcommittee safety and training this afternoon.

At the moment we do not have to deal with the topic training. Everybody seems to be happy with the IPPI card standards. Concerning the worldwide acceptance of the IPPI card our President Olivier Burghelle has made an inquiry. The result is published on the CIVL website. It is a very good result. The IPPI card is one of the big successes of CIVL because it helps all pilots a lot who want to fly in foreign countries in a legal way.

Fortunately, in most of the countries worldwide there are no legal restrictions for hang gliding and paragliding but in some there are restrictions. Normally the national hang gliding and paragliding associations are in good contact with their national authorities and fight successfully for the well being of our sport.

Now in Europe, more and more, the national authorities hand over some of their rights to the New European Authorities. And the European Authorities do not speak with national associations, only with European associations. That is the reason why we founded recently the European Hang Gliding and Paragliding Union as umbrella organisation for the national Hang Gliding and Paragliding Associations within Europe. Before there have been yearly presidents meetings of the Associations of Austria, Belgium, Germany, England, France, Italy, Portugal and Switzerland. Three weeks ago the presidents met again in Portugal and there we decided to found the European Union and to invite every Association within Europe to join us. For details please see annex: the statutes of EHPU.

Klaus Tänzler

Chairman's Report Annex

Results of the European Safety meeting 2000

Collision avoidance rules

Concerning collision avoidance rules in the various European countries, the federations shall advise their pilots in the following way:

1. The pilot ALWAYS must take responsibility for avoiding collisions. When applying the rules, priority must never be taken, but always be given.
2. There is a small set of rules everybody must know, and which apply European-wide
 - When in doubt turn right
 - When thermalling, the first pilot in the thermal determines the circling direction, everybody else is required to turn in the same direction
 - When ridge soaring, the pilot with the ridge to his left must give way
3. There are potentially dangerous variations/differences between national rules; the federations will publish this information (magazine/Internet), and pilots planning to go abroad are advised to inform themselves about those rules existing in the country they are planning to visit, and which they must apply. Additionally, the federations will hand out the list of European air traffic rules to any applicant for an IPPI card.

Common set of database fields to record incidents

The meet was also devoted to defining harmonised data fields to be used by the federations to store information on reported incidents, and to exchange incident data to enable European wide incident statistics. The new fields were created on the basis of the existing fields of the I-, D-A-CH- and UK- databases. They will be available on the CIVL website.

Annex 3

Hang Gliding Sub-Committee Report

HG Committee Members

Neils Askirk- Denmark, Luis Niemeyer – Brazil, Flip Koetsier – Netherlands, Jose Sanchez – Spain, Stephane Vieilledent – France, Lillian Leblanc – Greece, Jim Bowyer – UK, Lukas Etz – Germany, Zlato Vanic – Slovenia, Vasco Rapaso – Portugal, Michael Zupanc – Australia – not present and August Gudmundsson – Iceland

Section 7 – Joint Discussion

5.21.6 Suspension, cancellation or stopping of a task.

After much discussion the following proposals were made;

- 1. When a task is stopped every pilots' score is determined by their position at the moment that the task was stopped determined by track log position.**

Proposed by Scott
Seconded by Juaki

For	15
Against	2
Abstentions	4

Motion carried

- 2 When a task is stopped then the task is devalued by 50%.**

Proposed by Martin
Seconded by Stephane

For	2
Against	19
Abstentions	1

Motion Failed

5.25 Rest days

A short discussion on rest days was followed by a unanimous vote to leave the rules unchanged.

Revision of the Algodonales Local Regulations

The Local Regulations were reviewed and the final version adopted subject to the following changes;

Team size in Class 2 will be changed to 4 + 2. Deadline for registration is 31st March 2001. The females are only competing for WAG champion, not World Champion.

Team Size at WAG & Site Modification at WAG

Juaki reported that the size would be 6 + 2 in Class 1 and 4 in Class 2 but the modifications at launch had not yet started, although it is reported that it will start soon. It was considered to move Class 2 to another site but there will still be congestion with Class 1 with the present numbers.

