

APPENDIX B -CIVL PLENARY 2012 – Chinese Taipei

Minutes

Paragliding Subcommittee Meeting

1) Review, and consider recommendations from the CIVL Paragliding Competitions Safety Task Force reports in conjunction with Plenary Proposals where they coincide:

i) Lifting the temporary suspension

TF2. Lift the temporary suspension of Competition Class gliders, as early as possible, preferably before the CIVL Plenary in February 2012, in combination with an announcement regarding the definition of the 2012 Competition Class.

Bulgaria Proposal 4: Lift the suspension introduced at the Piedrahita Worlds and remove the recommendation to the NACs to restrict wings in their events.

CB commented that we have already had comments from other organisations (PMA, PWCA, EHPU) that it should not be lifted for 2012. Good for pilots and manufacturers.

SM: CIVL should not lift the suspension for 2012.

GD: lifting the suspension immediately will upset the manufacturers who have made efforts to introduce serial class gliders. PWCA has discussed this with pilots and manufacturers. PWCA will continue to run serial class only in 2012. Some would even like to see PWCA stay on certified wings for 2013 also – decision not made yet. We need some stability to re-establish a 2 year design cycle.

However, PWCA strongly in favour of reminding NACs that, the decision on which glider classes are allowed remains at all times with the NACs

KT: EHPU meeting concluded that there is a legal situation in some European countries such that only certified gliders should be flown in competitions

KK: Not the case in Czech R and does not agree with keeping the restriction.

HJ: Not all countries in same legal situation. Poland will allow open class.

SM: For once France and EHPU agree – pointed out that EHPU wording suggests that we need only find a ‘satisfactory solution’ – which may or may not be EN-certified. Regarding the Cat 2 recommendation, the French proposal suggests changing S7B wording such that Cat 2s should be based on Cat 1 rules as far as ‘appropriate’ instead of ‘possible’.

GD: We should be clear between ‘open class’ and ‘comp class’. we do not want to go back to the old ‘open class’ – but now we need a new definition of ‘comp class’.

IE: Slovenian authority may even ban free flying of uncertified gliders

KK: Under Czech law, responsibility is on pilot. It will be difficult to introduce a new comp class if no countries will allow them to fly. Dividing open and serial class gliders, wrong way go.

IE: Testing/checking that gliders conform, or are not taken out of certification – an issue.

GD: PWCA checked two similar gliders which won at PWC Superfinal. There were differences, and designers were surprised by this and the apparent tolerances within manufacturing; line lengths +/- 4cm. Another check could be the range of speed bar – difficult to do with 2 liners. Still working on this. Maximum difference in first and last row of lines – looking for shrinking or modifications that might affect performance (inadvertent or cheating).

CB: Checks on gliders are going to be difficult. Probably no more difficult to check certified gliders than comp class gliders. Still needs to be worked out.

SM: EHPU has agreed now to finance the EN meetings which should allow the norm to evolve faster. There could be a ‘lite’ norm that is easier to change.

KK: Serial only will not allow development of comp class

GD: World is looking for CIVL decision on gliders to be flown in competitions over x period of time.

PWCA looking at issues: Timeframe: to bring in comp class for 2013, this is an 8 month lead time. It may be too short – look at the experience at the Superfinal with just-finished gliders. How to define comp class: manufacturers, test pilots, test houses define the tests, performed by test pilots, according to procedures in front of test house – less pressure on test houses. Personal opinion of some of the TF members (comp pilots) are noticeable within the TF recommendations. We should probably look at 2 years serial class.

An indicative show of hands for lifting the (Cat 1) suspension for the 2012 season: 3 for and 14 against.

ii) Formalising Competition and Serial Classes; allowing two classes in Cat 1 events

TF3. In addition to Competition Class, formally introduce Serial Class within Section 7, with a recommendation to Category 2 organizers to consider running their events as joint competitions for Competition and Serial Class gliders (as most of them already do now). This step is crucial, especially if Competition Class is required to be EN certified for 2012 – even if Serial Class is not introduced in Category 1 events (see 5.).

CB: This can only be a discussion in principle, as we currently only have serial class, and this does not look likely to change for 2012.

IE: In principle it is a good idea.

SM: Having multiple champions can devalue the title. Multiple events or single mixed class event?

Logistics, allocation and organiser and pilot cost implications. Cannot decide now, but should look at this within the subcommittee or a dedicated working group.

DD: Could have World Championships each year by different classes.

It was agreed that the PG SC should set up a WG to discuss and identify these issues:

Volunteers: DD, SM, CB

SM to head the group and co-opt other interested parties to discuss.

