

**Fédération Aéronautique Internationale**



---

# **FAI Code of Ethics**

**Approved by the 96<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference 2003**

10 and 11 October 2003

Krakow, Poland

# FAI Code of Ethics

**This Code applies to all who participate in FAI,  
whether as competitors, judges, jury members,  
delegates to Commissions, elected officials,  
staff members or in any other capacity.**

## Dignity

The dignity of all individuals who participate in air sports in any capacity shall be safeguarded and maintained. There shall be no form of discrimination based on any criteria other than merit and performance. Cheating in any form, including doping, will not be tolerated. The principles of fair-play shall be applied by all competitors and officials.

## Good Behaviour

All FAI participants have a duty to uphold the good name of the FAI and the air sports community. They shall refrain from harassing or inflicting any form of physical or mental injury on other members of that community or of society as a whole.

## Integrity

All FAI participants shall act in accordance with the highest standards of integrity. When representing FAI, they shall be impartial and refrain from defending the specific interests of their own country or sport. All members of FAI staff and elected or appointed FAI officials with decision-making power shall observe the following principles regarding conflicts of interest :

- Definition  
A *possible* conflict of interests is any situation in which a person's judgments or decisions on matters affecting FAI might be influenced by relations that person has (or is on the point of having) with other persons or organizations that might be affected (positively or negatively) by his/her judgments or decisions.
- The conflict of interests becomes *real* when the person fails to reveal the potential for conflict and then expresses an opinion or makes a decision in favour of, or against, the person or organization concerned, or accepts any benefit from that person or organization.
- Conflicts of interest may arise as a result of direct personal relations, or indirectly, through the interests of a closely related third person (parent, spouse, partner, dependent etc).
- Types of Interest  
Typical circumstances in which conflicts of interest arise are involvement with suppliers, sponsors, professional advisers, event organizers and contracting parties (shareholdings, payments, hospitality, gifts or other benefits).

- Disclosures

All those to whom these rules apply must, if facing a possible conflict of interests, refrain from giving their opinions, making decisions or accepting benefits, and must make a declaration of interest. This can be made in one of two ways :

- ♦ *A public statement to a FAI body such as a Commission meeting.*
- ♦ *A written disclosure to the FAI Executive Director responsible for Ethics. The information given will be kept confidential if requested.*

- Treatment of Disclosures

The FAI Executive Board, on the advice of the responsible Board Member, will take the necessary decisions. The options may include, but are not limited to :

- ♦ *Registering the declaration without further action;*
- ♦ *Removing the person from part or all of the action or decision-making opportunities that create the potential for conflict;*
- ♦ *Eliminating the person's involvement in the external interest causing the conflict*

- Penalties

Failure to disclose potential conflicts of interest may lead to action under FAI Statute 2.8.1. and Chapter 6 of FAI By Laws (Enforcement).

- Prevention

All FAI Commissions and other legislative and executive organs of FAI should have as a standing item on their meeting agendas "Declaration of Conflicts of Interest", in order to provide a formal opportunity for people to make disclosures of potential conflicts.

## **Confidentiality**

FAI participants shall not disclose information entrusted to them in confidence.

## **Breaches of Code of Ethics**

Any breaches of this Code will be considered by the FAI Executive Board, advised by the FAI Executive Director responsible for Ethics. Action may be taken in accordance with FAI Enforcement Procedures (By Laws Chapter 6).

END

## **Annex 2**

### **Guide lines for Sub-Committees and Working Groups**

The Chairman is appointed by the President

Members: The members after consulting the Chairman join the Subcommittee / Working Group of their own wish. The chairman may restrict number of members to 7 + himself. There will be a maximum of 2 representatives per country in each SC / WG

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 paper for submission to the Plenary.

The chairman has to prepare an agenda and make a written report to the CIVL Plenary for distribution at the beginning of the meeting including Decisions and recommendations.

**Any Technical SC / WG decision and recommendation is subject to approval by the CIVL Plenary**

It is recommended to announce the results of the votes.