The WG reviewed the launch area and team size with the meet organiser and strongly urge him communicate our concerns about the launch problem with the local authorities.

All decisions will be made by the 1st April and published on the website – to include;
Whether Class 1 & 2 will be split.
Whether Class 1 will be flown in groups.

Launch Systems

Options will be published on the CIVL website and to the delegates. The decision as to which system will be used will be made by the meet organiser and published on the website by 1st April.

The options are;

Ordered Launch
Signup list

Meet Headquarters

Have been moved to a more suitable location – see the website for details.

Transport

Transport will be available to the Stewards and Jury to travel to goal and any other areas that may be required.

Proposals for Media Support at Championships

The paper was discussed and we agree that the launch and landing interview requirements are reasonable for HG competitions. However, after flight interviews cannot be guaranteed because of the nature of the sport.

Additionally some concern was expressed over the total weight and complication of carrying cameras and ancillary equipment. We are especially concerned with any requirement that requires weight to be added significantly far from the gliders centre of pressure.

Paragliding Sub-Committee Report

Team size WAG 2001

150 pilots that fulfil the requirements as previously published.

If there is not 150 pilots, then we will fill the remaining spaces...

Firstly - Female pilots up to 2/team (as long as they fulfil the qualification criteria)

Secondly - Male pilots according to the rule made last year

Thirdly - Add 1 pilot for all the top 5 countries, and so, one by one.

Vote unanimous.

Team scoring.

Best 3 pilots in each task.

Vote 9/14

Validation

Proposal to change the validation from 3 tasks to a total of 1500 points task value.

Report of subcommittee meeting Safety and Training

Members: G.W. Meadows (USA), Marc Presson (Sweden), Andre Wolf (Brazil), Zlatko (Croatia), John Aldridge (UK), Olav Kant (Norway), Sarah Fenwick, Olli Borg (Finland), Yves Gouslain (France), Michael Zupanc (Australia), Paul Thomas (South Africa), Klaus Tänzler (Chairman).

Serial class for Paragliding

Support from Australia, Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, South Africa, Sweden and UK for Paragliding serial class to be nurtured, however there are still major reservations concerning compliance. There is still no answer to the question how to prove that a glider is a serial class glider during competition.

HG safety standards

Issues concerning costs are not part of this discussion of the subcommittee. This is the realm of “level playing field” which has to be discussed in the CIVL plenary.

The proposal to implement a minimum width for uprights has been rejected by 2 to 5 votes. The following proposal is accepted by the subcommittee:

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of these standards is to insure a certain minimum level of structural integrity and pilot safety in class 1, 2 and 4 Hang Gliders.

In general hang gliders should comply with the load test certification standards of, the HGMA, BHPA or DHV, or similar testing body.

Where dimensional limits are applied to structures, these have been chosen such that adequate strength is achievable with materials currently in use.

Reduced strength due to use of unconventional materials meeting these dimensional limits is the competitors responsibility. Where relevant the conventional material is stated.

1.2 Structural limits

- Minimum diameter of any structural external wire cables is 1.9 mm or 5/64 inches.
- Where an external compression strut is braced with rigging wires they must attach within 10cm of the point where the compression load is applied.
- If a control bar (basetube) is made of material other than metal, it must have an internal steel rigging cable that serves as a structural backup.
- The pilot suspension must include a non-metallic load bearing webbing of minimum 25 mm width (normal material Nylon woven webbing of over 1000kg breaking strain). The attachment loop must have a backup, which bypasses any mechanical devices and either the main, or backup must be non-metallic.
- A rescue parachute must be capable of deployment by each of the pilot's hands in a normal flying attitude is mandatory.

1.3 Penalties

The normal penalty for non-compliance is a 20 % reduction in score for the last round flown. If during a subsequent round the glider is again found to be non-compliant a zero score will result for that round. At the discretion of the Meet Steward a lesser penalty may be applied in rare cases due to extenuating circumstances

Revision of Section 7 5.11 (2/3 rule)

Just for clarification: The 100km rule is only of relevance to the Sierra Nevada WAG.