The Terms of Reference created for this Working Group appears in Annex 1

TF4. Define Serial Class and Competition Class for 2012 according to Appendix A at the end of this document.

In light of developments within PMA etc, this will not be done by CIVL. We trust that the PMA has taken note of the TF recommendations and suggestions.

TF5. Introduce Serial Class in Category 1 competitions, as an alternative to Competition Class.

Bulgaria Proposal 1: Make possible organizing events (Category 2) with both classes at the same time. Make Category 1 events single class only.

Bulgaria Proposal 5b: Make Category 1 events for “Class 1” every even year and for “Class 2” – every odd year.

While there is only likely to be certified gliders in 2012 Cat 1s, the SC was not inclined to discuss the hypothetical possibility.

DD agreed that he is satisfied this issue be pursued by the Competitions Structure Working Group. Bulgaria has agreed to withdraw Proposal 1 and 5b

iii) Separating Individual and Nation World Championships

TFp22: CIVL should further consider separating World Championships into separate events to determine the World Champion (male and female) and the World Champion nation.

Switzerland Proposal: Split Individual & Nation World Championships

Proposer could not be present. Proposal adopted by GD

GD: Proposal has arisen from the cooperation discussions between PWCA and CIVL. Too much stress for top pilots to compete in Superfinal each year and a World Championships every 2 years. We need some synchronisation of the competition calendars. By splitting the events: nation and individual; we can invite all FAI members to put up a team for the nation FAI World Championships. Meanwhile, the individual FAI World Championships would take on more of the Superfinal concept and would be an FAI/PWCA joint venture. Finding additional organisers is difficult but not impossible.

BH: This is a safety proposal, and also a recommendation from the TF. It is not only about CIVL/PWCA cooperation. In current World Championships, there can be too much pressure on pilots to perform for their team.

JMB: FAI is international sports federation. While it is good to have ideas, proposals like this need to be properly analysed. FAI is finding it difficult to find good (high level) organisers, host cities etc. Have to be careful about changes that multiply the number of championships, with consequent cost issues etc. SC is strongly advised to take time to analyse it.

DP: If this proposal pulls together greater cooperation between PWC and CIVL it can only be a good thing, CIVL has been striving for this for years. Proposal does not conflict with FAI rules. Impressed with the PWC's ability to find good organisers – it would take a burden off CIVL to some extent. At present, this SC is far too big to work effectively. Work should be allocated to dedicated WGs.

DD: More competitions means less pressure on pilots and greater safety.

YO: If it is feasible, then this is a good idea. How will it work? FAI Worlds every 2 years and Superfinal every year. Which will change?

CB: This needs to be analysed in more depth by a specialist group, to be set up at the end of this meeting. Timescales need to be determined (bidding for 2015 Worlds will be in 2013).

It was agreed to add this to the task list of the Competition Structures working group.

iv) Increasing entry requirements for Cat 1 competitions

TF6. Adapt entry requirements for Category 1 competitions to require a higher level of current competition experience, at least for pilots flying Competition Class gliders: Higher minimum WPRS ranking in a shorter period (e.g. top 300 in the last 2 years) and no exceptions around this requirement.

UK Proposal:

Slovenia Proposal 1b:

SM: France likes the UK proposal. France does not want accidents at St André due to inexperienced pilots. Would like to see more qualifying events ie Gold Cat 2 events.

YO: How can pilots get into qualifying events?

CB: Qualifying events will reserve some places for pilots wanting to qualify

BR: Supports UK proposal as it would allow Asian pilots a greater opportunity to qualify.

DP: Do we need this proposal if the championships get split? Need to be inclusive of as many nations as possible.

CB: Need to do this as an interim safety measure. It can be reviewed again later if necessary.

DD: Does not see real conflict between proposals, they could be combined. Long and short term qualifying mechanisms.

YO: Why differentiate between Worlds & Europeans when it is a safety issue?

DM: Important to consider the profile of pilots in the top 300 WPRS. Should maybe use more competitions as qualifying events.

CB: Another qualifying option is to specify that the pilot qualifies if he gains 65 WPRS points in a single competition.

A small group convened to combine these proposals.

Revised proposal in Annex 2

Vote in favour of combined proposal: 16 none against

Slovenia has agreed to withdraw Proposal 1a and 1b.

v) Pilot experience form

TF9. In order to continue gathering and providing data for long term improvements, continue the requirement for Category 1 competition participants to complete the Pilot Experience form.

CB: set up for Competition class, but should it continue for 2012?

HB: Yes, it should stay, we only have a very small sample.

It was unanimously agreed it should stay for Cat 1 events.