The Chairman will present his report to the Plenary

## **Annex 3:**

### **Amendment to the CIVL Internal Rule:**

You will find attached to the Agenda the Internal CIVL Rules with the proposed wording amendments aiming at

- 1) Addition of a clause allowing the co-optation of a Bureau member when we don't have volunteers elected during the Plenary for the Secretary and Treasurer post.
- 2) Addition of a clause allowing the President to delegate his powers to a vice President when his not available.

These amendments need a 2/3 majority vote to be passed.

In addition an amendment introducing the declaration of interests at the beginning of the Plenary is automatically introduced following a FAI General Conference decision.

## **Annex 4**

### **HG Competition Sub committee agenda:**

Chair : Dennis Pagen

A meeting chaired by Dennis will be held on Friday morning from 09.00 in the hotel Palace-Bellevue . You are kindly requested to appoint your experts directly to Dennis: e mail address:

[pagenbks@lazerlink.com](mailto:pagenbks@lazerlink.com)

### **Proposed Agenda:**

- Progress report on the future competitions:
  - o World HG Championship 2005 in Australia.
  - o Progress report on the Euro HG Championship in 2004 France
  - o Progress report on the World HG Female and Rigid in 2004 in Austria
- Approval of the local regulations for the World HG Championship in Australia taking into account the dates (January 2005) with no other opportunity for the Plenary to approve them .
- Local regulations for the 2004 Euro HG in Millau and the World female and rigid in Austria
- Limitation of Ballast in class 1, 2 and 5

It has been reported that the use of heavier and heavier ballast was becoming critical with regard to safety and fairness. The sub committee is tasked to make proposals to the plenary to limit ballast in class 1,2 and 5. Please note that a rule already exists for class 3 and could be adapted to cope with the other classes. As well in speed gliding there is a rule for ballast limitation.

- Study and recommendations on the bureau proposals for section 7 changes. The proposed section seven changes are attached : ( Section 7 & Annex 12 doc) and have to be read together with the minutes of the Bureau meeting
- CIVL Doctor proposal: Annex 10 Comments and recommendations to the Plenary
- Qualification procedures including exemption procedures: in light of the Bureau minutes:

Any applications for exemptions to the stated method of qualifying must be made by the pilots NAC, with supporting evidence of the pilot's international competition history. This should be received by the CIVL PR Co-ordinator *at least 60 days before the Championship.*

## **Annex 5 / 2004**

### **PG Competition Sub committee Agenda**

Chair : Xavier Murillo

A meeting chaired by Xavier will be held on Thursday morning from 09.00. in the hotel Palace-Bellevue.

You are kindly requested to appoint your experts directly to Xavier: e mail address:

[xm@xmurillo.com](mailto:xm@xmurillo.com)

### **Proposed Agenda**

- **Progress report on the future competitions :**
  - o Euro PG Championship 2004 in Greece
  - o World PG Championship in 2005 in Brazil
  - o First Asian championship 2004 Hadong
- **Approval of the local regulations for the Euro PG Championship**
- **Approval of the local regulations for the 1<sup>st</sup> Asian PG Championship**
- **The selection Procedure:** Comments on annex 21 and recommendations to the Plenary.
- **CIVL Doctor** annex 10 / 2004 make recommendations to the Plenary
- **Review of the restructured S 7** including the changes. Recommendations to the S7 Sub committee
- **Evaluation of bids:** Euro PG 2006 and 2<sup>nd</sup> Asian 2006. Make recommendations to the Plenary
- **Comments on the Nordic proposal** In annex 25 make recommendations to the Plenary.

## **Annex 6 /2004**

**Note:** We just have been informed that Anestis Paliatsos withdrew from his position of chairman of this sub- committee and will not attend the Plenary meeting. We will try and find a new chair and please those who wish to participate to this meeting notify Paula Bowyer at the following email address : [paula@fai.org](mailto:paula@fai.org)

### **Record, Badge and Flight verification sub committee**

Chair : Vacant

A meeting will be held on Friday morning from 09.00.in the hotel Palace-Bellevue. You are kindly requested to appoint your experts directly to Paula Howitt:  
[paula@fai.org](mailto:paula@fai.org)

The 2 chairs of the WPRS HG and PG working groups should participate namely Paula Howitt and Michael Zupanc.

