



Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)

held virtually via ZOOM platform

From 4 to 7 March 2021 (daily between 13:00 and 15:30 UTC)

Final Ver. 6/19/2021 12:34 PM

Summary of Session 1 on 4th March 2021 (13:00 - 15:30 UTC)

1. Opening and Welcome (Eric Mozer)

The IGC President Mr. Mozer welcomed the delegates, alternate delegates, and observers to Session 1 of the 2021 IGC Plenary meeting. He then specifically welcomed FAI President Mr. David Monks and other FAI Executive Board representatives present namely Mrs. Marina Vigorito and Mr. Pankul Mathur as well as other guests including the IGC Presidents of honor and the representatives of some FAI Air Sport Commissions. Mr. Mozer regretted that the meeting cannot take place in Copenhagen as initially planned and appreciated the support from the IGC delegates given the circumstances, expressed in a high participation to the virtual meeting.

The President then called the meeting to order and requested the observation of a moment of silence in honor of friends and colleagues lost in the previous year.

1.1 Roll Call

A roll call of Delegates was undertaken by Mr. Foltin, and it was determined that 37 voting members were present (including 1 proxy).

1.2 Administrative matters

- The IGC Secretary Vladimir Foltin reminded the meeting about the guidelines to be followed during the virtual meeting that are also available on the cloud.

- The Secretary informed the meeting participants that the meeting will be recorded, which requires a prior consent from all participants. No objections or concerns were raised in this regard.

- FAI representative Visa-Matti Leinikki was appointed to oversee the counting of ballots during the meeting and explained the procedures to be used (yes/no for normal votes and electionrunner.com for secret votes).

The Secretary informed about the use of IGC cloud for dissemination of documents during the meeting and reminded all presenters to send their files in advance by email.

2. Minutes of previous meeting, Budapest 6 and 7 March 2020

Note: The item was discussed on Day 3.

The President presented the minutes of the previous meeting held in Budapest 6 and 7 March 2020 (available [here](#)) prepared by IGC Secretary Mr. Vladimir Foltin. The minutes were unanimously approved including minor editorial comments received from EGU.

3. IGC President's report

3.1 Bureau Decisions taken since the last Plenary that need the IGC Plenary approval

3.2 Discharge of Bureau responsibility for decisions since the last Plenary

4. FAI Matters

The FAI President Mr. David Monks addressed the meeting participants, introduced himself to the IGC and expressed appreciation to the new FAI Executive Board. Mr. Monks particularly welcomed that Mr. Eric Mozer had joined FAI Executive Board. While regretting the IGC is losing a high-quality person Mr. Monks is confident of the good succession within IGC and wished the best luck to the very good candidates for IGC president. Mr. Monks priorities as for FAI are return to financial stability, improve efficiency and communications. FAI secretariat is

working hard with the Commissions to achieve on those priorities. FAI is proud of and thanks to all volunteers particularly those devoting their time to work for the Commissions. This year is going to be another unkind year to air-sports and FAI will rely on IGC to manage its sport as best as it can. FAI will succeed despite the unusual times we are living. Better time will come.

4.1 FAI's report to the IGC Plenary

Mr. Visa-Matti Leinikki from FAI secretariat reported on behalf of Markus Hagganey, FAI Secretary General who was unable to attend. The outcomes of FAI General Conference 2019 called for the FAI to become leaner and more effective and the FAI secretariat to focus on the main issues of Competitions, Records and Awards and the necessary management, communication, and promotion. It also requested achieving of these priorities as rapidly as possible. The serious budget cuts (approx. 35% of fixed cost) resulted in the immediate cost cutting measures affecting staff (FTE), salaries, work-schemes and change of the modus operandi to a "survival mode" (even before pandemic). Consequently, the tasks and responsibilities had to be re-focused on core FAI activities, which resulted in amendment of the staff work profiles and the detailed cost review affecting insurance, rent and running costs. The new financial system has been implemented in 2020, which resulted in better and more tailored services and lower costs (approximately 50%). That allowed for implementation of Application Management System (AMS) with full workflow management used for invoicing and collecting of fees. Concerning the FAI website, it has been reported that the information, which was previously published in the FAI Year Book (discontinued last year) is now available on the FAI website and the FAI Commission webpages are now easier accessible through the specific menu item on the home page. Regarding the FAI's financial situation, it has been mentioned that the membership been declining for a long period of time (over 6 years) despite of the higher membership fees since 2019. One of the reasons is that many large members have switched to a lower membership class, which then resulted in a lower membership fee. The FAI budget structure has changed in 2021, now it contains overall, sectorial and commission budgets respectively. The income in in 2021 is expected to be 50% lower, so are the costs. The budgeted Commissions' projects are not seriously affected. The focus of FAI in 2021 will be:

- Overhead/office: Continuing to improve the financial system and related tools, interfaces, automated workflows, outsourced activities; Introducing the electronic handling of documents (organizer agreements); Reviewing the structure and number of bank accounts needed to run the FAI and to Cooperate with Commission Secretaries on invoices, payment approvals and related reporting.
- Services for FAI activities: Addressing the diverse schemes in place for sanction fees, performances bonds and deposits; Reviewing ASC services for organizers and the pricing structure (event directors, officials, technical expertise); Reviewing the different ways of ordering, handling and invoicing FAI Medals and Diploma; Reviewing the records handling-processes and; Identifying harmonized workflows with Commissions, and involving National Record Officers.
- Secretariat/ASC Support: Electronic or face-to-face plenary meetings: tools, cloud space, document handling, invitation processes; Handling expense claims and reducing the diversity of processes amongst Commissions; Regular financial reports and related timelines; Implications of activities handled in CHF and EUR; Guidelines for the creation and dissolution of special reserves (provisions) to meet the request of the auditor and; Paperless office.

The FAI has benefited from Swiss support scheme in 2020 during COVID-19 pandemics and as a result the secretariat staff (5 persons/ 3,2 FTE) were all working mostly part time.

5. Finance

IGC Treasurer Mr. Patrick Pauwels reported about FAI finances.

5.1 Treasurers Report and 2020 Financial Statement

Mr. Pauwels referred to the published financial report (available in the cloud) and added that:

- An in-depth audit (early 2020) of the FAI accounts of 2019 resulted in several corrections. The final figures were approved by the FAI General Conference in December 2020. The provisional IGC figures as presented during the Plenum in March 2020 were also changed.
- The audit also led to a completely new accounting system as from January 2020 with the support of a new accounting service bureau. Less complex, more transparent and better reporting possibilities.
- While 2020 is still a transition year, as from 2021 all ASC will work with a new budgeting/ reporting system.
- The IGC budget 2020 was updated due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Nearly all Cat. 1 events were postponed.
- The results for 2020 are still provisional, as the overall accounts are not yet finalized.
- Important was the procurement of the first batch of "IGC Trackers", the second batch will be delivered shortly.
- The proposed budget for 2021 is based on a normal working year, thus expecting that all planned events can take place. An update will be made as necessary.
- As FAI is based in CH, the accounting is done in CHF (with extra transfer/bank costs).
- In three years-time (2019 – 2021) will have used +50% of our special reserves.

Overview of Financial Statement by the end of 2019 (Euro):

- Revenues 32 712,99
- Expenses 57 059,09
- Result of the working year - 24 346,10
- IGC Special Reserves 116 537,07

Overview of Financial Statement by the end of 2020 (Euro):

- Revenues 17 695,40 (-45% YOY) were mostly driven by the income from the sanction fees (Women WGC in Australia), Ranking List and some GNSS flight recorders approvals.
- Expenses 45 135,53 (-21% YOY) were mostly due the cost of officials, championships, and meetings, GFAC operations, website, ranking list hosting & development, currency conversion fees and bank charges and finally by the purchase of the first batch of IGC/OGN trackers.
- Result of the working year - 27 440,13
- IGC Special Reserves 89 096,94

5.2 2021 Budget

Overview of proposed budget for 2021 (Euro):

- Revenues 39 900,00

- Expenses 66 080,00
- Result of the working year - 26 180,00
- IGC Special Reserves (by the end of 2021) 62 916,94

Mr. Mozer thanked Mr. Pauwels for the report and his work on IGC finances over the last year.

6. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

Mr. Leinikki reminded the voting procedures to be used (yes/no for normal votes). Following that Mr. Mozer initiated the practice vote so that all delegates will have a confidence in the procedure and voting. The delegates were recommended to do the voting accessible from the list of participants

6.1 Year-2 Proposals

Mr. Mozer asked Mr. Spreckley to lead the session. Mr. Spreckley then briefly referred to the consultation trial on Year-2 proposals and reminded that it related only to the Year-2 proposals affecting Annex A.

6.1.1 Elimination of glider type in declaration (IGC/SC3)

Mr. Howard Mills presented the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the SC3 Committee and asked the delegates to support the proposal.

The proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

Mr. Foltin, the IGC Secretary, in response to question from Mr. Fila (Sweden) confirmed that the number of votes remained the same as during the roll call.

6.1.2 Eliminate written declarations for badges (IGC/SC3)

Mr. Howard Mills presented the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the SC3 Committee and the reasons behind. He mentioned that the proposal was extensively discussed during the previous IGC Plenary meeting and reminded that it only affects Gold Distance performances that are not claiming Diamond Goal the same time. Mr. Mills then concluded by mentioning that the change will be applicable from the next scheduled release of the Sporting Code i.e. from October 2021 (as stated in the proposal). Following that he asked the delegates to support the proposal.

Mr. Rick Sheppe (USA) stated that the USA is opposed to the proposal for the following reasons: It does not add security, it does not remove requirement for signing a paper by official observer that identifies the pilot and the glider, the steps that cannot be done by the flight recorder. Also, the paper declarations are completely legal that can be the very useful option especially in the club environment. The proposal can make the process easier for the IGC, but not for the pilots.

Mr. Artur Rutkowski (Poland) mentioned that the proposal raises some questions related to the possibility to file declarations via Internet. As there is no common tool for this or a possibility from IGC such tools would need to be developed at the national level.

Mr. Mills, in response to Mr. Sheppe, referred to his experience at the national level. The paper declarations can contain some errors (e.g. swap between LAT and LONG). Therefore, one of the main objectives of the proposal is to remove the need for a paper declaration of coordinates. Then, in response to Mr. Rutkowski, he added that one non-representative survey a year ago among NACs revealed that many participants were generally against the Internet declarations. Then the question is if making such declarations for the silver and golden badges (other than diamonds) possible would be worth of effort.

Mr. Alexander Georgas (Greece) expressed his support to USA. IGC voted favorably for simplification of the rules in the past. The presence of official observers ensures validity of the claims and we should trust them. The proposal can make the rules simpler for some, but more difficult to others. Greece is against the proposal.

Ms. Mandy Temple (Australia) referring to her statement last year mentioned that Australia is using the Internet declarations for badge performances for quite some time without any problems. The pilots find it as a big advantage because the online declaration proves that it was done before the flight and allows for online verification of the claimed task meeting the criteria. Otherwise the claimed performance might be lost for reasons such as declaration not meeting triangle task criteria. The problems with the coordinates have not been observed. The system is very well understood especially by young pilots who found it more convenient. The paper declarations almost stopped completely. It also provides advantages and less workload for official observers. As a result, more people are interested now in doing official observer's tasks than before. Australia is firmly in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Mills added that the current sporting code allows internet declarations for silver and gold attempts.

The proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

6.1.3 Eliminating unnecessary scaling of handicaps (IGC/Annex A)

Mr. Reno Fila (Sweden) presented the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the Annex A Committee. The proposal has been initially triggered by identifying a difference between Swedish and IGC rules related to handicaps. A double scaling has been discovered in the IGC rules. Handicaps are scaling the glider performance to the Standard Cirrus and that is fine because all adjustments happen on that scale. There is however another rescaling in the rules that depends on which gliders participate in the race. The performance of one glider is completely independent from the performance of another glider flying on the same day. However, if one glider drops out of competition, the handicaps of other pilots may be suddenly different because their handicaps will be rescaled in relation to handicaps of gliders remaining in the race (function of max. handicap in the class). The rule although strange has been always like that in the past. What is proposed is to use the handicapping as it was always intended, i.e. to apply a simple scale factor without any double scaling based on who else is flying the competition. It will also result in more security about what minimum distance needs to be flown to allow for the competition day to be valid. That value now depends on what other gliders are in the race. There is a need to correct this and use only one simple factor for scaling the performances.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

Following that the amendment by Sweden has been tabled and seconded. The amendment proposed immediate applicability of the proposal.