The subcommittee has the opinion that we need stricter pilot qualification rules for category 1 events in Paragliding.

The recommendation:

- stricter definition of category 2 events in Section 7, to include minimum pilot numbers (80) and minimum of (e.g.10%) international standard pilots

In addition for WPRS purposes only

- to introduce a lower sanction level/value of open national championships that do not meet the new category 2 criteria (e.g. those with less than 80 pilots and/or less than 10% international standard pilots).

Annex 6

WPRS Working Group Report

Present:

Sarah Fenwick (CIVL), Mike Zupanc (Australia), Jim Bowyer (UK), Tomoko Kobayashi (Japan), Miyuki Tanaka (Japan), Paul Thomas (S Africa), Urs Dubach (CH), Agust Gudmundsson (Iceland), Klaus Tanzler (Germany), Stefan Mast (Germany), Andre Wolf (Brazil), Luiz Niemeyer (Brazil), Anestis Paliatos (Greece), Fred Escriba (France), Xavier Murillo (CIVL), Olav Kant (Norway), Martin Brunn (Austria), Philippe Broers (Belgium), Scott Torkelson (Denmark).

Aims & Objectives:

To improve the WPRS so that it:

1. gives a credible ranking
2. can be used for selection purposes (eg PWC, Category 1)
3. to establish implementation dates

Martin Brunn and Mike Zupanc presented their ideas to the working group. It was proposed and agreed by the working group that any proposed solution(s) should be run alongside the existing system for 2001 and we recommend the following proposal to the Plenary;

Proposal

That in the interim period the following improvements (as presented in the WPRS proposal) be made to the current system:

1. Keep Category 1 and category 2 events at their current sanction values (1.0 and 0.67)
2. Award a podium bonus of 1st 10 points, 2nd 7 points, 3rd 5 points, 4th 3 points and 5th 1 point.
3. For ease of checking qualification criteria for Category 1 events:
 - a. All competitions over the previous 3 years are on the ranking list with a time devaluation factor on a year to year basis, whereby the sanction given to a competition will be devalued by a factor on 0.8 once the corresponding competition is run in the next season, or in the case of category 1 events the next corresponding event (category 1 comps will only ever be devalued once, as they will drop out of the 3 year time period before the second devaluation). Second subsequent events (i.e. 25-36 months old) will be devalued by 0.2. If there is any ambiguity as to what constitutes the corresponding competition the WPRS sub-committee will make a ruling.
 - b. all pilots who finish in top 2/3rds of a competition are listed on ranking list (this may mean those who have finished in top 2/3 of event with less than 4 tasks having 0 score).

Separation of HG and PG

After much discussion which highlighted the different requirements of hang gliding and paragliding a vote was taken as to whether to split into HG and PG sub-divisions. The vote was unanimous. At this point two working groups were formed. HG under the chair of Mike Zupanc and PG under the chair of Sarah Fenwick.

WPRS PG working group

Present: Sarah Fenwick (CIVL), Miyuki Tanaka (Japan), Paul Thomas (S Africa), Urs Dubach (CH), Stefan Mast (Germany), Anestis Paliatsos (Greece), Fred Escriba (France), Xavier Murillo (CIVL), Olav Kant (Norway), Martin Brunn (Austria), Philippe Broers (Belgium), Scott Torkelson (Denmark) & Mark Presson (Sweden).

Martin will present a brief outline of his proposed formula

Recommendation to the Plenary that:

1. Martin Brunn's formula is run in parallel to the current WPRS for 2001.
2. The formula is 'live' and under continuous development
3. The rankings of the new formula are published alongside the current system
4. There will be an open e-mail discussion group set up on the CIVL website
5. The sub-committee will consist of Fred Escriba (chair/co-ordinator), Xavier Murillo, Ulf (S Africa), Stefan Mast, Miyuki Tanaka & Martin Brunn.
6. If the trial is considered successful the results and implementation proposals will be presented to the Plenary meeting 2002.

Sarah Fenwick will be the CIVL co-ordinator between the two working groups.

Mike Zupanc will provide a report on the WPRS HG working group.

Hang Gliding WPRS.