### **Proposed Agenda:**

- Badges: Study and make recommendations to the Plenary on the proposal in Annex 20.
- Progress report on updating in co-operation with the FAI secretariat of the procedures for records using the GPS technology. Are Barograph still needed in that case standards and procedure for Barograph approval.
- GPS verification software acceptable for cat 1 meets: criteria and procedures
- RACE scoring program: improve the existing bugs
- Review the Bureau proposal for changes in section 7
- Proposal of Angelo and Ivan to create a new software:

I had several discussions with Ivan and he agrees to make a single program which makes:

- Tracklog validation
- Provisional scoring via SMS for security reasons
- Automatic publication of the results on the web
- Retrieval organization (not immediately available)
- Automatic World Ranking (with payment by Internet)
- Everything else needed

Ivan asks:

12000 to make it

5000 for the first year maintenance



3000 on the second year maintenance

2000 on each year then.

I will take care personally of the user interface to be sure that the program will be very easy to use, even for inexperienced people.

I only ask for a free entry fee on any competition I enter (that's is more to get an official reconnaissance of my work on scoring systems since 1978 than anything else).

In my opinion CIVL should give the program for free to anybody but any organizer would have to pay the equivalent of one entry fee to have the competition valid for the world ranking. Considering 200 competition per year at 50 Euro each it makes 10000 Euro per year (and numbers would become bigger. If you use the same system for paragliding then you'll really make money.

If the decision is taken very soon (at least an unofficial one) I could convince Ivan to start immediately and we could have the program ready for the 2004 European season.

Alternative proposal from Stefan Mast and Martin Jursa: progress report from Paula

## **Annex 7 / 2004**

### **Safety & training sub committee**

Chair : Klaus Tänzler

A meeting chaired by Klaus will be held on Thursday morning from 09.00

You are kindly requested to appoint your experts directly to Klaus: e mail address:

[klaustaenzler@talknet.de](mailto:klaustaenzler@talknet.de)

### **Proposed Agenda**

- CIVL to require coated front to rear cables on hang gliders. The reason being that we have had a number of severe injuries due to pilots hitting the wires. Also there is some concern that it is only a matter of time until a wire cuts a parachute bridle.

- CIVL Doctor ref annex 10 / 2004

- Limitation of ballast for class 1 , 2 and 5

It has been reported that the use of heavier and heavier ballast was becoming critical with regard to safety and fairness. The sub committee is tasked to make proposals to the plenary to limit ballast in class 1,2 and 5. Please note that a rule already exists for class 3 and could be adapted to cope with the other classes. As well in speed gliding there is a rule for ballast limitation.

- Nordic proposal in annex 25 comments and recommendations

## **Annex 10**

### **CIVL Doctor**

The Rescue /medical services are not always properly assured and recent accidents have shown the importance of a properly equipped and competent doctor on site.

The World Cup just adopted the possibility to impose to the organiser a world Cup Doctor in case he is not able to provide a competent qualified doctor.

The doctor has to be First aid qualified, properly equipped and his job is described in details.

If the organiser cannot fulfil this requirement the World Cup can provide a Doctor whose wages, travel, food, lodging and catering shall be supported by the organiser.

In case the organiser decline this offer and doesn't fulfil its obligation a dissuasive penalty will be charged: 3 000 Euros for a 7 days competition that should be 5 000 Euros for a 14 days competition.