The amended proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

6.1.4 Requirement for 1 second recording interval possibility for all GNSS FR used at Continental and World Gliding Championships (IGC/Bureau)

Mr. Angel Casado (Spain) presented the proposal (available [here](#)) on behalf of the IGC Bureau and added that the 1 second interval makes the difference in analyzing the flight in case of claim or resolving issues. All the new flight recorders that are nowadays used at the championships are capable of recording in 1 second interval so there should be no impact. IGC Bureau strongly supports the proposal and invites the delegates to support it too.

The proposal has been adopted by a clear majority.

6.1.5 Penalties for incorrect finishing (Belgium)

Mr. Pauwels, the delegate from Belgium presented the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Rutkowski, acknowledging the objective behind is safety, asked whether the initiators have considered various finish ring radiuses when proposing the penalties. He added - There are many different radiuses used at the competitions. Sometimes the finish 100m below the limit could be safe but may result in a harsh penalty. Has this been considered? Should not we change the proposal so to address this issue?

Mr. Bob Henderson (New Zealand) – Trying to catch-up with all the changes to the finish since the last time I have been involved in Annex A. New Zealand would prefer the finish ring to be set at or around 3 km radius and this proposal would mandate the 10 km radius. There is still a holistic issue to be solved: How to define a safe finish without pilots gaming their final glides to try to minimize any penalties they do receive on the glide. The proposal is not supported by New Zealand.

Mr. Spreckley clarified that the proposal does not deal with the finish ring radius but addresses only the penalties.

Mr. Aldo Cernezzi (Italy) – Italy is against the proposal for several reasons. Pilots make mistakes in high workload and in stress situations like the final glide. The current rule is fair enough, but I acknowledge the rules could be always improved. This proposal can make the pilots more anxious about the final glide. In such a stressful situation during the competition the pilots may be more prone to an error. I witnessed the accident, which happened in Ferrara in Italy. A pilot knew about not being scored speed points if crossing the ring too low. Because of that the pilot pulled-up and flew as slow as possible along the finish ring. Then stalled and entered a spin at the height around 100 m about the ground. The allowed altitude was 150 m. All of that happened because the pilot wanted to get some more points for speed. The current rule of 1 point per meter provided the penalty will not be higher than the speed points is good enough. On the other hand, I would like to note that if I could modify something, I would modify the penalties so that these will be proportional to the day factor. If one day is worth of only 500 points, the penalty should be lower than it would be on a 1000 points day.

Mr. Uys Jonker (South Africa) – We support all views presented by New Zealand. We do not think this proposal will add to safety. One example is from WGC in Uvalde, where the finish ring with 15 km radius was used together with a quite high finish altitude. On one occasion there were 15-20 gliders struggling to get up to the finish ring altitude despite being well above the safe final glide height required to reach Uvalde. If the finish as proposed here would have been used there, those gliders would had been likely not scored for speed, which means that at a contest like WGC they will be effectively out of the top competition. We therefore do not support the idea that crossing the finish ring 100 meters below is scored as an outlanding as that does not add any benefit nor that would be fair in many instances, especially when the finish ring is wide. The second example supports the concern raised by Italy i.e. that the penalty should be proportionate to the distance points. There was a recent case of two finishers at our national championships on a 200 points day where the second one finished 10th instead of 2nd because of the severe penalty despite he would have finished much faster than the other finishers who scored better on that day. Therefore, we support that penalties should be proportionate to the points of the day.

Mr. Sylvain Gerbaud (France) – The proposed penalty for finishing 100 meters below is good close to the airfield, but it is not fair if far from the airfield. Regarding the proposed penalties, we will discuss it also later as there is the Year-1 proposal suggesting the time penalty instead of points. The use of the time penalty will mean that in case of the only finisher will not be severely penalized even if finishing 100 meter or more below.

