

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	1 (21)



### WINGSUIT FLYING COMMITTEE Annual Report - ISC MEETING 2026

#### **Content:**

- *Committee members*
- *2025 Wingsuit competitions*
- *2026 Competition Rule change proposals*
- *Future competitions*

#### **Committee members 2025:**

Chair	: Mike Pennock (NED)	
Deputy Chair	: Steve Hubbard (USA)	
Members	: Michael Cooper (USA)	
	: Bert Ham (NED)	
	: Sudeep Kodavati (IND)	
	: Jack Pelpoe (GBR)	
	: <del>Jason Dodunski (AUS)</del>	=> Linda Makaela (FIN)
	: <del>Ali Asker (KUW)</del>	=> Boris Paturet (FRA)
	: <del>Scott Callantine (USA)</del>	=> Marie Clark (USA)

#### **2025 Committee Member Changes**

According to IR's 6.4, the committee is asking the Plenary to approve the proposed committee changes. The proposed new members are Linda Makaela (FIN), Boris Paturet (FRA) and Marie Clark (USA) and we have already received written approval from their respective NACs for them to join the committee.

#### **2025 Use of the approved special reserve budget**

At the 2025 Plenary in Rome, the Plenary approved our special reserve budget request with the goal to renew the Acro sequences animations. Jack Pelpoe and Steve Hubbard have been working on this project and the final result was revealed at the competition in Prostejov. All competitors were amazed about the quality of the animations. Currently Jack is working with Visa Matti from the FAI with the goal to host the animations on the FAI servers. I will proudly present the result at the Plenary in Riyadh in January 2026

#### **FAI FCE Competition – 2025**

**8-14 August 2025 – 3rd FAI European Wingsuit Flying Championships and 5th FAI World Cup of Wingsuit Flying.**  
Prostejov, Czech Republic

We have experienced a World Cup and European Championship that was well organized by Martin Dlouhy and his team in Prostejov. All key players, FAI Controller, Jury and Judges panels, worked together to the benefit of the competitors and the common goal to conclude a successful event.

For this competition it must be mentioned that the CJ originally appointed had to be changed, just a few months before the competition. The new appointed CJ, Steve Hubbard, did a very good job stepping up and into the role as late as he did. He handled all preparations well throughout the year and he handled the competition very well.

One complaint and one protest were brought forward in the Wingsuit Flying Performance Championship. The jury handled the protest according to the rules and ultimately upheld the decision made by the judge panel.

The discussions during the competitor's meeting were constructive. We have been sharing information about the ISC procedure and deadlines for changing Competition Rules the last few years which has resulted in

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	2 (21)

competitors reaching out to the Committee more and more. We also have started a Wingsuit Corner Facebook page to interact even more with the community

As the chair of the committee, I see that we are taking the right steps in the interest of the discipline. The Performance competitors are more actively involved and Acro is growing again. We achieved this by listening to the competitors wishes and input.

A big thanks goes out to the host Skydive Prostějov for hosting this competition and especially to Meet Director Martin Dlouhý, to FAI 1<sup>st</sup> time controller Tash Higman, Jury President Gilian Rayner, Vera Asquith and Randy Connell for their professional work with the protest but especially the records.


### Participation:


Performance = 37 competitors from 16 NAC's


Acro = 24 competitors from 6 NAC's


### **Proposed Changes to the Wingsuit Flying Competition Rules 2026**

**We are asking the 2026 plenary for approval of the attached rule changes. Please review these separate documents for details:**

 2026 Rule Changes - Competition Rules (WS Committee)

 2026 Rule Changes - SC5 Proposals (WS Committee)

 2026 Rule Changes - Scoring System Proposals (WS Committee)

 2026 Rule Changes - WS Large Formation Records

### **Future Competitions:**

The Wingsuit Committee is always eager to receive bids. Please send them to [isc-ws@fai.org](mailto:isc-ws@fai.org)

### **FCE 2026**

In the 2025 Plenary the bid for the 6<sup>th</sup> Wingsuit World Championship in Elsinore has been approved.

### **FCE 2027**

One bid for the Mondial World Cup, including the 6<sup>th</sup> World Cup of Wingsuit Flying, was reviewed by the WS committee. We support this bid.

### **FCEs 2028 and beyond**

The Wingsuit Committee is actively contacting Drop zones and NAC's, to host future competitions. Currently we are talking with representatives from Egypt, Belgium and the Nordic countries.

NAC delegates are kindly asked to check the possibilities in their home country and send any possible hosts to [isc-ws@fai.org](mailto:isc-ws@fai.org)

**76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA**

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	3 (21)

---

***Committee Members***

My sincere thanks go to the committee members who contribute very actively throughout the whole year. I know I can be demanding, but all Committee members contribute actively to all meetings and discussions. This consistency and participation are the backbone of the Wingsuit Committee and helps the discipline to grow and stabilize as one of the younger ISC competition disciplines.

Without disregarding the other committee members, I want to give my special thanks to Steve Hubbard for not only being the Deputy Chair, but specifically for all the work he is doing for the competition rules. I also want to thank Michael Cooper for all the work and effort he puts in the cleaning and checking of all records and helping Steve with the competition rules.

Last, but not least, I want to thank the other committee chairs for a wonderful year of working together and synchronizing as much as possible of the competition rules. Especially Ronald for his incredible work with R&R and synchronising all competition rules. I also want to give a special thanks to our President Alberto Martin Paracuellos for his interest in our Discipline by attending all meetings and helping us this year with giving us support and guidance to finalize the budget documents for our Special Reserve project together with Tash Higman.

Kind Regards

Mike Pennock

Chair of the Wingsuit Committee

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	4 (21)

## **2026 Rule Changes - SC5 Proposals (WS Committee)**

The ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee is proposing that the following items be added or modified in the wingsuit-specific sections of ISC's SC5.