#### **Doctor Job description :**

The Doctor must be first aid qualified and competent in traumatic medicine

During the registration period he should contact the rescue services to make sure that

- A properly equipped ambulance for first aid is available
- The response time of the helicopter is acceptable. The helicopter must be equipped with a winch and enough space must be available to accommodate an injured pilot laying down on a stretcher.
- There must be intensive care equipment available and special mattress for spine injuries for both ambulance and helicopter.
- The hospital where the injured pilot will be send is of sufficient standards and properly equipped to operate surgeries on heavy traumatic injuries.
- The Doctor should stand at the take off during the opening of the window with the ambulance.
- During the task the Doctor and the ambulance should follow at strategic points the course of the task being permanently in contact with the organiser by Radio and Mobile phone.
- He should be at the landing field when pilots arrive.

The proposal is to include in S7 Chapter 10 these requirements under the bullet:

Rescue/Medical services. Germany and France are already prepared to provide such a doctor for a reasonable cost.

## **Annex 12 / 2004**

### **Section 7 Sub committee**

Chair: John Aldridge

[HGMeethead@aol.com](mailto:HGMeethead@aol.com)

A working session is planned on Friday from 16.00 to 18.00 after all the other working sessions. In the hotel Palace-Bellevue.

- The aim is to finalise recommendations for amendments if any to the proposed changes in section 7: with reference to the Minutes of the Bureau meeting.

- A strategy for presentation must be established to make it well understandable to the Plenary.

The members of this sub committee are in addition to the President and a Secretary, the chairmen of the sub committees and Working groups involved: namely

Dennis  
Xavier  
Klaus  
Paula  
Zupy  
Jocelyn

**Note:** Following the Sinaïa Plenary John Aldridge has been redrafting S7 in 4 different parts that are attached to the Agenda.

The amendments in purple are the renumbering due to the new version

The amendments in red take only into account the new design of S7 and doesn't modify anything compared with the 2003 S7 version.

The amendments in blue are the new amendments proposed by the Bureau and have to be red with the minutes of the Bureau meeting.

Comments are welcome and must be sent to John

## Annex 13

### Presentation of bids

This year the CIVL Plenary will award the following championships to be hosted in 2006:

- European HG Championship
- European PG Championship
- Asian PG championship
- World Female HG and Rigid wings Championship
- Other Continental Championships if any

The formal bids will be circulated when received to the NACs and the delegates.  
The bids should include answers to the check list in S7 chapter 10 when relevant

Note that only bids with the 1000 CHF deposit paid to CIVL account will be considered.

The Candidates will make their presentation on Saturday p.m. from 14.00  
The presentation must be as short and precise as possible video are acceptable only if they show technical interest.

**The maximum presentation time is 30 minutes** including 10 minutes for presentation and 20 minutes for questions.

The Competition sub Committees will evaluate the bids and give their comments.

The votes will take place on Sunday morning. When the Championship is awarded, the organiser will have to sign the organiser agreement.

## **Annex 14 / 2004**

### **Paragliding Accuracy Landing Sub Committee**

Chair: : Louise Joselyn

<mailto:louise.joselyn@wanadoo.fr>

No Working session is planned, however a meeting took place during the year and proposed a certain number of changes in the rules to be approved by the Plenary.

Leipzig, 21.01. 2002

Dear friends,

New and/or unused possibilities for stimulation both the hobby and competitive sport and that of maximum performances are to be opened for hanggliding and paragliding. Therefore the following requests are placed against the sport committee:

1. The existing criteria for the award of the FAI Badges and/or Eagles are critically to examine. The CIVL needs new criteria, which correspond better to the technical possibilities of the air sport devices. These criteria should be worked out.
2. Conceptions are to be discussed, how the Badges and Eagles are to be popularized, so that they stimulate and popularize both the hobby sport and that of maximum performances.

