

**CIVL PLENARY 2010 – LAUSANNE
PARAGLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA**

PART 1 – SAFETY ISSUES

1. Report from PG Safety Working Group

- i) Helmets – Agree with decision to: *“Introduce 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?

- ii) Harnesses – progress on specifying minimum standards?
Discuss PMA proposal of harnesses with protection to LTF standard.
(Information will be circulated on the PGssc email list)

- iii) Policing the safety equipment rules at Cat 1 events?

2. Improving Paraglider Safety in Category 1 Competitions

- i) Discuss options: A: Certified Gliders only (Serial Class)
 B: Certified and Open class, no prototypes
 C: Gliders tested to CEN D at trim.
 D: Aspect ratio limited gliders.
 E: Other types of limitation

ii) Swiss Proposal 2: See Annex 16:

Setting up Working Group to set restrictions on construction acceptable for gliders in competitions OR setting new homologation for competition class gliders.

3. Numbers of competitors allowed at Category 1 events

and level of qualifications required. Reference earlier email discussions covering how to specify gaggle-flying experience. (Ref also allocation discussion later)

PART 2 – COMBINED HG/PG ISSUES

1. Clarifying the definition of a prototype

See Sporting Code SC Agenda, Chapter 12 of S7A. Relevant to S7B?
Note also Netherlands Proposal 2 to ban prototypes from HG XC Cat 1 events.

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
- 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 implications 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 – PARAGLIDING SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Paraglider Definition in S7 and General Section

Discuss: Does it need qualifying or changing? (It was designed to differentiate HG from PG) Why does it need qualifying or changing? (Safety, simplicity.....).

- i) **Switzerland Proposal 1:** See Annex 16
Based on PMA recommendation for qualifying the term ‘rigid primary structure’.
- ii) Consider other definitions to achieve the reason for change.
- iii) Consider other options (ie new class)

2. Allocation of Gender specific team places at Cat 1 events.

Following the earlier email discussion: Given the pressure on places (more nations competing):

- Is a change needed for allocation system? Discussions included straight allocation by wprs (ie no free places to women); and 1+1 then by nation wprs order.
- Should qualification levels be increased? (Cross ref earlier discussion – Part 1.3)
- Is it time to consider a PG Women's Worlds?
- If not, is it fair to award Women's medals when allocation (may) only allow 1 female from each nation?
- What about split nation/individual championships?

3. Task dropping:

- i) Discuss if task dropping should be covered in Ch4 (Cat 2) scoring chapters of S7B (it is specifically excluded from S7A) and if there should be restrictions: ie worst task can be dropped after x tasks flown. No more than x% of tasks in a competition can be dropped. (Not only the PWCs have been dropping tasks during 2009)
- ii) Consider impact on WPRS. Review Bureau decisions: *"To upload competition results with task dropping using the full number of tasks flown to determine the Ta factor. Also, if organisers choose to drop an entire task for all pilots, then this is effectively an invalid task, and should be not be counted towards Ta in the WPRS formula."*

5. Proposals from Sporting Code Subcommittee

See Annex 9 for full information. A key point listed below:

- i) **S7B, new paragraph 4.3.2 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.

Review other proposed changes in Annex 9.

6. Qualification & allocation dates:

In S7B 3.4.5 the qualification date is specified as no later than 60 days before the competition. In 3.2.1 the nation rankings to be used for allocating places is first day 3 months before. Any change required? Maybe use the same reference date?

7. Discuss/review bids for:

- 12th FAI European Paragliding Championships: France
- 3rd FAI PanAmerican Paragliding Championships: Brazil