**1. Separate each discipline's performance records into separate documents, similar to the Wingsuit Large Formation Performance Records document.**

This has multiple benefits – it cleans up the records section of SC5, which would only list the records that are achievable, not all of the specifics of how they are achieved, and it would give each discipline the flexibility to make changes to their performance records without necessarily involving the R&R committee (unless it involved adding or removing performance records, etc) The Wingsuit Committee has been enjoying this benefit for a number of years and it seems to be working very well – we feel other disciplines may appreciate the same treatment.

**2. Correctly list the WS Large Formation record types**

3.3.6.1 - ~~Largest Formation WS No Grip~~ Large Formation – No Grip (Horizontal)

The record performance is the number of persons (minimum of 16) in close formation, without grips that is performed and evaluated in accordance with the current WS Largest Formation Performance Record Rules. The formation must be in a horizontal orientation, to the satisfaction of the judges.

3.3.6.2 - Large Formation – No Grip (Vertical)

The record performance is the number of persons (minimum of 16) in close formation, without grips that is performed and evaluated in accordance with the current WS Largest Formation Performance Record Rules. The formation must be in a vertical orientation, to the satisfaction of the judges.

3.3.6.3 - Sequential Large Formation – No Grip

The record performance is the number of persons (minimum of 16) in close formation to complete a sequence of two or more wingsuit formations, without grips, that is performed and evaluated in accordance with the current WS Largest Formation Performance Record Rules, giving a separate record performance for each number of formations completed.

The wingsuit large formation record types were never updated following the creation of orientation-specific (horizontal vs vertical) and sequential record formation record types. This change correctly lists the records that are available to be achieved.

**3. Multiple updates to the Wingsuit Large Formation Performance Records (separate document describing specific rules for WS Large Formation records)**

- Include Videographers when recognizing record participants
- Require record organizers to specify the viewpoint of the written plan and formation orientation of the formation(s)
- Specify that Sequential Large Formation – No Grip records may include both horizontal and vertical formations, not just one or the other.
- Update what constitutes a “different formation” when doing Sequential Large Formation – No Grip records
- Update the process by which Sequential Large Formation – No Grip are judged
- Update the grid which is used when judging Wingsuit Large Formation Records, to support the updated requirements.

The inclusion of videographers was supposed to have been added last year, similar to the CF large formation record update, but it seemed to have been missed. We would like to see videographers recognized for their participation in records, however, we will not be including recognition for alternates – we feel as though in order to be recognized for achieving a record, you must be actually in the record formations.

**76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA**

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	5 (21)

For the remainder of the updates, over the course of the past year, since the creation of vertical and sequential large formation records, there have been several situations which have not been clearly defined in the rules – these updates are meant to better clarify to organizers attempting records and the judges working to confirm that records are successfully achieved.

**4. Adjust Section 5 wording for number of Wingsuit judges. With or without Acro.**

SC5 4.6.1.2:

Discipline / event	Number of Judges	Maximum Entrants (ME)	More Entrants than ME
WS performance+ acrobatic	Total 7: 4 panel judges <del>(including performance-EJ)</del> , 2 EJs (Performance EJ serves as 5th panel judge), 1 CJ	For <del>30</del> 35 ME  ME = performance competitors + acrobatic teams	<del>performance event only:</del> 1 extra panel judge <del>31</del> 36 to 50 55 entrants 2 extra panel judges <del>51 to 70</del> if ME > 55 <del>entrants, etc.</del>
WS performance	Total 4: 3 panel judges for standard competition, 1 CJ	For 20 ME	1 extra panel judge 21 to 40 entrants 2 extra panel judges 41 to 60 entrants, etc.

This table was created at a time when participation in the WS Acrobatic event was barely reaching minimums, it was thought, at that time, that there may be FCEs that are only the WS Performance event.

We are happy to say that this is no longer the case. Participation in the Acrobatic event is at an all-time high, and interest in it seems higher than ever.

We are proposing cleaning up this table to remove the WS Performance only competition line and then instead of basing the number of judges on the performance event only, to include all competitors registered for the FCE. We have specified that each Acrobatic team is counted as 1, and all entrant numbers have been increased by 5.

**5. In SC5, 3.3.6.4, the references to the error range should be removed.****3.3.6.2 - ~~(2)~~ WS Time of Fall Record individual**

The record performance is the time of fall, measured in seconds, rounded to the nearest tenth (0.1) of a second, while wearing a wingsuit, from exit altitude to the altitude at which the fall is terminated as measured by the required equipment as per paragraph 3.3.6.5 below.

**3.3.6.3 - WS Distance of Flight Record individual**

The record performance is the straight-line distance of flight, measured in metres, rounded to the nearest whole number, while wearing a wingsuit, from exit altitude to the altitude at which the fall is terminated as measured by the required equipment as per paragraph 3.3.6.5 below.

3.3.6.4 - A new wingsuit time of fall/distance of flight record is set only if ~~the lower limit of the error range of the record performance is greater than the upper limit of the current record error range~~ the new record performance exceeds the current record performance by at least 2%.

**6. Add PLD accuracy requirements for WS time of fall/distance of flight records**

3.3.6.5 - The wingsuit time of fall/distance of flight record is to be determined using an appropriate flight recorder, calibrated barograph or other reliable and appropriate method.

The performance shall be determined with an overall margin of error of +/- 1%. No record shall be established if the overall margin of error is determined to be greater than +/- 1%.