Mr. Rene Vidal (Chile) – I want to make a comment. The statistical data from the safety working group report collected over the last 12 years suggest that landing and arrival is the most critical phase of flight in terms of accidents and incidents recorded. The proposal may require pilot to look inside the cockpit continuously to monitor the arrival altitude and that may result in a higher workload, which is not safer. This should be considered in deciding whether to support the proposal or not.

Mr. Rick Sheppe (USA) – I have two points to make. This type of finish has been used in US national championships for quite some time and we have a good experience and feedback from pilots. Therefore, we are in favor of the proposal. I want also to address all other comments in general. There seems to be some misunderstandings about what the proposal does and how it will be used by the task setter. The minimum finish altitude rule remained unchanged for a long time. That altitude should be normally as low as it could be. There is no proposal to change that. The other altitude limit set to 100 meters below the minimum finish altitude should be so extremely low that trying to reach the airfield from there would result in a very dangerous situation and the pilots should be discouraged doing that. So the point of having a subfloor: If you are below the floor you get the penalty 1 point per meter, if you are below the subfloor you should have no motivation to continue to the airfield and you should outland. Because the score will outland you anyway. This is an enhancement of safety. Perhaps the number 100 is not large enough and maybe it should be 200 meters. It should anyway bring the lower limit down to a dangerous limit and that is where the subfloor should be. This is a good proposal.

The proposal failed.

6.1.6 Delete designated start option (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)). He added – I just repeat what was said last year, the designated start option creates more problems than solutions. It also contributes to creation of gaggles and dangerous situations at the start.

Mr. Rutkowski – I want to say one thing supporting this proposal. We have tried it a few times already e.g. at EGC in Ostrow where I have had a direct possibility of observing it's use in a real environment. The experience proved it is a wrong way not providing for safe starts. Therefore, Poland is strongly supporting this proposal.

Mr. Øjvind Frank (Denmark) – I have tried it in Ostrow, and it was extremely dangerous. Please vote for this proposal.

Mr. Jonker – I also want to support what other have said. This method created the biggest gaggles I have ever seen at WGC. I did not see the advantage of splitting the gaggles, but the contrary.

The proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

Following that the amendment by Sweden has been tabled and seconded. The amendment proposed immediate applicability of the proposal.

The amended proposal has been adopted by a large majority.

6.1.7 Energy Control at the Start (France)

Mr. Spreckley briefly summarized the proposal and the three amendments to this proposal, developed during the consultation trial, which also need to be considered. All proposed amendments have been available in the cloud before the meeting.

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the original proposal (available [here](#)). He added – The main motivation is to relieve the pressure on pilots during the pre-start phase, when all gliders try to reach and remain at the top of thermals. In case of clouds, the situation may be even worse.

The idea of the proposal is to limit the start energy in terms of altitude and speed so that pilots would have a less stressful start. The proposal removes the incentive for pilots to strive for a maximum altitude and energy before the start.

The meeting then considered the amendments filled in advance, all of which were seconded for discussion.

The first amendment from Romania, proposing to make the procedure optional at the discretion of Championships Director, has been introduced by Mr. Norbert Scarlat (Romania). He added – We think the procedure is not necessary to be used on some days e.g. with blue thermals. Therefore, we propose the amendment to make it optional.

Mr. Reno Fila (Sweden) – The reason that Sweden supports this amendment is because we are totally opposed to the original proposal as such. We have just failed one proposal on the grounds of high pilot's cognitive workload during finish and we are about to discuss the proposal that hugely increases such a workload during the start where the congestion of gliders is even higher. If the proposal would eventually pass this amendment could at least make it optional. Anyway, we would rather see the whole proposal fail.

Mr. Jonker – From a competition pilot's point of view the workload is a problem. I understand the safety issues. Bigger problem is to control two items, the height and speed. The speed limit used could be a realistic e.g. 200 km/h instead of a low limit that would require pilots to control it closely. However, the need to monitor two parameters simultaneously will increase the pilot's workload so that the safety may be affected.

Mr. Spreckley has clarified that the current discussion concerns only the first amendment from Romania.