Action: Form urgently needs some improving, in conjunction with Safety SC and TF members.

vi) Longer term monitoring/review of paraglider development:

TF12. Collaborate with PMA, PWCA and testing houses to develop class definitions for Serial and Competition class, independent of current certifications for passive safety, to become effective by 2013, at the latest by 2014. These definitions are to be reviewed on an annual basis by the defining body.

Consider whether this is a role for the Task Force, if it continues, or if a separate subgroup of experts should be set up to discuss this and associated issues.

CB: CIVL should not be setting these limitations, but should be in a position to review the output of such discussions. Are we in favour of the development of a new pg competition class?

IE: Provided it is within EN standard

GD: Need to enforce the message that CIVL is looking for a new competition class, separate from EN-D

DD: A new standard should be cheaper for manufacturers, easier to do and flexible

IE: Disagree

GD: CIVL should respond to the PMA on its idea to form a group to define/develop a competition standard.

DM: Good that the technical definition is done by the experts not the politicians/bureaucrats. Too early to decide what happens to it, who adopts it etc, but it should be done.

Show of hands in favour in principle of creating a separate competition class: 10 for. Against: 1
A draft statement is in Annex 3.

vii) Encourage more varied task setting styles and options

TF19. Educate task setters on different task options, their advantages and disadvantages, what conditions they are best used in.

TF20. Initiate test competitions where alternative task formats are used. Encourage Category 2 event organizers to include alternative task formats in their competitions.

Also consider reviewing/expanding S7b ch 2.23.2 to clarify and encourage different types of tasks in Cat 1 and Cat 2 Championships.

KK: In Czech R. been encouraged by comps committee to try out AATs rather than race to goal on every task. A scoring system developed to support it. Pilot that maximised distance in time rather than racing to a goal got as many points. Good to see it tried out in other comps.

PB: FS does not yet support AAT. Only really have race to goal and speed run. Should be referred to Software WG.

GD: All superfinal tasks were race to goal. PWC concept is 'racy'. Now using very big cylinders – need to educate the task setters to use them. Provides more opportunities, to avoid race lines etc, not solving all the race issues, but helping. Concentric cylinders round a single turnpoint, going in or out multiple times.

Open distance is tricky because it creates retrieve difficulties, perceived safety issue. But looking to explore other options - multiple start gates, needs some scoring expertise.

ST: spreadsheet of what has been tried and how it worked?

CB: highlight what issues it solved, goal at altitude

LJ: suggested video interview with someone on these ideas

GD: agreed, and for South Africa, wants to try out goal at altitude. This needs more tactics and pilot calculations, and brings back interest to goal. Conical goal cylinder has been discussed, would also help reduce the race to goal stretch.

PWCA agreed to create some educational/informative videos on task setting issues for CIVL to include on FAI youtube subsite. Similar videos will be sourced.

2) Rule changes/reviews:

See Annex 4

3) Review and discuss all other Proposals on Plenary Agenda relevant to PG SC:

Bulgaria Proposal 2: Recommendations to EN for certification improvements

RR: Explained that Bulgaria could be part of the EN process

SM: Reported that French EN delegate says there is a lack of volunteers and too much work. Yet is same person that the so-called EN-X new standard (fewer tests), funded by EHPU, it is a possibility.

Bulgaria agreed to withdraw the proposal 2

Bulgaria Proposal 5: a) Introduction of discards in Cat 1 events

GD: Discards are controversial. Handled by PWCA on regular basis. Scoring systems have to be adapted to cope with it. Can't really explain how it is done. Suggest it is too difficult to do for Cat 1s.

DM: You lose visibility through the scoreboard on who is winning. Less exciting for the media/spectators. Will only work in events where it is guaranteed there will be many tasks. Not good for comps with few tasks.

KK: Accuracy has used discards for many years, and it works very well. Drop worst score after 5 rounds. Only once in a competition. OK for team scoring too, as best scores from team are selected, irrespective of whether that score is ultimately dropped.

DM: This can be seen both positive and negative in terms of safety.

GD: Discards do give flexibility, make allowance for pilot error. But for XC will only work when all tasks are equal (as they are in Accuracy). Difficult for pilots to drop a task as they might be scored at different levels. A

pilot may end up dropping a low scoring task that was his best task. Normalisation issues to make tasks artificially the same. Dropping of 'bad' tasks – ie dropped for all pilots.

DM: The best system to use is FTV (fixed task validity), but it is complicated. Have to assess tasks 'good or bad'.

GD: Prior to FTV, put GAP parameters very low (making bad days look good).

Show of hands in support of the proposal: 1 for, 8 against.

France Proposal 1: Clarification of ruling for Cat 2s to follow Cat 1 rules

HB: Will this help avoid situations such as the implications following Piedrahita?