We've removed the language that says the lower limit of the error range for the new record must exceed the upper limit of the error range for the old record. The main reason for this is that the error range for records is

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	6 (21)

not published on the FAI website, so it would be difficult for judges to check this condition. Instead, we favour a two-step approach:

1. When the record is submitted, the judge must check that the accuracy is better than 1%. For WS records, this is easily achieved - for example, on a distance record of 30 km, this implies an accuracy of better than 300 m in the measurement, where our typical accuracy is better than 10 m.
2. When the record is submitted, the judge must also check that the new record exceeds the current one by at least 2%.

Conceptually, this separates the measurement system requirement (better than 1% accuracy) from the judging requirement (2% difference compared to the old record), which simplifies judging and eliminates the need for an extra measurement associated with each record on the FAI website.

Roughly speaking, if each record has accuracy better than 1% and the two records are separated by 2%, the probability that the rank of the two records is correct (i.e., the record with the higher value is actually the better performance) is about 95%, which lines up pretty well with our intuitive notion of "margin of error".

### 7. Housekeeping:

SC5, 3.2.12 (2) Female Category – best performance achieved **by** a woman or a women's team

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	7 (21)

### **2026 Rule Changes - Scoring System Proposals (WS Committee)**

The ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee is proposing that the following items be added to the list of requirements for any scoring system which will be used to judge a WS competition.

1. Require approved scoring systems to print complete scoreboards for all events and classifications. These scoreboards are to be used by the Chief Judge when posting both physical and digital updates following completion of tasks and rounds.

*At the last FCE, the Skyderby scoring system did not have a scoreboard output, which required significant work by the Chief Judge in order to post the scores.*

2. Require approved scoring systems to automatically interface between the scoring system and the FAI results website instead of any manual downloading and uploading.

*At the last FCE, the Skyderby scoring system did not automate the updating of the scores from the official scoring system to the FAI results website. This required a relatively high level of technological expertise that is far outside the scope of the Chief Judge.*

3. All computers used by any scoring system (including server and client machines) must be set to the English language.

*This situation is not specific to the WS scoring system, so this likely needs to be made a requirement for any scoring system being used for any discipline.*

*We have experienced a conflict for several years when arriving on site, preparing to begin our judge seminar day, only to find that the computers being used to run InTime have been set to a non-English language. This has caused some sort of conflict within InTime, which takes quite some time to resolve, causing the judge panel to lose valuable time. Standardizing the language to English would ensure that this does not continue to occur*

4. Require approved scoring systems being used for the Wingsuit Flying Performance event to make competition .csv files available for download, similar to FS videos being made available after being judged.

*Competitors have asked for this feature for several years, and some scoring systems have made them available – we would like to make this a requirement for all WS Performance scoring systems. There should be no fear of competitors filing complaints or protests if given access to this data, since you cannot protest a judge's evaluation, and the data would not be made available until the completion of a task (already specified by the WS CRs).*

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	8 (21)

## **2026 Rule Changes - WS Large Formation Records**

### **1 RULES & PROCEDURES**

#### **1.1 General Rules & Definitions**

1.1.1 All declared participants must be wearing wingsuits, as defined in SC5, 1.1.2 (16).

1.1.2 For all WS Large Formation records, the record shall be held by the Large Formation Team, which consists of:

1.1.2.1 The declared participants, and

1.1.2.2 A maximum of two (2) declared videographers.

1.1.3 All members of the Large Formation Team must be a holder of a FAI Sporting Licence valid at the time of the record performance, each of which need not be issued by the same NAC.

1.1.4 "Record Formation" is defined in 2.1.1, 2.2.1 and 2.3.1.

1.1.5 A written plan describing the Record Formation(s) to be attempted and the Largest Formation Team involved must be submitted in advance to the Judges. The Record Formation(s) must be completed as described with all declared participants in the Record Formation(s) but need not be slot-name specific.

1.1.5.1 This written plan must specify the viewpoint used for any diagram(s) of the Record Formation(s)

1.1.5.2 This written plan must specify whether each Record Formation is horizontal or vertical.

1.1.6 One (1) continuous video of the jump without break or interruption that shows continuity of the performance must be provided to the Judges following a record attempt. This video must be included in the record dossier.

1.1.7 A photograph of each Record Formation must be provided to the Judges following a record attempt. All wingsuit flyers must be clearly visible and in a formation which matches the written plan submitted to the Judges. These photographs must be included in the record dossier.

1.1.8 Record Formation(s) are judged using a standard grid downloadable from the FAI Website.

1.1.9 Each individual grid space is a square defined by four (4) interior 90° angles.

1.1.10 Using suitable software, the grid (in a graphic file) will be overlaid over a digital photograph of the Record Formation(s) to evaluate the record performance.

1.1.11 The grid may be sized and rotated to best fit the Record Formation(s) while maintaining a constant aspect ratio.

1.1.12 For Record Formations of 40 and smaller, all ~~persons~~ declared participants (their body, equipment and wingsuit) must be within their designated flying space in the grid. No part of their body, equipment or wingsuit may be visible outside the lines of their designated space; however, touching a line is allowed.

1.1.13 For Record Formations larger than 40, no more than 10% of ~~persons~~ declared participants (rounded to the nearest whole number) may have a part of their body, equipment or wingsuit visible across the grid line of their designated flying space.

### **2 RECORD TYPES & DEFINITIONS**

#### **2.1 Large Formation – No Grip (Horizontal)**

2.1.1 The record performance is the number of persons (minimum of 16) in close formation, without grips, which is the Record Formation.

2.1.2 The Record Formation must be in a horizontal orientation, to the satisfaction of the judges.

#### **2.2 Large Formation – No Grip (Vertical)**

2.2.1 The record performance is the number of persons (minimum of 16) in close formation, without grips, which is the Record Formation.