Mr. Henderson – Responding also to the comment made by Mr. Fila about the workload, I would support this amendment to make it optional to ensure that the Championship Director is not to use the altitude and speed restrictions for the start.

Mr. Gerbaud – After all the pre-meeting discussions France accepted the proposed start procedure can be optional in the rules. I also do not see anything making the procedure mandatory in our proposal.

Mr. Foltin (IGC secretary) confirmed that wording of the original proposal allows for the optional use.

Mrs. Frouwke Kuijpers (Netherlands) – It would be good if the proposal is optional so that we can learn how to work with it, which would not be possible if it would be mandatory. I would also add that IGC should write a guideline when and how to use it. Referring to the earlier statement by Romania about the use on blue days and, the designated start option we have just discussed, I still think this is a good method for start but may be not for all kinds of weather conditions. Keeping that in mind, the procedure should be optional.

Mr. Bruno Ramseyer (Ireland) – We deleted the designated start option just recently, the problem with that procedure was that we had no guidelines how to use it and then it was used incorrectly. This is going to happen again if we introduce rules but do not actually give out guidelines for their application.

Mr. Gerbaud confirmed that the proposal by France anticipates the procedure as optional.

There was no further discussion on the amendment and the discussion confirmed that vote was not necessary.

Following that the second amendment filed in advance by Romania was discussed.

Mr. Scarlat (Romania) introduced the amendment – The big question is whether we do really need such a procedure because limiting the altitude and speed at the start line will not affect what the pilots will do before the start. They may still go close to cloud base and try to stay as high as possible until the start. What we propose here would be a better and easier rule. We see no issues and perhaps it will make pilots more responsible when preparing for the start.

Mr. Rutkowski – In what way this amendment is better for pilots to have a sharp cut in the altitude decided by the Championships Director? Why it would be better than having a buffer with some penalty points? We have having the same discussion as we have had earlier about the finish ring, in which we have understood that a sharp limit is unsafe in such situations because it motivates pilots sometimes to make strange and even dangerous decisions. We must also consider that pilots sometimes may not be fully conscious about actual altitude of their start, at least not knowing the exact number. A difference of few meters may result in devaluating the whole performance on that day. Therefore, Poland is against the amendment.

Mr. Kristian Roine (Finland) proposed the following amendment:

It is proposed to remove the following text from proposal 6.1.7: "If the excess height above the altitude limit is 50 meters or less, the pilot may avoid a penalty by finishing above the Minimum Finish Altitude by at least the same margin. This rule creates incentive to start and finish task 50m higher than what organizers intended. Simplify altitude and speed penalties to this: "Exceeding the maximum altitude or speed at the Start: 1. If the excess height above the altitude limit is 100 meters or less, the penalty is 1 points per metre. 2. More than 100 meters above the altitude limit: no valid start." 4. From 0 to 50 kph above the groundspeed limit: 1 point per kph 5. More than 50 kph above the groundspeed limit: no valid start".

Mr. Roine then proposed to introduce all amendments together and have only one discussion about all of them. He also added – In addition to what we propose, there are some additional issues that would need to be solved in the original proposal. For example, we propose that the pilots can have a valid start even if starting 50m higher than the altitude limit imposed by the organisers if finishing the task with the same or higher altitude difference. This could reduce the risks of finding the first thermal low or outlanding close to finish. This may require modification of the originally proposed rule. The second point is that we must make simple rules. We cannot make this rule a one-page long list of possible penalties in different cases. It must be the rule pilots can understand. We propose penalties that are in line with the current penalties i.e. up to 100 meters one point per meter and after that no valid start and a very similar and simple rule for the speed. The original proposal is too complicated.

Mr. Mozer requested the delegates to discuss only the tabled amendment.