SM: It might.

Straw poll: 17 in favour of recommending this proposal.

Slovenia Proposal 1a: Change of team size & allocation rule for Cat 1 events

AG: Should not specify 5+1 maximum from one nation, not good for Continentals.

CB: IE to split out this aspect of the proposal in break out session tomorrow when part 1b is combined with UK proposal

Slovenia agreed to withdraw this proposal in favour of revised UK proposal

Slovenia Proposal 3: Harness & Helmet rule for Cat 1 and Cat 2 events

SM: Disagree. Cat 2s are under the jurisdiction of the NACs. Cannot be policed. Countries should be able to make their own decisions.

HJ: Disagree. There are many small manufacturers. It will penalise pilots.

CB: Although UK has adopted helmet rule for all comps, does not agree that CIVL should mandate it

HB: Can't bring in a rule that affects so many pilots immediately, would need a lead time. Could be implemented for 2013.

Straw poll 2 in favour. 10 against.

Slovenia Proposal 5: Serial class only gliders for Cat 1 and Cat 2 events

SM: Disagree: Putting this into S7 would then make it apply to Cat 2 events worldwide

Straw poll: 1 in favour. 8 against.

Poland Proposal: Introduction of an Open Distance discipline alongside Race competitions

HJ: Proposal is very detailed. There are already a number of competitions that run in this format. It is not a matter of adding events to a busy calendar.

CB: It would mean new competitions? No, already some there.

SM: But if you want World champions, means organisers, officials etc

IE: Retrieve is a nightmare. If there are incidents it could be difficult.

Andy: sees these tasks as safer, no racing. Takes advantage of conditions of the day. Adds more pilots into the comp scene. Current format of competitions has moved away from roots of XC flying. 8000 pilots but only 80 in comps.

ST: Little control of where pilots go. Saw it in Manilla in 2007.

CB: With a set task, they can get stopped if CuNb develops, in open XC pilots fly around it.

No media interest (except via live trackers) – pilots everywhere.

PK: Very popular in Asia, and safe too. Pilots making own decisions on how fast to fly. Take fewer risks. Ran these tasks in SE Asian Games.

SM: Maybe it is something that can be defined for Cat 2s? Maybe we should think about it some more?

Show of hands to add this to the WG list for further analysis and development: 12 vs 1

4) Upcoming Category 1 Championships

What needs to be done, by whom?

i) Asian Championships: any issues?

YO: Local Regs specify that gliders must have been certified before 1st December. Pilots are preparing according to these published rules.

GD: It is the decision of the organisers, but can be seen as controversial.

CB: No suggestion to make any changes to the Local Regs.

YO: Please confirm the helmet and harness list on the CIVL website will be updated.

ii) European Championships St André issues?

CB: Local Regs are in their final stages. Waiting for organisers to send back final version. The organisers will agree to follow the rules in force at the time of the event (May 2012). Entry requirements should already have been published. But entry requirements could be fixed now. Organisers had to wait 4 months for the Steward Report following the Test Event, and are now finding some delays in communications.

5) Review Bids for 2014 championships:

One bid received for Europeans from Serbia
Some questions were asked concerning the site, safety issues etc.

PG SC recommends the bid from Serbia.

One bid received for PanAmericans from Argentina
*SC chair had requested some comments from pilots and organisers who know the site. All feedback favourable.
The only hesitation is that there is very little funds in the budget to cover staff costs. It was noted that the dates for the Championships and the Test Event are missing from the bid document.
Test Event scheduled for: 3 to 9 November 2013. Championships: 1 to 10 November 2014.*

PG SC recommends this bid to the Plenary

Meeting closed: 18.30 Friday 17th February

Annex 1

Terms Of References - PG Competition Structures Working Group

Several proposals regarding competition formats and structures were presented to the 2012 Plenary.

The PG Competition Sub-committee underlined the complexity of the topic.

It wishes that these proposals be withdrawn at this time, and that a Working Group be implemented in order to:

- analyse pros and cons;
- define a long term strategy;
- make proposals to the next Plenary.

Having in mind that a Category 1 championship must be a “safe, fair and satisfying contest”, the WG will explore the following avenues:

1 / - To have Individual and Team championships in different events.

or

- To keep Individual and Team championships in the same event.

2 / - To have two separate championships for two different classes of gliders (for example, one championship for Serial and one for Competition).

or

- To have two classes of gliders in the same championship, hence two titles (for example, Serial and Competition).

or

- To keep championships open to any class of glider and give only one title.

3 / - To have a separate new championship (and ranking system) for XC Open Distance.

4 / - To call on the expertise of PWCA to help organize championships.