2.2.2 The Record Formation must be in a vertical orientation, to the satisfaction of the judges.

#### **2.3 Sequential Large Formation – No Grip**



**76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA**

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	9 (21)

- 
- 2.3.1 The record performance is the number of persons (minimum of 16) in close formation, to complete a sequence of two or more wingsuit formations, without grips, which are the Record Formations, giving a separate record performance for each number of formations completed.
- 2.3.2 [The written plan may include both horizontal and vertical formations.](#) Each Record Formation must match the orientation provided in the written plan, to the satisfaction of the Judges.
- 2.3.3 After the group has completed three different Record Formations, the group may elect to return to the first formation and repeat the sequence.
- 2.3.4 In consecutive formations, at least 75% of the persons must move to a new ~~designated~~ [numbered](#) flying space in the grid.
- 2.3.4.1 [For each formation, the Judge will determine each flyer's numbered flying space using the numbered grid.](#)
- 2.3.4.2 [In consecutive formations, the judge will rotate and translate the grid to achieve a maximum number of unchanged numbered flying spaces going from one formation to the next.](#)
- 2.3.4.3 [Consecutive formations are considered different if the judge cannot achieve more than 25% unchanged numbered flying spaces.](#)

We will be updating the downloadable grid as well as the instructional video/document that judges should be using.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	10 (21)

### **2026 Rule Changes - Competition Rules (WS Committee)**

#### **Proposal #1**

- Remove the requirement to judge training jumps
- Maintain the 2 jumps currently included in registration
- Allow teams to submit jumps prior to the competition, to be judged on the seminar day

7.3.1 - One day will be set aside prior to the start of the competition for each Acrobatic team and each Performance competitor to have the opportunity to make two (2) training jumps, ~~which will be scored by the judges.~~

7.3.1.1 - The aircraft ~~and the judging and scoring systems~~ to be used in the competition will be used for these training jumps.

7.3.1.2 - Acrobatic teams may submit one (1) video and associated PLD file prior to the judges' seminar day, which will be judged during the seminar day.

7.3.1.3 - The Chief Judge must indicate the method for submission of videos and PLD files in Bulletin #2. Judged scores for these videos will be made available to teams prior to the official practice day.

~~If no training jumps are possible due to weather, teams may deliver up to two (2) previously recorded training jumps for scoring.~~

For many years, there has been conflict between competitors/teams wanting to perform their official training jumps and the judge panel not having the time to devote to the training jumps. Due to the nature of our discipline, training jumps have historically required the entire panel to stop everything they are doing to get the competition site prepared to facilitate these training jumps. For performance training jumps, it has meant acquiring the competitors' helmets, attaching PLDs to them, and once the PLDs are on the helmets, the helmets must stay in the custody of the judge panel, so we would have to escort the competitors to the boarding area, wait for them to land, get the helmets back, and then actually score the device. We were doing this up to 2 times per competitor, and it never seemed to be coordinated to a point where it wouldn't completely derail the judge's preparation. For the acrobatic teams, much of the same would apply, but the actual judging of the jumps takes significantly longer, and again, 2 times per team, whenever the teams felt like they wanted to do their jumps.

We discussed this with both the Acrobatic and Performance competitors at the last World Cup. The Performance competitors agreed that there was no real benefit to judging the training jumps that they were doing, but they did not want to lose those jumps, as area familiarization is important prior to the start of the competition. The Acrobatic competitors felt mostly the same, however, they wanted to leave a way for them to be judged if there was something in their jumps that they wanted to see how the judge panel would judge, so we're adding the ability to submit jumps prior to the competition that the judge panel will judge during its seminar day.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	11 (21)

### **Proposal #2**

- Remove all existing rules regarding video requirements – already covered by SC5

This should have been done when R&R consolidated all of the camera/video requirements into SC5.

In order to accomplish, the following needs to happen:

- ~~6.8 – Air to air video recording~~

Entire section is removed, except for 6.8.8

- 6.8.8 gets moved to 7.2.2

The videographer shall provide the video evidence required to judge each jump and to show the team's performance to relevant third parties. It is the responsibility of the videographer to show the exit of the Performers so that the start of working time may be clearly determined. If, in the opinion of the Panel of judges, the start of working time may not be clearly determined on the video, a penalty of 10% shall be deducted from the team's total score for that jump as determined in 7.2.8.2. or 7.2.8.3.

- The current 7.2.2 (becomes 7.2.3 following the above move) needs to be updated:

The evaluation of each ~~sequence competition jump~~ will take place during the full working time but may cease before the end of working time if the team abandons the ~~performance. requirements for the required routine. Teams may continue scoring by continually repeating the sequences in the required order.~~

### **Proposal #3**

- Allow the judging staff to utilize a secondary PLD

5.8.5 - If at any time after the start of the competition the Chief Judge finds the mounting position of the PLD unsatisfactory, the Chief Judge may require the PLD to be remounted or that the competitor must wear a second PLD mounted on their helmet, body or equipment to the satisfaction of the Chief Judge. This decision shall not be grounds for a protest.

Historically, there has often been times where there have been struggles with the technology aspect of the competition and the use of a 2<sup>nd</sup> PLD has helped resolve those struggles – this rule just permits the Chief Judge to do so.

### **Proposal #4**

- Add helmet custody rule

5.8.4.1 - Once the device has been attached, the helmet shall remain under the custody of the judges throughout the competition.

It is well known and has always been the case that once a competition PLD has been affixed to the competitors' equipment, that equipment must remain in the custody of the judging staff to maintain the integrity of the PLD data, however, there has never been a competition rule that mandates that.

### **Proposal #5**

- Add "helper" rule, permitting non-FAI judges to perform some judge duties while under the instruction and supervision of the CJ.

4.1.1 - The Meet Director or Chief Judge may delegate administrative duties and authority to others but may not relieve himself or herself of the responsibility of conducting the meet according to all applicable competition rules.