**Reason:**

The FAI badges were introduced by the glider pilots and proved to be a success. It is led in the performance levels "silver", "gold" and with three individual "diamonds". The criteria were once so lucky selected that both beginners are lured into the achievement gliding, and top results were stimulated and acknowledged. The carriers of the "Gold badge with three diamonds" are in particular specified in the register of the FAI (at present over 6500 pilots). The glider of the 30's had lift/drag ratios of approximately 25, thus 500km enroute flight was a outstanding achievement. With the modern high performance gliders the borders could be expanded further. There are further incentives for top results with the diplomas created later for flights over 1000km, 1250km (etc. all 250km). Worldwide already about 400 pilots received the 1000km-Diplom. 4 flights are known over 2000km. This unmistakably positive effect with the glider pilots should be obtained also with the hangglider and paraglider pilots. Therefore after developing these new air kinds of sport appropriate badges were introduced. So far they played however practically no role. That is unfortunate and should be cause to seize appropriate measures.

There are objective and subjective factors, which are to be considered here:

- a) - Are the criteria in their gradation balanced and form an effective incentive for tackling the next performance level?
  - Is the expenditure for the documentation and requesting appropriate or too high?
- b) - Are the badges among the pilots sufficiently known?

- Is it worthwhile to improve the performance and to drive the expenditure for documentation etc.?
- Are the achievements accordingly acknowledged?

**Tab. 1 Current conditions for FAI Badges and Eagles**

	gliding				hangliding				paragliding			
	silver	gold	diamond	diplom	bronze	silver	gold	diamond	bronze	silver	gold	diamond
Gain of Height	and 1000m	and 3000m	5000m		or 500m	and 1000m			or 500m	and 1000m	and 2000m	3000m
Duration flight	and 5h	and 5h			or 1h	and 5h			or 1h	and 5h	and 5h	
Free Distance flight	and 50 km	and 300 km	500 km	1000km 1250km 1500km "	or 15km	and 50 km	and 300 km	500 km	or 15km	and 50 km	and 100 km	200 km
to goal								400km				
Out& return or triang.			300 km				and 200 km	300 km				

If one compares the valid criteria for gliders and deltas in table 1, then it is noticeable that these are nearly identical. Obviously one had in former times much too optimistically estimated the potential of development of the hanggliders. Today the technical possibilities are nearly exhausted in the building of top hanggliders. The conditions for the golden badge lie within the range of national records, diamonds even in them from world records. It cannot be task of the badges and eagles to stimulate record flights. Their task should be to produce "from down" suction. That can function only if the rungs of the "achievement ladder" lie in passable distance. Obviously the step of "silver" is too far to "gold" with the deltas and the "achievement ladder" is not accepted. With the paragliders at least the last stage is limited to the diamond comparatively far. Here the reasons of b) probably play a more crucial role. In addition the hanglider as potential outriders had failed. Reason for it were however surely the problems designated under a).

### **Suggestion on the new definition of the performance criteria**

Outgoing of it that the badges arrived so good with the glider pilots, one could compare first the efficiency of the glider with those of the deltas and bring the criteria into a similar relationship. In the index list for gliders and deltas, compiled of the German center for air and space travel (DLR, Braunschweig) the efficiency of selected types is evaluated as follows:

		handicap-factor
Nimbus 4	("super orchidee")	128
ASF H 25	("super orchidee ")	126
ASW 19	(modern standard class glider)	100



Ka 6	(wood builded, lift/drag ratio 30)	84
Blanik	(metal builded, lift/drag ratio 28)	82
Exxtaccy		56
Kingpostless hangglider		47

A 200km distance with the Exxtaccy corresponds for example to a flight of 476 km with the ASW 19. An absolute top flight of 2000km with a modern top glider of the open class is about just as "worth" according to these factors as 736km with the kingpostless hanglider. Both examples appear plausible. Therefore one should not set the route distances for the upper performance levels with the deltas any more than approximately half of the appropriate glider routes.

A further entrance for the evaluation of performance criteria is purely more pragmatic: How many top pilots exist, who are to carry the highest achievement badge? How many very good flights do they have annually? An overview of this data is given in Tab.2, which have being published in the magazine "Fly&glide" about 10 furthest flights in the XC cups by Austria, Germany and Switzerland in the years 1997-2000.