The WG will take into account:

- The value of a World championship title (symbolic and financial).
- The benefits and concerns for different parties (FAI, NACs, pilots, organisers, sponsors...).
- The financial consequences for these parties.
- The need to find additional competent organisers.
- How Continental and World championship alternate.
- How it fits in FAI General Section rules and emerging Sports Strategy.

They will define for the eventual new solutions realistic basic rules, cycles and deadlines.

Composition

At least 6 people including:

- 1 Chairman – Stephane Malbos (FRA)
- 1 championship organiser – Calvo Burns (GBR)
- 1 PWCA representative – Goran Dimiskovski (MKE)
- 1 high level competition pilot – Thomas Brandlehner (AUT)
- 1 “big team” NAC representative - tba
- 1 “small team” NAC representative - tba
- 1 Bureau Member - tba

Deadlines

October 2012 – Intermediate report to the Bureau.

December 2012 – Proposals to the Plenary.

Annex 2

UK Proposal for Pilot qualification in an Fai category 1 event.

This Proposal is in 2 Parts

Part 1

To change the wording in Section 7B 3.4.2 from:

3.4.2 Additional requirements

In the 3 years before the entry deadline for the competition a pilot has to have either:

- Ranked above a certain level in the WPRS for paragliding.

Or

- Flown X number of flights over Y kilometres in FAI sanctioned paragliding competition with over Z number of pilots.

The WPRS ranking level and the values of X, Y and Z will be published in the Local Regulations for each Category 1 championship. Qualification criteria for both men and women will be published by CIVL with the entry requirements 8 months before the competition, taking into account the advice of the organiser and the CIVL steward at the test competition.

To:

3.4.2 Additional requirements

3.4.2.1 For World and European championships:

In the 24 calendar months before the ranking reference date which is 3 calendar months before the championship starts.

a pilot has to have:

- **Ranked in the top 400 in the WPRS.**

Or

- **Scored a minimum of 45 WPRS points in any single FAI sanctioned event**

3.4.2.2 For Other Continental Championships:

In the 24 calendar months before the ranking reference date which is 3 calendar months before the championship starts.

a pilot has to have:

- **Ranked in the top 1500 in the WPRS.**

Or

- **Scored a minimum of 20 WPRS points in any single FAI sanctioned event**

3.4.2.3 If an organiser wishes to set stricter criteria they must be declared with the bid for the event.

Annex 3

Statement supported by PG SC that should be issued by CIVL after the Plenary:

CIVL believes that for the present (2012 season), FAI Category 1 competitions must remain restricted to EN-926 certified gliders. This view is in line with the recommendations made by other major bodies in the sport (PMA, EHPU, PWCA and Testing Houses).

CIVL recognises that the EN-D certification has come under pressure due to the unintended consequence of the temporary suspension of competition class gliders last year. Clearly, we need to find a solution to satisfy both competition and recreational pilots. CIVL welcomes the PMA initiative to set up a competition class paraglider working group and we offer whatever support is within our means.

We look forward to communicating and cooperating with the group as this important work progresses. We are sure the PMA has taken note of the recommendations of the CIVL Paragliding Competitions Safety Task Force.

By the next Plenary in 2013, CIVL expects to be in a position to consider approving a new 'competition class' glider for use in FAI Category 1 Championships from 2014. Meanwhile, for Cat 2 sanctioned events, the decision on which glider classes are allowed remains at all times with the NAC.

The CIVL Paragliding and Safety Subcommittees have both agreed that it is important to encourage competition pilots to improve their skills and experience. In line with the CIVL Task Force recommendations, CIVL is working towards developing a number of initiatives designed to improve overall safety in paragliding competitions, including pilot qualification requirements, type and setting of tasks, reserve systems and competition structure.

Annex 4: Rule changes requiring 2/3 majority vote
Paragliding Subcommittee Meeting – S7b Rule Change proposals
February 2012

3.5 Exceptions to Pilot Qualification Requirements

3.5.1 Applications

For any exceptions to pilot qualification requirements, applications must be made by the pilot's NAC, with supporting evidence of the pilot's international competition history. It is the responsibility of the NAC to ensure this is received by the CIVL Competition Co-ordinator at least 60 days before the championship

Replace:

3.5.2 Guideline for approval

Exceptions will not normally be granted for World Championships.

With:

3.5.2 Guideline for approval

Exceptions will not be granted for World or European championships

Agreed by a vote of 10 for and none against.

Existing:

2.20 External aids.

2.20.3 GPS

The use of GPS or similar positioning systems, by competitors in the air is permitted for navigation and flight recording purposes.

Replace with:

2.20.3 GPS

The use of GPS or similar positioning systems, by competitors in the air is permitted for navigation, **live tracking** and flight recording purposes.