At nearly every competition, there are "helpers" on site, available to assist the judge panel with the things that they may need help with, be it issuing helmets, collecting helmets after jumps, etc, however, there has never been a rule that formally permits the CJ to delegate these responsibilities.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	12 (21)

### **Proposal #6**

- Add Technical Scoring Director and Flight Director lists of responsibilities

~~Technical Scoring Director (TSD): Appointed by the ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee and approved by the organizer for that position. The Technical Scoring Director is responsible for the planning, setup and maintenance of the scoring system before and during a World Championship/FCE. The Technical Scoring Director may not be a Competitor, Principal Judge, Event Judge, Chief Judge, or Meet Director in the WS Performance or WS Acrobatic events.~~

~~A Flight Director must be placed aboard an aircraft larger than eight places to assist competitors with identification of ground reference points and landmarks. Under no circumstances will such a Flight Director direct a competitor to exit. That decision is solely the responsibility of the competitor.~~

~~7.1.1.1 – The Technical Scoring Director may assist with the importing of performance data.~~

4.1.2 - The Technical Scoring Director (TSD) is appointed by the ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee and approved by the organizer for that position. The Technical Scoring Director may not be a Competitor, Principal Judge, Event Judge, Chief Judge, or Meet Director in the WS Performance or WS Acrobatic events.

4.1.2.1 - The Technical Scoring Director responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- The planning, setup and maintenance of the scoring system
- Assist with the importing of PLD data
- Assist with the required archiving of the competition for the ISC Judge Video Librarian

4.1.3 - A Flight Director must be placed aboard ~~an~~ all aircraft used for the Wingsuit Flying Performance event ~~larger than eight places to assist competitors with identification of ground reference points and landmarks. Under no circumstances will such a Flight Director direct a competitor to exit. That decision is solely the responsibility of the competitor.~~ The Flight Director is appointed by the organizer and approved by the Meet Director.

4.1.3.1 - The Flight Director responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- Assist competitors with identification of ground reference points
- Operation of exit separation timers
- Confirm competitors' adherence to exit spacing requirements
- Ensure competitor safety both in and while exiting the aircraft

4.1.3.2 - Under no circumstances will such a Flight Director direct a competitor to exit. That decision is solely the responsibility of the competitor.

The Technical Scoring Director and Flight Director roles have long been a part of these competition rules, however, their roles have never been adequately defined, leaving each Chief Judge and/or Meet Director left to figure out how they're supposed to be used and what they are and are not permitted to do. This change should resolve that.

While we were implementing this change, we found that there was no process by which the Technical Scoring Director is selected or approved, so that has been included in this change. Additionally, the previous rules only required a Flight Director to be on board an aircraft that is larger than 8 places. After discussion, it was decided that the Flight Director's responsibilities still exist, regardless of how many competitors are on board a competition aircraft, and with the addition of operating the exit timer(s), it's even more important that a Flight Director be on board all competition aircraft, regardless of how many competitors are on board, so that change has also been included.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	13 (21)

### **Proposal #7**

- Clarify 4.2.1.1 to specify that all competitors must be released from one event prior to starting the next event.
- Revise CR 4.2.x to differentiate between switching from performance to acrobatic vs acrobatic to performance.

4.2.1.1 - All competitors must be released from one event before ~~they~~ any competitor can be put on standby for the other event. This rule does not apply to rejudges.

4.2.1.2 - The minimum time between the release from one event and first call for the other event shall be ~~60 minutes~~ as follows. This rule does not apply to rejudges.

- If changing from Performance to Acrobatic, 30 minutes
- If changing from Acrobatic to Performance, 60 minutes

These changes are being added to clarify what was intended by the “events cannot be run concurrently” change that was added several years ago. There were several ways to interpret what was meant by “competitors must be released”, so this clarifies that ALL competitors must be released, not just competitors competing in one or the other event. This time is also meant to allow the judge panel to complete its duties before switching to the 2<sup>nd</sup> event.

It was also determined that it takes the competitors and judges far less time to go from Performance to Acrobatic vs Acrobatic to Performance, so a modification to the time is being added to reflect this.

### **Proposal #8**

- Revise equipment inspection for acrobatic competitors.

Move 3.2.1.1 through 3.2.3.1 to 5.8 - Performance Event Equipment

3.2.1.1 through 3.2.3.1 are the rules that were added to govern the requirements for wingsuits and what modifications may or may not be permitted for use in a competition. These rules were meant to be applied to the wingsuits being used in the Performance competition and was never intended to be applied to Acrobatic competition wingsuits. Moving them from 3.2 to 5.8 correctly applies them to the Performance event. Judging staff still need to ensure that the ISC’s definition of a wingsuit is being adhered to, but it is intentionally vague on how exactly to do that, permitting the judge panel to confirm this in the easiest way possible.

### **Proposal #9**

- Update definition of infringement to include breaking grips during compulsories that require grips to be maintained through maneuvers
- Update language of Scary Roll to reflect change

#### **Infringement**

1. A Manoeuvre not clearly presented, or
2. An incorrect Manoeuvre performed within working time, or
3. A Sequence performed in a different order than drawn, or
4. A required element of a Sequence is not correctly performed

#### **Sequence O: Scary Roll**

- If the grip is not maintained, ~~no point will be added to the number of grips~~ an infringement will be assessed and performers may omit the following manoeuvre.