There is a fundamental problem with some major competitions.

The world number one pilot lost his ranking position because he was denied entry into a European Championship because he was not European. There was a limit on competitor entries in the competition and only Europeans were allowed to enter.

To deny a high ranking pilot the opportunity to compete for high competition points is fundamentally wrong.

To address this problem, a two-part proposal is being put to the Plenary for approval.

Firstly,

Any competition that includes pilots irrespective of their country of origin may be included in the world ranking system.

Then.

Continental Championships must allow at least the top 50 pilots of the world ranking system into the competition. Except that no nation can enter more pilots than the normal team size.

These proposals were accepted by the working group without dissent

Note if there is conflict with the GS in terms of “guest” pilots, these issues can easily be fixed by using two score sheets. Ie. The “continental championship” and “all pilots”, with the complete score being used for WPRS purposes. - The RACE scoring program accommodates this function easily.

An ongoing working group, which will be advertised on the internet, will continue to evaluate the HG aspects of the WPRS

Martin’s system will be run in the background in parallel with the current system (if possible) so that the formulas can be evaluated.

Of special concern is the level where the pilot weighting begins to devalue a competition.

We need to have a system whereby smaller competitions that have solid competition between the potential winners are not penalised if there are small numbers of competitors overall.

It is impossible to evaluate where the formulas allocate this level is at the moment. We need time to examine the system during the year.

Also during the year the concept of a super series (or whatever, it ends up being called), whereby known sanction points are available to whoever turns up will also be investigated further.

The aim of this concept, is that pilots are able to plan in advance which competitions they will or will not attend, and it will ensure that the pool of HG skill is demonstrated around the world.

With appropriate mathematical tuning, Martin’s proposal may (or may not) be able to address some, or possibly all of these issues, hence the need for time to evaluate the options with thorough mathematical and philosophical consideration.

Class definition committee report

Present: Dennis Pagen (chair), Stephane Vieilledent (France), Hansjorg Truttman (France), Lukas Vetz (Germany), John Aldridge (UK) GW Meadows (USA), Leonard Grigoresh (Romania), Olli Borg (Finland), Vukicevic Zlatko (Croatia), Seiji Kobayashi (Japan), Sepp Himberger (Austria).

Dennis read Bureau support statement of Class 2 fairing rule from Plenary meeting 2000, for 2001.

Dennis presented proposal from a group of international pilots regarding subclasses in Class 2.

See attached.

Move GW: Have limitation of Class 2 gliders tied only to footlaunch and footlandability requirements as listed in Section 7.

Seconded Aldridge.

2 for 5 against 2 abstain.

Move Aldridge: Amend definition of Class 4 by adding “or which fail to meet the requirements of any other class”

Second Sepp.

6 for 1 against 2 abstain.

Move: Lucas Hang Cage hang gliders are not allowed in Class 2

Second Sepp.

5 for 1 against 3 abstain.

Move Hans: Cage rule effective Jan 1 2002, to go back to the Bureau if not accepted by the 2002 class 2 World Championships organiser.

Second Sepp.

7 for 1 against 1 abstained.

Lucas, Hansjorg, GW, John subcommittee to include intent/goal of definition.

Move sepp: rename Class 4 to open class

Second Hansjorg

8 for 1 against 1 abstain.

Move Aldridge: Require organisers of future Class 2 meets to also run Open Class meets after Jan 1 2003.

Second Stephan

& for 1 against 1 abstain.

Respectfully submitted.

Dennis Pagen.

Annex 9

CIVL-2001, Lausanne

Olli Borg, M.Sc. (environmental protection technology)
member in the Finnish sports federation environmental commission
in charge of environmental issues in the Finnish Aviation Association.
research work concerning aviation and environment.

Paragliding, Hang-gliding & the Environment

- all human activities have an impact on the environment – also flying, sports etc.
- the impacts vary from local to global
- the local impacts have been a problem on many mountain sites. (especially in national parks etc.)

The **local** impacts may include :

- Disturbance of wildlife (eg. breeding)
- Noise
- Littering
- Excessive wear of vegetation

From an environmental point of view, these are all **minor** issues.
Nevertheless, the world is changing and we have to face it.