Agreed unanimously

Existing:

5.2.3 Scoring Formula

The program and scoring formula to be used will be stated in the Local Regulations. The GAP scoring parameters will be decided at the first team leaders meeting and published in writing by the organisers prior to the start of the first task.

Replace with:

5.2.3 Scoring Formula

The program and scoring formula to be used will be stated in the Local Regulations. The nominal GAP scoring parameters will be ~~decided at the first team leaders meeting and~~ published in writing by the organisers prior to the start of the first task. **Nominal parameters should not be changed after the start of the event.**

NB: HG SC should consider adding this last point.

Vote: Agreed unanimously

Existing:

Chapter 4 – Category 2 events

4.1.4 Type of Event

Only competitions defined as International Sporting Events or Open National Championships (GS 3.1.3 & 4) and meeting the requirements below may be sanctioned as CIVL recognised 2 category events. In order that international

competitors will not be at a disadvantage compared with host nation pilots
no Category 2 competition may be run as a series with more than one rest day
between planned flying days. Multiple competitions for the same FAI Class in
the same location with overlapping dates will not be accepted as 2nd
Category events.

Replace with:

4.1.4 Type of Event

Only competitions defined as International Sporting Events or Open National Championships (GS 3.1.3 & 4) and meeting the requirements below may be sanctioned as CIVL recognised 2 category events. In order that international competitors will not be at a disadvantage compared with host nation pilots no Category 2 competition may be run as a series with more than one rest day between planned flying days. Multiple competitions for the same FAI Class in the same location with overlapping dates will not be accepted as 2nd Category events, except where the multiple competitions are different subclasses (Open, Serial, Sport) and the total number of pilots competing in all the subclasses does not exceed 150 pilots.

Vote: agreed unanimously

Existing:

12.2.1 Harnesses

All pilots in 1st Category events must fly with a harness certified to EN1651, LTF09, or LTF03. The harness must be equipped with a back protector certified to LTF09 or LTF03.

Replace with:

All pilots in 1st Category events must fly with a harness certified to EN1651, LTF09, or LTF03. The harness must be equipped with a back protector certified to LTF09 or LTF03.

From 1st May 2016, all pilots in 1st Category events must fly with a harness and back protector combination that has been tested to LTF09.

Vote: agreed unanimously

Changes inline below:

12 EQUIPMENT SAFETY STANDARDS & DOCUMENTATION

12.1 Paragliders and Associated Equipment

12.1.1 Competing gliders

12.1.1.1 Airworthiness

All gliders and associated equipment shall be of sufficient performance and standard of airworthiness to meet the demands of international championships.

12.1.1.2 Classification of Paragliders

Paragliders permitted to fly in FAI Category 1 championships must be ~~either EN926-Certified or Competition Class~~ paragliders. ~~Competition Class paragliders must have been registered on the CIVL website at least 60 days prior to the first competition day of a Category 1 championship.~~

• EN926-Certified (or *Homologated*) Paragliders: gliders that have successfully passed testing to EN926-1 and EN926-2 and been awarded the appropriate certification (EN-A, B, C or D) by an approved Test House. **Paraglider models must be certified 90 days prior to the start of the championships.** For 2012 it is 60 days prior to the start of the championships.

Agreed so far

~~• Competition Class Paragliders : gliders registered on the CIVL website, which will have a certificate demonstrating compliance. See for the test certificate and the test criteria.~~

~~• Open Class : all other uncertified gliders~~

~~• Prototypes : gliders of any of the above classes that have been modified and/or changed in configuration~~

12.1.1.3 Proof of Airworthiness

• EN926-Certified Paragliders: Demonstrated by a paraglider certification/homologation certificate from a CIVL-recognised test organization, incorporated into the glider. A certified glider that has been modified or changed in its configuration in comparison with the tested model is considered as a prototype. Pilots will be required to sign the Certified Glider Certificate provided as an Annex to the Sample Local Regulations. The organisers have the right to refuse any glider not of acceptable standard or configuration.