Mr. Sheppe – From the discussion it seems there is a disagreement about what causes a heavy workload. If a soft penalty at the start is in place, then pilots will aim for the limit because of knowing it is a soft penalty. If a hard penalty exists, then they will avoid that limit because they know it is a hard penalty. I really do not know which one creates more workload. Because of that I support the arguments presented by Mr. Roine, which is not the amendment discussed yet. Consequently, US will vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. Gerbaud – If there is no penalty there is no rule. We should have an appropriate penalty for the rule. This proposal is quite long because it is a result of all discussions we have had before the meeting where we have tried to satisfy everybody who participated in the discussions with the view to find a consensus for this rule. Therefore, the text is perhaps more complicated than it was before. Regarding the workload, there is the 50-meter altitude buffer and the ground speed need to be at least 160 km/h and that allows also for a higher speed limit.

Mr. Spreckley (UK) – The amendment suggests there will be no penalty structure. This means no valid start if breaching those limits. This would create a situation that is quite untenable because of pilot going through the start even if only a few meters high will be told by his instrument that there was no valid start. The result is that pilot will turn back and try to start again opposing the traffic coming other way. This would create an enormous risk at the point of start to other competitors.

The second amendment from Romania failed by a clear majority.

Mr. Spreckley briefly introduced amendment 3 from USA: *The proposal includes a provision for a pilot to avoid a start altitude penalty by finishing higher. This amendment proposes that this provision be omitted, to become a separate Year-1 proposal.*

Mr. Sheppe added – To have the finish height dependent on the start height is the brand-new idea that was not part of the Year-1 proposal. It is an interesting idea, but it is no clear that it was thought through correctly and it would make a good Year-1 proposal today.

Mr. Roine – This amendment solves one of our complaints so Finland will be in favor. There is also a problem one can kind of optimize the finish and start altitudes and this amendment is not addressing that. I wish that this amendment gets accepted so that I can then modify (still to be tabled) Finnish amendment.

Ms. Nina Shalneva (Russia) – If we allow for a higher start then we would eliminate the whole idea of the original proposal, which was to improve safety by limiting the start height.

Mr. Spreckley – Just to clarify, this will allow for start only up to 50 meters above the start height.

Ms. Kuijpers – I have had the same comment as Russia, but now it is confirmed that the difference is only up to 50 meters. On the other hand, and as already said by Finland, the rules must be simple. And this one, at least for me, is not simple, because it again creates what-if scenarios about which the pilots would need to think. The team captains would be then queried about that during starting. I also think it is a completely different proposal. So I would suggest making that a Year-1 proposal and now discuss only the proposal from France.

Mr. Foltin (IGC secretary) clarified that the amendment from USA was not considered in the Year-1 proposal adopted in 2020 and therefore the amendment constitutes a new proposal that needs to be treated separately as a Year-1 proposal.

Mr. Peter Eriksen (Denmark) – I confirm that is also our understanding.

Mr. Fila – This 50-meter rule should be clearly out of order because it was not part of the Year-1 proposal. It is not following the established Year-1/Year-2 procedure.

Mr. Foltin (IGC secretary) provided following explanation – Although the amendment 3 from USA may be amending the original Year-2 proposal from France in a good direction, its principle has not been included in the Year-1 proposal adopted at the 2020 IGC Plenary meeting. Therefore, it cannot be considered as the amendment of the Year-2 proposal from France (6.1.7). It may be however considered as an amendment to proposal 6.3.1 provided this proposal (6.1.7) will pass.

Mr. Gerbaud added – This part of the proposal came from the discussion we have had prior to the meeting. Therefore, the difference between the Year-1 and the Year-2 versions of the proposal. If it is procedurally not possible to proceed that way, we would accept this part to be a Year-1 proposal.

Mr. Eriksen – The easiest way forward would be if France would accept the amendment from the USA as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Henderson asked for the clarification about what exactly will be subject to upcoming vote. The discussion has been interrupted at this point due to lack of time with the view to continue as the first agenda item the next day.

13. Elections of Officers

Mr. Mozer (IGC President) then presented the received nominations for IGC officers. He also confirmed that the list will be uploaded in the cloud right after this session.

Mr. Mozer briefly described tomorrow's objectives, thanked all participants, and then closed Session 1.

Please see the next page for the Summary of Session 2.

Summary of Session 2 on 5th March 2021 (13:30 – 15:30 UTC)

1. Opening (Mr. Mozer)

Mr. Mozer welcomed the Delegates to Session 2.