It is our responsibility to react and ensure the use of our flying sites in the future.

By far the best way is **to adapt our activity to reduce the negative impacts** on the environment.

To help the task, the FAI has established an environmental commission that has agreed on **codes of conduct** for the disciplines (available at the FAI website)

Some methods to reduce impacts:

- reduce traffic by use of eg buses
- organize car parking
- take care of (collect, recycle) wastes
- prohibit / restrict the use of sensitive areas
- information to pilots and all concerned
- noise control

All the mentioned methods are in fact very easy to organize!

As meet / competition organizers **it is OUR duty** to assure that the environment is taken into account in our events.

For every meet someone in the organization should be appointed to **assure that the environmental policy is put into practice**. The person in charge should be given sufficient rights. (there is **an analogy to dealing with the media** or press)

The environmental codes and - policy of an event can be advertised to obtain a positive image on the media.

This is essential in order **to get the general attitude on our side**.

Global impacts are becoming more important and are of great concern around the world.

This is an issue that we have to face in the near future.

Global impacts are related to the greenhouse-effect. The major concern is of carbon dioxide. This is directly connected with the use of fossil fuels. (almost all energy we use!)

As free-flight pilots, we are on the safe side from the start!

(wind & thermals = solar power)

This should also be used as a positive argument in the media!

The issue will be the traffic and towing

In the future we may be facing requirements to reduce the emissions (policy of constant development).

More research results concerning aviation & environment will be available from the Finnish AA.

CIVL GOALS

A brainstorm on the goals of CIVL, brought up the following list. Delegates are asked to consider this list in consultation with their association before the Plenary meeting.

Overall goal: to enhance and ensure popularity, longevity and safety of the sport, by:

Airworthiness and safety

1. To improve safety in free flying and competitions
2. Focus on safety and training
3. Liaison and co-operation with testing organisations (DHV, SHV, BHPA, FFVL, etc) in particular monitoring safety standards for build.
4. Continue with safety and training committee
5. Promote CIVL safety and training abilities
6. Promote consolidation of countries training programmes to align with Safe and Para Pro standards
7. Safety and training programmes for new countries

Competitions

8. Development of the sport (e.g. continental champs)
9. Promotion of sport to media
10. To reduce the pilot entry fee at Category 1 events
11. To reduce the number of competition days
12. To reduce the number of minimum number of valid tasks
13. Improve the format of our competitions in order to better achieve the determination of World Champion.
14. To have all gliders in Category 1 competitions certified.
15. WPRS to become a ranking system that is accepted by majority and is of such a nature that any interested party can use the ranking scheme for pilot and team selection in category 1 competitions
16. Include other disciplines in flying sports at WC and WAG
17. Continually assess WAG for validity in terms of promotion and status (set CIVL level of compromise)

Organisational

17. Meetings to be open and democratic process with time for debate on all proposals
18. Become more professional in organisation and running of events

PR Report – Sarah Fenwick

- Website updating
- Publication of press releases
- Category 2 sanctioning (communications, approval, fees, etc)
- Qualification for category 1 events
- Free Movement of Pilots survey
- IPPI card promotion
- Communication and liaison with FAI office and staff
- 2 new versions of Jury & Steward Handbook
- New version of Organisers Guidelines, including new chapters
- Media and Marketing presentation (draft 5) produced by Patricia Lamy (FAI Media Officer)
- PR, Media and event Organisation – chapter in Organisers Guidelines
- Profile raising → appoint media co-ordinator → increased profile → increased media exposure → attracts sponsors → increased £££££'s

Sarah's replacement from July 2001

Requires good English, communication skills and some knowledge of hang gliding and/or paragliding and CIVL.

Job description: CIVL PR Co-ordinator (Olivier's chief slave!)