~~• Competition Class Paragliders: Each glider must have a serial number for identification and the following documents must be made available 60 days before the first competition day of the Category 1 championship at which it will be flown. In exceptional circumstances, this deadline may be varied, and shall be stated in the Local Regulations.~~

~~a) A test certificate (*see 12.1.7.4*) from a CIVL recognised test organisation showing the glider has passed the structural strength requirements specified in 12.1.7, plus a complete line scheme with line sample sheets, signed by the test house, must be lodged with CIVL.~~

~~b) A written report/manual specifying how and why the glider would not pass EN926 2 flight tests, must be lodged with CIVL.~~

~~e) A video (not to be made public without the manufacturer's permission) is to be produced and made available to CIVL. The reaction of the glider must be within EN D norm, but pilot input is allowed. It is recommended that the following manoeuvres be demonstrated:~~

~~– Steeply banked turn (spiral dive).~~

~~– Symmetric front collapse.~~

~~– Exiting deep stall (parachutal stall).~~

~~– Recovery from a developed full stall.~~

~~– Asymmetric collapse (not like EN D: Only 50% of the leading edge / 45°)~~

~~– Change of course after collapse.~~

~~– Quick height descent possibility in straight flight.~~

~~See 12.1.1.4 for rules on pilot eligibility to fly Competition Class paragliders.~~

~~12.1.1.4 Competition Class Paraglider Pilots~~

~~Each pilot intending to fly a Competition Class glider must prove possession of the glider by sending a photograph of his signature on the fabric next to the serial number, which must be clearly visible. Up to two gliders can be registered per pilot. Photographs must be lodged with CIVL, at least 30 days before the start of the competition. In exceptional circumstances, the organiser may give permission to allow the pilot an extension of this deadline.~~

12.1.1.4 Paraglider Pilots

Each pilot must prove possession of the glider by sending a photograph of his signature on the fabric next to the serial number, which must be clearly visible. Up to two gliders can be registered per pilot.

Photographs must be lodged with CIVL, at least 30 days before the start of the competition.

In exceptional circumstances, the organiser may give permission to allow the pilot an extension of this deadline.

12.1.1.5 Pilot Experience Declaration

All competing pilots (irrespective of their glider class) must complete the Pilot Experience Declaration form outlining their general flying experience and specific experience and skills with their current glider. The form should be submitted on-line to the organiser prior to signing it at physical registration.

Pilot Experience Declaration – to be retained, but modified as soon as possible.

12.1.2 Modifications to a glider

~~A glider shall fly throughout the championships as a single structural entity using the same standard of components used on the first day. Small changes shall be possible prior and during the competition, providing they do not cause any reduction of the structural strength of the glider and they are made in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Concessions to this rule are made to cover the case of essential repairs (see 12.1.3. Damage to a glider).~~

12.1.2 Modifications to a glider

Modifications to a glider that take the glider outside of its certification are not permitted. Concessions to this rule are made to cover the case of essential repairs (see 12.1.3. Damage to a glider).

12.1.3 Damage to a competing glider

Any major damage shall be reported to the organisers without delay and the glider may then be repaired. Any replacement parts must conform exactly to the original specifications. If permission is given by the Director to replace the glider temporarily or permanently for reasons of damage or loss or theft beyond the control of the pilot, it may be replaced by an identical make and model, or one of similar or lower performance.

12.1.4 Acceptance Equipment check

All paragliders must be made available to the organisers during the period of registration, for an acceptance check, in the configuration in which they will be flown. After the opening of the launch window on the first scheduled competition day no changes of paraglider may be made except in the case of damage (see 12.1.3.).

12.1.5 Airworthiness Checks

At any time during the championships the organisers and FAI officials have the right to inspect any competing glider and, if necessary, ground it for safety reasons. They may also apply any other penalties listed in these rules and the Local Regulations for non-compliance with class or airworthiness standards.

12.1.6 Check Procedures for Competition Class Gliders

For Competition Class gliders:

~~•Pre checks of completeness and validity of documentation delivered by the 60 and 30 day deadlines may be made by CIVL Steward and CIVL Screening Committee, in conjunction with the Organisers.~~

•At registration : Serial numbers should be checked (by the organisers) against the documentation already provided to the organisers by CIVL. ~~the test house, the pilot and/or the glider manufacturer. Line diameter check comparisons can be made against the sample line sheet.~~

•In competition : There will be checks during the competition ~~After every scored task, one out of the first 3 and one out of the first 10 of any class will be randomly checked (serial number and line diameters~~ (lengths) ~~as a~~

minimum); Where possible, checks will be made at the goal field, but on request a pilot should, with the minimum possible delay, deliver his glider to the HQ for checking.

12.1.7 Requirements for Competition Class Paragliders

This section describes the testing required to be undertaken for an uncertified (non homologated) paraglider to be entered in FAI Category 1 Championships, making it 'Competition Class'.

The structural strength of uncertified gliders will be confirmed by requiring them to pass the following 4 tests:

According to EN926-1:

- 1) Shock load test to 800kg
- 2) Sustained load test to 800kg

Plus:

- 3) Line set strength test using load calculation of the line sets of 23G with new, sewn and/or spliced lines
- 4) Individual line strength tests of all lines to 40daN minimum with new, sewn and/or spliced lines

12.1.7.1 Shock & Sustained Load Tests

Physical shock load and sustained load tests shall be undertaken for each different type or model of glider required to be entered as a 'Competition Class' glider. A medium size of each model shall be load tested using the standard procedures specified by EN 926 1. (A medium size (100kg take off weight, roughly) is the size that is most used in competitions.)