With the Scary Roll being a new compulsory and with it having a new requirement of holding a grip through a transition, the way the rules are currently written make it very complicated for judge panels to correctly assess scores when grips are not maintained. Updating the definition of an infringement and adding the application of an infringement to the definition of the compulsory will resolve this.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	14 (21)

### **Proposal #10**

- Clarify Scary Roll grips prior to transition

In Addendum B - B-1 Scoring Grips, add the following:

- For the Scary Roll sequence, the grip prior to the transition to inverted flight must be determined to be a scoring grip prior to the transition to inverted flight. Evidence provided after the initiation of the transition cannot be used to establish the grip as a scoring grip.
- ~~Compulsory Rounds have to be made in the correct sequence.~~
- ~~A Compulsory manoeuvre omitted in the sequence will result in one point being subtracted from the total number of grips for that round. This result may not be less than zero.~~

The judge panel at the last FCE had some confusion on how to judge a situation that occurred with multiple teams – the teams would take the grip prior to the transition to inverted flight, however, that grip was not visible, most of the time obstructed by the competitors' wingsuits, until after the transition to inverted flight was initiated. This same situation regularly occurs during other compulsories and it is not scored as a scoring grip, so we feel that this specific grip should be treated the same. We feel that if a grip is not determined to be a scoring grip at the time of the grip, then it cannot be counted, regardless of evidence that is provided later. This guidance to the judge panel should resolve this confusion.

### **Proposal #11**

- Ensure that MD has authority to adjust exit order.

6.4.4 - The ~~starting exit order of the first round of jumping shall be in reverse order of the standings at the most recent FCE. Teams that did not participate in the most recent FCE will jump at the beginning of the round with the order determined by random draw made of each competition round shall be determined~~ by the Meet Director.

There have been multiples times over the last several FCEs where the teams in the Acrobatic competition have requested to exit in a different order, due to specific demands of their respective routines. This has routinely been permitted by the Meet Director, however, at the last FCE, it was discovered that there was no actual rule permitting this. There is no inherent benefit to reverse order of standings, like there is in the performance competition, so we feel as though allowing the Meet Director to set the exit order for all rounds is the easiest way to resolve this. If he would like the Chief Judge or someone else to do so, or for the teams on each competition pass to sort it out themselves, he has the ability to delegate that responsibility.

### **Proposal #12**

- Update the definition of Grip
- Update the definition of Scoring Grip

#### **Grips**

- 1) A hand grip consists of ~~a controlled stationary~~ contact with the front or back of the hand. The contact must be on or below the wrist.
- 2) A foot grip consists of ~~a controlled stationary~~ contact with the front or back of the hand on the foot, below the ankle bone.
- 3) A grip on the surface of any wingsuit without also achieving ~~a controlled stationary~~ contact with the front or back of the hand on a specified part of the body as defined in 1) and 2) above is specifically excluded from the definition of a grip.

**Scoring Grip:** A ~~controlled stationary~~ grip which is correctly completed and clearly presented and which, apart from the first grip after exit, must be preceded by a correctly completed and clearly presented Manoeuvre.

It was discovered that if the definition of a grip requires that grip to be controlled and stationary, then a grip that is not considered to be controlled and stationary cannot be considered to be a grip at all, rather than not

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	15 (21)

being considered a scoring grip. This update correctly moves the controlled stationary requirement to the application of a scoring grip.

### **Proposal #13**

- Small style mistakes should cap out at 9.9 instead of 9.0 and bottom out at 0.1 instead of 1.0.

Judging Style:

~~9~~-10 points - Routine is performed flawlessly with no noticeable mistakes.

6-9.~~9~~ points - Routine is performed with small mistake(s).

3-7 points - Routine is performed with medium mistake(s).

~~0~~.1-4 points - Routine is performed with large mistake(s).

0-~~1~~ points - Routine is not performed or not identifiable.

Judging Camera Quality:

~~6~~-7 points - Camerawork is performed flawlessly with no noticeable mistakes.

4-6.~~9~~ points - Camerawork is performed with small mistake(s).

2-5 points - Camerawork is performed with medium mistake(s).

~~0~~.1-3 points - Camerawork is performed with large mistake(s).

0-~~1~~ points - Camerawork shows no Performer manoeuvres.

With the rules as they are currently, the only way to award anything above a 9.0 for style or 6.0 for camera quality is for each to be performed flawlessly, which should be awarded a maximum score of 10.0 and 7.0 respectively. The same applies to the bottom end, if a routine is not performed or camera work shows no performer manoeuvres. This change opens the small mistakes bracket to allow scoring above a 9.0 and the large mistake bracket to allow the scoring of below 1.0.

### **Proposal #14**

- Revise 6.1.1 to include equal free vs compulsory

6.1.1 - ~~The objective is for a team to perform a sequence of manoeuvres.~~ The objective is for a team of two performers and a videographer to execute sequences of aerial maneuvers—both compulsory and free—within a defined altitude window, showcasing precision, control, and teamwork through coordinated rotations, transitions, and grips.

This update better reflects the objective of the Acrobatic event, including both compulsory and free routines.

### **Proposal #15**

- Update Event Description to add minimum participation in classifications and indicate when classification scores should be updated.

5.1.1 - Within the Wingsuit Flying Performance Event, separate classifications will be made for:

- Wingsuit Flying Performance Female
- Wingsuit Flying Performance Combined National Team

5.1.2 - The minimum number of participants in any classification to be valid and to award medals is four (4).

5.1.3 - The placements in the separate classifications are determined during the Wingsuit Flying Performance Event tasks, using the Wingsuit Flying Performance Event scores ~~or results~~, not through separate jumps.

5.1.4 - The ~~final scores~~ task results in the Wingsuit Flying Performance Event are carried across to the female classification as soon as all competitors in that classification have ~~completed a task~~ had their results for that task validated ~~during the Wingsuit Flying Performance Event~~.

5.1.5 - The task scores in the Wingsuit Flying Performance Event are carried across to the Combined National Team classification as soon as that task is considered valid.