- CIVL public relations
- Dissemination of CIVL information
- Editing/proof reading and publishing CIVL documents
- Administering WPRS
- Maintaining list of pilots qualified for Cat 1 events
- Updating CIVL website
- CIVL representative on FAI Media Working Group
- Communication and liaison with FAI office and staff
- Communication with delegates, pilots, associations, flying press, pilots, etc
- IPPI card promotion
- Attendance of CIVL Bureau and Plenary meetings

Hours: average 6-8 hrs per week, flexible, to suit you!

Location: can be done at home

Requires: tel, fax and e-mail (you may receive occasional late night/early morning faxes!)

Pay two rates:

Day to day administration tasks: £11.00 (approx Euros 18) per hour

PR/tasks requiring brain power: £16.50 (approx Euros 27) per hour

Proposal for Sanction Fee Increase

CIVL are currently running at a loss and if this trend is to be reversed the Bureau proposes the following sanction fee increases/amendments:

- World Championships & WAG to CHF 12,000 with effect from 2005 (WAG)
- Continental Championships to CHF 8,000 with effect from 2004 maintaining the provision for 50% reduction (i.e. CHF 4,000) for new Continental Championships
- The per pilot sanction fee for Championships with less than 75 competitors CHF 60 with effect from 2003
- Category 2 sanction fee to remain as it is (i.e. 1 pilot's participation fee) but to introduce a minimum of CHF 50 with effect from 1 May 2001.

Presentation of proposals for increase in sanction fees at Plenary

Annex 13

GPS and flight verification Report

Present: Michael Zupanc (Chair) A Nibls (DK), Noos (NL), Paul Thomas (SA), Juaki (Spain), Dennis Pagen (USA), Vasco Raposa (Portugal), Flip Koester (NL), Fred Escriba (Fr), Cristian Quest, Agust (IS), Lillian Leblanc (GR), John Aldrige (UK), Lukas etz (Ger), Zlato Vanic (SLO), Stefan Mast (GER), Zlatlo Volcivic (Croatia) Martin Brunn (AUT) GW Meadows (USA)

An Internet working group(s) will be established to investigate the requirements for security standards in record and badge flights and a standard file format for GPS developers so that flight evidence downloads can be achieved without the need for many different translating programs. There is a need for more integration with competition scoring systems, competition flight verification systems and technical requirements for records and badges.

So, some general aims of the GPS flight verification system.

- A simple and standard system used throughout the world.
- To be cheap and accessible.
- To make cheating almost impossible
- Should replace barographs
- Allow different types of tasks and competitions
- To continually actively develop ideas and technology to improve the system.
- To have the same verification standards for competition flights and records and badges.

The discussion then turned towards the GPS rules in Section 7.

It was recognised that as the hardware and software was still being actively developed, the rules had to remain suitably flexible to allow for differences in the manner that different hardware and software operated.

At the same time it is a goal of this group to push the development of hardware and software towards some standard form in the future, but also to still allow new ideas and concepts to be tried and tested by the various developers

Points of contention:

It was proposed to remove the possibility of mixing GPS evidence with photographic evidence, and there was overwhelming opposition to the continuation of mixing the different forms of evidence.

There was a proposal to remove the FAI sectors from GPS verification.

Vote 11 agree, 4 against.

Vote carried and FAI sectors are removed from GPS verification.

There was a proposal to remove the allowance of single track log points being used individually as part of the flight verification.

Vote 4 agree, 8 against

Vote failed, but then a clarifying statement was added to the rules to recognise the need for more stringent rules to used where it is deemed necessary.

There have been numerous other changes to the GPS verification annex, but these were settled without significant dissent.

RULES FOR GPS FLIGHT VERIFICATION

Annex 15

Flights in Cat 1 Championships will be verified using GPS track-log evidence. Only in exceptional circumstances will the relevant CIVL Competition Committee allow photographic evidence.

Where GPS flight verification is to be used, the competition organization must advertise beforehand what approved (by the relevant CIVL Committee) software will be used and the types of GPS instruments that will be supported.

Any system of GPS flight verification must first be approved by the relevant CIVL committee as being secure and suitable for the purpose of verifying competition flights.

Competitors who wish to use IGC standard equipment are welcome to do so, provided the competitor provides all necessary hardware and software, and all IGC standards are properly followed.