After successful shock load and sustained load tests the lines and loops of the glider have to be controlled and compared against the line scheme and the line sample sheet. After this the glider does not have to be stored.

12.1.7.2 Line Tests

The load calculation for testing the breaking strength of the line sets shall be applied to each size of the glider, at the maximum flying weight of that glider size.

The line breaking strengths for the load calculation will be based on the tests of an independent testing laboratory. The paraglider manufacturer will provide samples of the lines to the testing laboratory with the sewn and/or spliced terminations.

~~The testing laboratory shall test at least 3 samples of each type of line and will take the average load achieved from those 3 samples.~~

The load calculation shall be based on a load of 23 x the maximum flying weight of the glider. This factor is to be applied to the lower lines of the glider. At each level above, every cascade of lines the calculated total strength has to be the same (within 5%) or stronger than the level below it. If one level is weaker (max. 5%), the next level refers to the stronger one below. After calculation is done (with existing line models) it is permitted to use stronger lines in production. In this case the manufacturer has to note both line models on the line scheme: The one for the calculation and the stronger one for production.

It is permitted only to increase the strength of the lines compared to the shock and sustained load tests in order to satisfy the line load calculation.

The manufacturer will decide the load distribution between the different lines according to his own calculation. The line load calculation (23G) will be applied to all load bearing lines of the glider. This includes the stabilo, but not the brake lines. The manufacturer makes a line scheme with calculations. The individual line strength tests of all lines, including the brake lines, shall be 40daN minimum.

12.1.7.3 Documentation & Certification

The manufacturer produces 3 sets of documentations (test certificate including line scheme and line sample sheet with loops, written report and the video on a DVD, all according to 12.1.1.3) and signs his part of the test certificate. These 3 sets are for:

- 1: the test laboratory
- 2: the competition organizer / CIVL
- 3: the manufacturer himself

It is permitted to group different sizes of the same model in one document (especially the line sample sheet and the video), but the two pages of the 'test certificate' have to be filled out for every size, scanned and uploaded to the CIVL website in time.

After checking conformity, the complete documentation should be signed, stamped and dated from the test laboratory.

The test certificate must be scanned and uploaded to the CIVL website as soon the tests are finished, but latest 60 days prior to the competition. The written report can also be uploaded to the CIVL website. The test laboratory or the manufacturer can do this.

~~One complete set of documentation shall be kept at the test laboratory. The second complete set of documentation, including line sample sheets and video, should be sent, when requested by CIVL, to the appropriate CIVL/FAI official or the organiser of an upcoming competition.~~

12.1.7.4 Competition Class Structural Strength Test Certificate

Competition Class Structural Strength Test Certificate - deleted

Attendance List		
Hamish Barker	Australia	HB
Thomas Brandlehner	Austria	TB
Daniel Dimov	Bulgaria	DD
Elsa Mai	Chinese Taipei	EM
Zapata Mayer	Colombia	MZ
Kamil Konecny	Czech R	KK
Rasmus Rohlff	Denmark	RR
Scott Torkelsen	Denmark	ST
Raymond Caux	France	RC
Brian Harris	France	BH
Louise Joselyn	France	LJ
Stéphane Malbos	France	SM
Didier Mathurin	France	DM
Harry Buntz	Germany	Hbu
Klaus Tanzler	Germany	KT
Juan Gutierrez	Guatemala	JG
Alejandro Toralla	Guatemala	TA
Agust Gudmundsson	Iceland	AG
Andika Mountnear	Indonesia	AM
Aldy Patanroi	Indonesia	AP
Akira KOJIMA	Japan	AK
Yoshiki Oka	Japan	YO
Goran Dimiskovski	FYR Macedonia	GD
Basir H Ab Rahman	Malaysia	BR
Poobalan S Krishnan	Malaysia	PK
Koos De Keijzer	Netherlands	KDK
Jedrzej Jaxa-rozn	Poland	HJ
José Gonçalves	Portugal	JG
Uga Jondzic	Serbia	UJ
Zeljko Ovuka	Serbia	ZO
Igor Erzen	Slovenia	IE
Didyasarini Veerayuth	Thailand	DV
Chris Burns	UK	CB
Dennis Pagen	USA	DP
Jamie Sheldon	USA	JS
Jean-marc Badan	FAI SecGen	JMB