There were concerns and confusion regarding how many competitors or NACs are required to formally recognize the classifications in the Performance event, as well as when and how the standings for each classification are determined. This update should provide ample guidance for both situations.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	16 (21)

### **Proposal #16**

- Clarify how scores are calculated for Performance event

5.4.2 - A task is considered valid when the Chief Judge has validated ~~the~~ all results for that task.

5.9.2 - Each valid task in each round will be scored based on the top result of the task performed in that round, as determined in 5.9.1. The top result will be scored as 100%. The other results will be scored as a percentage of the top result. The score will be rounded to one decimal place for display purposes only, with the un-rounded score being used for further calculations.

5.9.3 - ~~For each task, the~~ The scores calculated in 5.9.2 ~~for all rounds for each separate task,~~ will be averaged for each competitor to give ~~an intermediate score for~~ the task score. The ~~intermediate task~~ score will be rounded to one decimal place for display purposes only, with the un-rounded score being used for further calculations.

5.9.4 - The three ~~intermediate task~~ scores, as determined in 5.9.3, ~~for each task~~ for each competitor will be added and rounded to one decimal place to give the total score for the competitor.

5.9.7 - Individual Task Champion: ~~In each valid task, Time, Distance or Speed, the~~ The individual Time, Distance and Speed Champion of a task is the competitor with the highest aggregate task score ~~from all valid tasks~~ in that particular task.

5.9.9 - Female Overall Champion: The female competitor with the highest aggregate score from all tasks. If there is less than one valid round, there will be no Female Overall Champion.

There were some holes and confusion with the way the current rules manage the scoring of the Performance event. This update resolves that, as well as adds the definition for Female Overall Champion, which should have been included when the classification was approved and added last year.

### **Proposal #17**

- Require ground reference points in bulletin #2 to be included as images and not just coordinates.
- Require the dropzone elevation to be published in bulletin #2

**Ground Reference Point:** The ground reference points will be determined by the Chief Judge, ~~with the consent of the Meet Director.~~ The coordinates (latitude and longitude) for each ground reference point ~~and an aerial photograph of the area with each ground reference point marked~~ will be published in bulletin 2. Prior to the official arrival day, the reference points will be displayed using a detailed map or aerial photograph of the area no more than 30 days old. The map and/or photograph must be acceptable to the FAI Controller.

**DZ Elevation:** The ground level for the competition site, in meters, will be determined by the Meet Director and will be ~~published in bulletin 2 and~~ made known at the pre-event competitors' meeting.

In years past, there have been different methods used to publish the ground reference points and dropzone elevation. This change standardizes when and how the competitors receive this information.

### **Proposal #18**

- Add a penalty for failing to adhere to the Meet Director's instructions for exit separation timing.

5.5.5.1 - Failure to adhere to the exit separation time will result in the following penalty, at the discretion of the Chief Judge and Meet Director:

- 50% result penalty for the first infringement
- 100% result penalty for any subsequent infringements

For many years of this competition, it has been possible to gain a competitive advantage by waiting longer in the door before exiting, which not only allows a more downwind flight for that competitor, it potentially puts any competitors exiting later on the same pass at a disadvantage because they are not exiting where they were expecting. We attempted to resolve this by requiring the Meet Director to provide the exit separation, in seconds, prior to each jump, however, we never added a consequence for not following the Meet Director's instructions.



## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	17 (21)

### **Proposal #19**

- Add requirement for exit separation timer at/in door, controlled by flight director

5.5.10 - A timer shall be fitted adjacent to the door, clearly visible to competitors at the door. The timer must display elapsed time, in seconds.

5.5.10.1 - The Flight Director shall be responsible for operating the timer.

5.5.10.2 - The timer shall be set to zero and started immediately after the exit of each competitor.

5.5.10.3 - The timer is an aid only, and the decision to exit remains solely the responsibility of the competitor.

Failure of the timer is not grounds for rejump or protest.

This proposal provides a more reliable and consistent way for the competitors to ensure they are adhering to the Meet Director's exit separation time instructions. Timers were used at this past World Cup and they were very well received and had a very positive impact on the exits of the competition.



## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	18 (21)

### **Proposal #20**

- Create rules that govern refusing to jump and possible go-arounds

5.5.10 - Competitors may refuse to jump.

5.5.10.2 - If the Meet Director determines that the reasons for refusal are considered pertinent, the team or individual shall be granted a rejump.

5.5.10.3 - If the Meet Director determines that the reasons for refusal are not considered pertinent, the team or individual will be scored as having made the jump and assessed the maximum penalty.

5.5.11 - If a competitor or team exits the aircraft (except in an emergency), the jump becomes official and will be scored.

5.5.12 - At the discretion of the Meet Director, additional passes may be permitted in place of a refusal to jump.

5.5.12.1 - The Meet Director must brief the competitors on the details of additional passes prior to the start of competition.

5.5.12.2 - The Meet Director may change the details of additional passes at any time. This change must be communicated to all competitors prior to their next competition jump.

There has been a long-standing practice of competitors requesting go-arounds if they get to the door and are unwilling to exit, regardless of the reason. Sometimes this has been expressly permitted by the Meet Director, and sometimes, only due to precedence, because it has “always been allowed”. It has not been uncommon for competitors to potentially abuse these go-arounds, at extreme costs to the competition and the organizer.

These rules aim to put down in writing what is permitted and what happens in case of a competitor’s refusal to exit. It also requires that the Meet Director formally briefs the competitors at the competitors meeting prior to the competition on whether or not additional passes will be permitted and if they are permitted, exactly how and under what circumstances they will be permitted. It would also give the Meet Director the flexibility to modify these instructions, provided that the competitors are briefed on any changes prior to their next competition jump.

### **Proposal #21**

- Add specified dates and times for equipment inspection to the official schedule

3.2.2 – All equipment must be inspected by the judge panel to the satisfaction of the Chief Judge prior to use in the competition.