GPS use

A pilot may use multiple GPS's for verification and backup and may submit multiple track-logs to the scorer. The evidence will be chosen so that the pilot's best possible score, from all correctly obtained data, will be taken for flight verification.

The verification means must show any start points and turn points claimed in the order specified on the day board, and some evidence of landing location.

Pilots must ensure they are using a GPS that is compatible with the flight verification software that is being used. The makes and models that will be accepted for flight verification during a competition will be publicised prior to the start of the competition.

Competition organisers must only use flight verification software that has been evaluated by the relevant CIVL committee as being suitable and secure. The organiser must publish, as part of routine pilot notification, the name and minimum version number of the flight verification software prior to the start of the competition.

Flight evidence submitted may only be submitted for the claimed flight.

Cylinder sectors

Cylindrical sectors will be used in competition. The radius of the sectors will generally be 400m.

Start, Turnpoint and goal sectors

All verification sectors will be cylinders.

Start, turnpoint and goal features.

As GPS evidence is used in a competition, physical features on the ground are to be taken as a guide only. The coordinates supplied by the competition will be the Turnpoint, Goal and Start points that the pilots will fly to, except where manned goals are used the pilots must cross the physical marked goal.

Track log

The pilot must provide an unambiguous track log that shows without doubt that the data was collected;

- By the pilot of the hang glider on the flight in question.
- Of the declared turn point feature from the correct location in the correct sequence.
- Between the takeoff and landing.
- With all relevant information being present on the track log.

The track log must show for any start, goal or turn point that is claimed for the flight, one of the following:

- A point within the normal sector, plus the allowable additions for possible GPS error.
- A pair of consecutive points not more than 30 seconds apart for which a straight line drawn from the first point to the second point passes through the allowable sector, plus the allowable additions for possible GPS error

Where the point being claimed is a start point and the track-log has 2 points either side of the start sector at most 30 seconds apart, then the start time is then interpolated from these points.

Otherwise a start time is taken from the last (in time) point within sector of the start sector.

Where the point being claimed is a goal point and the track-log has 2 points either side of the goal sector at most 30 seconds apart, then the finish time is then interpolated from these points.

Otherwise a finish time is taken from the first (in time) point within sector of the goal sector.

General Verification Rules

For the track-log to be accepted, it must contain on average at least 1 point for every five minutes of on course flying time (points taken prior to the start and after goal are not counted). e.g. a 2 hour flight must contain at least 24 track-log points between the start (launch or start point) and goal or the end of the flight.

If goal is not achieved, the end of flight may be taken to be the point within the track-log closest to the next target (not achieved). If the task is an open distance, the end of flight will be the point within the track-log that gives the pilot his/her best position according to the type of open distance being used. The time of the track log point chosen as the finish of the flight must be consistent with the flight being claimed.

The verification software will confirm that all points used to verify the flight occurred at reasonable times (e.g. on the day in question, between the start of the task and the end of the task, and showing the correct chronology of start and turn points).

The competition organiser has the discretion to reject any track-log, or part thereof, if she/he feels it does not show sufficient evidence that the claimed data is genuine.

If a task is stopped, the pilots will still be scored up to the point in time when the day was stopped. The pilots may submit their track logs to claim their finish of the flight as being the last valid track point prior to the task being stopped, or their best position on course prior to the task being stopped. No other means of flight verification will be accepted if the task is stopped. Pilots who do not present a valid track log will in this case be given a landing score according to an agreed procedure, but aerial photographs claiming a position over the ground will not be accepted. Pilots without a valid GPS track will be at a disadvantage.

The pilot must ensure that he/she has equipment that is secure and compatible with the approved GPS flight verification software that is in use.

Pilots will be required to correctly set up the operating parameters of their GPS instruments. Failure to correctly set up their GPS instruments may lead to penalties being applied.

Pilots will be required to correctly fill out a landing form with all relevant flight and landing information. Failure to do so may lead to penalties being applied.

More stringent rules may be imposed by the competition provided that they are included in the approved local regulations.

Note. The portability of paragliders may necessitate further rules.