The unusual achievement of the 8 members of the French national team with a goal flight over 281km in the year 1997 is also present in the table. It is remarkable, that the average values of the 40 furthest XC flights with hanggliders lie only about 30% over the reached distances of paragliders. There exist no hanglider flight of over 300km length, but 13 over 250km. Likewise 13 paraglider pilots flew more then 200km. If one put the threshold so high, we would have straight 3-4 carriers of the "gold badge with 3 diamonds" in 4 years. That is according to our judgement too few, in order to form an effective incentive. Substantially more pilot created the 200km, and in the different columns, see in table 3.

With the hanggliders there were 62 flights over 200km, with the paragliders 13. Over 150km there were with paragliders altogether 94 flights over 4 years. Some pilots emerge several times in the statistics, it means that about 20-30 pilots represent the highest performance level. For hanggliders schould 200km be the "measure of the things", for paragliders 150km. Substantially longer flights could be honoured with diplomas, as one practices with the glider pilots. The relationship of absolute maximum performances to the free distance diamond with the gliders amounts to 2000km: 500km. With the deltas is the picture similar with 700km: 200km. The difference between free distances, aiming and closed tasks is not very significant, sees one off from the exception position of the 8\*281km of the French crew. Should an elevator diamond be thereby, how at present with the paragliders with 3000m? Such a height gain is surely very difficult in the alps to reach, so the flier tourism to southern areas would promote. We would find it however very delightful. The silver badge is with the current criteria, which are equal for all three air kinds of air sport, of course quite pretentious. In the flat country the 5 hours flight is a large hurdle. It is a question, if a further badge is meaningful under the silver badge. The existing criteria for the bronze badge are like that which is practically acquired with a pilot licence. That has the following advantage: Each pilot gets this first badge and is stimulated to improve the performance and to get the next badge.

**Tab.2 Longest XC flights of pilots from Austria, Switzerland, Germany in the years 1997-2000**

	free distance		to goal		Out& return And flat triangle		FAI-triangle	
	PG	HG	PG	HG	PG	HG	PG	HG
	215	286	8 * 281)	274	204	294	205	259
	203	282	169	272	208	229	180	249
	196	278	161	270	187	222	162	235
	191	268	148	252	182	216	160	227
	186	268	142	229	169	214	157	227
	185	256	142	221	163	213	154	226
	183	256	135	217	162	209	153	225
	178	249	134	215	159	208	151	212
	176	248	134	207	156	208	147	204
	176	244	134	203	155	206	147	202
	175	242	133	201	155	204	146	192
	174	241	129	195	155	203	145	183
	172	235	124	191	154	203	145	178
	170	232	123	189	153	201	143	174
	168	231	122	173	152	200	137	173
	167	225	119	162	152	188	136	172
	167	223	117	162	147	186	131	172
	166	220	117	156	145	185	130	172
	166	219	116	147	144	183	130	171
	165	216	116	146	143	183	130	169
	163	215	116	145	142	183	128	169
	163	214	110	143	141	170	127	166
	162	213	110	142	141	170	127	166
	159	212	110	140	140	169	127	160
	157	212	108	139	139	168	126	156
	156	208	106	138	137	163	126	155
	155	198	106	133	136	163	126	155
	154	196	105	128	132	163	123	155
	154	195	104	122	131	161	120	154
	152	195	103	121	131	160	120	150
	147	192	103	120	126	158	118	147
	144	192	103	113	126	158	116	147
	141	180	103	113	125	157	115	145
	136	175	103	108	123	156	115	145
	133	173	102	107	123	154	112	145
	131	172	94	107	123	151	110	141
	131	158	92	98	121	149	110	140
	130	156	92	92	119	148	109	140
	129	154	90	82	118	147	107	139
	125	148	87	78	118	146	105	139
Mean value	163	217	117	161	146	184	134	176
Relationship	HG/PG1,33		HG/PG1,38		HG/PG1,26		HG/PG1,31	

(without 8\*281, French National team)