3.2.2.1 – The official schedule must include specified dates and times for equipment inspection.

3.2.2.2 – The Chief Judge shall provide instructions to competitors on the equipment inspection procedure.

3.2.2.3 – Competitors must be at the location with all equipment available for inspection, as instructed by the Chief Judge.

3.2.2.4 – Equipment that has not been inspected and approved by the judge panel may not be used on any competition jump. Violation of this rule shall result in a score of zero for the jump.

This is another small correction that ensures competitors be on-site and available to have their equipment inspected, as required by the competition rules. Currently, there is no obligation that the competitors have to be anywhere prior to the start of the competition, which theoretically could cause a competitor to miss the equipment inspection – this addition ensures that this cannot happen.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	19 (21)

### **Proposal #22**

- Creation of a panel of competitors on-site to assist judge panel with equipment inspections

Add to 2.2 – Performance Definitions:

**Competitor Advisory Panel (CAP):** A panel composed of 5 Wingsuit Flying Performance competitors that will be created prior to the start of the scheduled wingsuit inspection. This panel shall assist the judge panel in making decisions on whether equipment may be permitted for use in the competition.

#### 5.9 - Competitor Advisory Panel

5.9.1 - The Competitor Advisory Panel is composed of five (5) registered wingsuit performance competitors.

5.9.1.1 - The panel members shall be nominated by the registered wingsuit performance competitors.

5.9.1.2 - No more than one (1) panel member may be nominated from each delegation.

5.9.1.3 - The list of panel members must be submitted to the Chief Judge prior to the start of the scheduled wingsuit inspection.

5.8.4 - The judge panel shall consult with the Competitor Advisory Panel when a particular type of modification is first identified.

5.8.4.1 - If the same type of modification is encountered again, the Competitor Advisory Panel need not be consulted.

5.8.5 - The final decision to allow or disallow any equipment for use in the competition remains with the judge panel.

Over the past several years, since the equipment inspection process of the competition has gotten more and more in-depth, the competitors feel as though equipment is being permitted for use that maybe should not be. As good as our judges are, they are not experts on the latest technology regarding wingsuits or other equipment being used at competitions, nor should they be expected to be. The best resources available at any competition are the active competitors.

This idea of an advisory panel of competitors was heavily discussed at the last post-competition competitors meeting, and it is very highly supported by the competitors. They asked for more involvement in the decision making, being given a “vote” in whether equipment should be permitted or not – we ultimately felt as though that might not be truly fair, as it’s hard to ask any competitor to be unbiased when reviewing another competitor’s equipment. Creating this panel in an advisory capacity allows the judge panel to ask questions and receive information that they otherwise do not have while the judge panel retains the final decision making responsibility seems like a reasonable compromise and should go a long way to easing the minds of the competitors.

## 76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	20 (21)

### Housekeeping:

Housekeeping

1. In Addendum D:

Foot fairings, or any **other** extension to the bottom of the sole of the bootie, may extend perpendicular to the foot no more than 30 cm from the location that the foot makes contact with the inside of the bootie (E).

**Rationale:** This implies that foot fairings are an example of such an extension, as opposed to being a separate class of feature.

2. In Addendum D:

If winglets are present, the height (F) of a single winglet, **measured perpendicular to the surface of the wingtip**, above the upper surface or below the lower surface of the wingtip, whichever is greater, will be doubled and added to the suit's span measurement (B).

**Rationale:** Clarifies the existing rule, which says that the suit should be laid flat on the floor, but does not specify the direction in which this measurement should be taken.

3. In CR 2.3: (a) Remove degree requirement on barrel roll definition; (b) Remove back loop & front loop; (c) Add definition for inverted flight, mixed orientation.

**Normal Flight:** ~~The performer is in a belly-to-earth stable position.~~ A performer shall be considered to be in normal flight when they are in a belly-to-earth position.

**Inverted Flight:** A performer shall be considered to be in inverted flight when they are in a back-to-earth position.

**Mixed Orientation:** A team shall be considered to be in a mixed orientation when one performer is in normal flight and the other performer is in inverted flight.

**Rationale:** Barrel rolls are now being used in excess of 360 degrees, so we need to remove that specification from the definition. Back loops and front loops are no longer being used in the competition, so we can remove those definitions. Inverted flight and mixed orientation are both being used and neither has a definition, so those need to be added.

4. In CR 7.1.4.1:

Immediately after the data has been downloaded and ~~is determined to be sufficient to evaluate~~ **evaluated according to 7.1.2**, the calculated results (as defined in 5.9.1) shall be published.

5. In CR 7.1.1:

Each jump shall be imported into the official scoring system by a ~~Judge. This Judge must be an FAI Wingsuit Flying Judge~~ **member of the Judge Panel or the Technical Scoring Director**.

6. Addendum A, Sequence A: Formatting. "Performers are in normal flight with a hand grip." should be bulleted.

**76<sup>th</sup> FAI/ISC PLENARY MEETING, 24-25 JANUARY 2026, RIYADH, SAUDI ARABIA**

Subject:	ISC Wingsuit Flying Committee Annual Report 2026	Annex No.:	19
Author:	Mike Pennock, Wingsuit Flying Committee Chair		
Date:	11 November 2025	Page:	21 (21)

---

**2027 Competition Rule Change Proposals**

1. Consider adding an additional free round to the Acrobatic event to better balance compulsory and free rounds.
2. Revamp Acrobatic event scoring metrics, removing the normalized (%) scores.

Due to the way that the Acrobatic event is scored, there is a higher weight to the grip scores of compulsory rounds. The Acrobatic competitors have asked us to explore methods of evening the balance between compulsory and free round scores.

We intend to work on this throughout the 2026 competition year and have a proposal for the 2027 ISC Plenary Meeting.