**Tab. 3 Number of flights from Tab.2 with air routes longer than 200km, 150-200km, 100-150km**

	free distance		to goal		Out& return and flat triangle		FAI- triangle	
	PG	HG	PG	HG	PG	HG	PG	HG
over 200 km	2	26	8	11	2	15	1	10
150-200 km	28	13	32	7	14	21	7	20
100-150 km, more than	10	1	24	22	24	4	32	10

**Tab. 4 suggestion for the new definition of the criteria for FAI badges**

	hangliding				Glparagliding			
	Bronze	Silver	Gold	Diamond	Bronze	Silver	Gold	Diamond
Gain of Height		and 1000m	and 2000m	3000m		and 1000m	and 2000m	3000m
Duration flight		and 5h				and 5h		
Free Distance flight	15km	and 50 km	and 100 km	200 km	15km	and 50 km	and 100 km	150 km
Out& return or triang.			and 100 km	200 km			and 100 km	150 km
Diploms all 50km				250 km 300 km -				200 km 250 km -

### **To the further work with the achievement badges**

So far the Badges and Eagles played no important role in the air sport. The new definition wouldn't automatically change everything at the first time. However manageable basic conditions would be achieved. The criteria for paragliders in the suggestion according to tab.4 are only few modified in comparison with the present valid criteria. Possibly it must not be changed. The modification of the performance criteria is not so necessary with paragliders as with the hanggliders. A campaign for the revaluation of the FAI badges is however only meaningful as a joint measure with the hanggliders after their alteration. Suitable measures are to be accomplished by the national federations. The FAI should place the list of the carriers of the gold badge with three diamonds and with diplomas at its homepage. That is similar as by glider pilots. The evaluation of the documentation of the accomplished flights should take place from the national federations.

Please excuse my bad English. In my school time I had no possibility to learn this language.

Sincerely yours

Konrad Lüders

**Qualification procedure to enter a first category event in 2004**

**Bureau recommendations:**

- 1) The Bureau recommends to set up the following minimum criteria for a cat 2 event to count for the WPRS and for pilot's qualification:
  - a. 20 pilots
  - b. 2 tasks flow.
- 2) The Bureau recommends to follow S7 which reads that exemptions are not usually granted.
- 3) Selection for PG events please state a clear policy on the exemptions for Euros
- 4) Selection for the 1<sup>st</sup> Asian Championship:  
Bellow the decision made last year in Sinaïa:  
Considering that :
  - only 2 countries, Japan and Korea, will attend for sure the next continental Asian championship.
  - several upcoming countries (like Taiwan, China, India, Nepal, etc ...) have good pilots (fulfilling the selection criteria) which may not have the possibility to take part previously to a category 2 event.

Considering also that this rule is not linked with safety, to avoid to have to refuse these new enthusiastic countries, to be able to validate the championship and to keep developing flying sports in this part of the world, the paragliding working group is proposing to use the Section 7 possibility of exemption to this rule for the next Asian championship.

- 5) To evaluate exemptions for the Euro HG a group of 3 people chosen among PH, JA, FK, MZ and if needed OB is enough.
- 6) Selection committees for PG cat 1 events in 2004
  - a. European: PH, LG and the meet Director. OB will help teaching LG if needed.
  - b. Asian : PH, OB and the meet director
- 7) Selection using the new Pilot Ranking Scheme. Define a clear rule if we decided to use this new system.

## **Annex 24 / 2004**

### **Revision of the sanction fee system for Cat 1 events.**

The current cat 1 events sanction fees were originally decided for events run over 14 competition days and including more than 100 pilots.

With the development of new, smaller and shorter cat 1 championships, it has been felt that for these championships a new sanction fee system should be developed and it is proposed the following:

For Class 1 and Class 3 World Championships the sanction fee is 10 000 CHF

For other World Championships the sanction fee is based on 5 CHF per pilot and per competition day including the rest day if any but not including the practice days or specific days dedicated to opening or closing ceremonies with a maximum amount of 10 000 CHF

For the European Championship the sanction fee is 6 000 CHF

For other continental championships the sanction fee is based on 5 CHF per pilot and per competition day including the rest day if any but not including the practice days or specific days dedicated to opening or closing ceremonies with a maximum amount of 6 000 CHF

The 50% rebate for the first Championship organised in a specific class and category remains unchanged as well as the deposits.

## **Annex 25 / 2004**

### **Improved safety in paragliding competitions**

*Proposals for CIVL Plenary Meeting 2004*

Competition paragliding is one of the most dangerous sports in the world. Top competitors die or get seriously hurt every year. This summer both the British and the American (US) championships had fatal accidents. In the last three years Norway and Denmark have lost two of their best pilots. It is so bad that anything else than a fatal accident is considered just an incident. Broken arms, legs and backs, helicopter rescue and hospitalisation are everyday occurrences. Most of these accidents have one common cause: *The pilot lost control of his glider and spun or spiralled to the ground.*

Other sports, where performance of the equipment is directly related to safety take action to prevent these kind of disasters. In Rally driving, for example, all racing was stopped for a period following a couple of fatal accidents, in order to make safety rules. Now horsepower is restricted, and the World Rally Circus is safe, but still spectacular and fun. In Alpine skiing, restrictions have been put on the amount of sidecut that can be built into the skis, in order to prevent knee and leg injuries. Does this spoil the fun of skiing?

In paragliding it is up to the competitor how safe he wants the equipment to be. And people die east and west. CIVL has tried to increase safety by demanding pilot qualifications (the 100 km or best 2/3 rule) and by staging Cat 1 competitions in less demanding conditions (Montalegre). This is not enough. We forget that it is we, CIVL that set the rules for almost all paragliding competitions on the globe. Most competitions are Cat 2 and bound to follow Section 7. All these competitions are also our responsibility.

In practice, there are no rules for what equipment can be used in a competition. The sections in Section 7 regarding wing classification are unclear at best and not enforced at all. In practice, any pilot can compete with any wing he wants (particularly if he is from one of the top countries). At the last Worlds in Montalegre, top pilots from Switzerland were permitted to change the Official preprinted wing classification form, where they should sign to declare conformance with Section 7, into a different text that declared meeting requirements but not conforming with requirements. A matter that again clearly indicates a lack of control and a safety issue that undermines the attempts that CIVL is undertaking to improve safety issues.

In order to bring competition paragliding into a reasonably safe sport, where the success of safety is not measured by whether any given competition had fatal accidents or not, we must do something with the safety rules of the equipment. We therefore have the two following separate proposals for the Plenary Meeting 2004:

#### **1 The Serial class again**

A subcommittee (or whatever it should be called) is formed to investigate the Serial Class concept for paragliding competitions. The committee shall make a proposal for the next Plenary meeting, with at least the following content:

-Suggestion for how a Serial Class can be organised in CIVL, for all competitions, Cat 1 and 2. This could be as a separate class, with separate competitions, or in any other way. Maybe an other name than Serial would be good.

-Suggestion for how conformance with the class can be tested. This could be a speed/glide test, destructive test, measurements etc. We do understand that this can be difficult, but not impossible (very few things are).

This committee should be made up of people that believe and understand that a competition class with restrictions on equipment is necessary. The proposal should be complete enough for a plenary vote in 2005 and contain a plan for implementation.

## 2 **Regulations for competition gliders** (and harness etc?)

The Safety Committee should look at the rules for gliders as stated in Section 7 and assess if this is satisfactory. Is it ok to let it be up to the manufacturers to "test" their own gliders? How should the rules be reinforced at every competition? Do we want everyone to compete on gliders that only a handful of pilots can fly with an acceptable degree of safety in difficult conditions? The work and conclusions should be presented at the Plenary Meeting of 2005.

On behalf of the Nordic countries:

Denmark

Finland

Island

Sweden

Regards

*Tor-Erik Stranna*

Tor-Erik Stranna, CIVL delegate for Norway

Oslo, December 18, 2003.