Apologies were received from the Secretary, who was unable to attend this session.

1.1 A roll call of Delegates was undertaken by Mr. Leinikki, and it was determined that 36 voting members were present

1.2 Administrative Matters (Mr. Mozer)

Mr. Mozer explained the online voting procedures to be used in this session and the next session.

Declarations of conflict of interest were received.

Mr. Mozer explained the purpose and use of recording the session and received no objections.

6. Proposals requiring voting (Eric Mozer)

6.1 Year 2 Proposals

(Continued from the previous session)

6.1.7 Energy Control at the Start (France)

(In progress)

The discussion was led jointly by Mr. Mozer and Mr. Spreckley.

Mr. Spreckley summarized the status of the proposal from the previous session. There is an amendment to the proposal from Finland. The amendment is a) to treat finishers and non-finishers the same for exceeding start energy limits, and b) to simplify the penalties at the finish (i.e. to bring them in line with existing penalties).

Mr. Roine – a) There is no reason to distinguish speed days from distance days in the application of penalties for starting too high or too fast. b) There is no reason to complicate the finish height penalties. The existing penalties suffice.

Mr. Rutkowski (with permission to speak about the amendment and the proposal together) - There are disadvantages to using a groundspeed limit: True airspeed is not considered. Also, pilots must watch their digital displays and may perform maneuvers near the start line for the purpose of reducing groundspeed. It would be better to have an airspeed limit.

Mr. Fila – Sweden supports the amendment because it reduces the complexity of the penalty structure, but we do not support the proposal, which increases cockpit workload.

Mr. Christof Geissler (Germany) – There should be graduated penalties for too high or too fast at the start. For a start higher than 100m above the maximum height, the penalty of an Invalid Start is too severe. We could also have a rule against maneuvering during the start run.

Mr. Eriksen – There were two other amendments that were accepted by France as friendly amendments, and the final wording of the proposal should be clear before we vote.

Mr. Mozer – The wording will be clear.

Mr. Jonker – We have to be careful not to mix safety and fairness. We should focus on a penalty structure that keeps the start procedure fair. Penalties for safety violations are a separate topic. In general, point penalties should be scaled in proportion to the maximum points awarded for the day (or alternatively, penalties should be given in seconds, not points).

Mr. Roine – In response to Mr. Geissler, the sharp penalty for being more than 100m too high at the start is within the current rules. In response to Mr. Jonker, it is not easy to consider safety rules and fairness rules independently.

Mr. Vidal (Safety WG) - It is difficult to consider the amendment out of the context of the proposal. We in the Safety Group often see proposals that use “safety” as a justification, yet they increase the workload for the pilot. We consider the management of too many variables at the start to be unsafe.

Mr. Gerbaud – One of the intentions of the proposal is to reduce pilot stress during the extended time before the start, a time when everyone wants to be as high as possible. This period of stress can last for hours. The procedures proposed have been used in large competitions for several years.

Mr. Spreckley summarized the amendment from Finland, which was then seconded by Sweden. Mr. Mozer called for a vote.

The amendment was accepted by a large majority.

Mr. Spreckley then summarized the amended proposal.

Mr. Rutkowski proposed a new amendment, to use airspeed control instead of groundspeed control at the start. The amendment was seconded by South Africa.

Mr. Jonker spoke in favor of using indicated airspeed.

Mr. Henderson – I am concerned that the discussion so far has not included a consideration of cloud base. Also, the fact that we have seen five amendments suggests that this proposal needs more work.

Mr. Gerbaud – In practice, it is not difficult to control the speed at the start by choosing an appropriate groundspeed. During the pre-meeting debate of this proposal, we did discuss best practices for choosing the maximum start height.

Mr. Eriksen - I agree with Mr. Henderson that despite all the good intentions to have this discussed before the meeting, this appears to be an immature proposal. We have two options. We can vote on it now, and if it fails, we cannot go back and have this discussion again next year. Or it can be withdrawn, and we can have a discussion and a vote next year.

Mr. Mozer – Noted, but at this time, we are discussing the amendment from Poland, only.

Ms. Kuijpers – The airspeed/groundspeed question needs further research. And many of the procedures we have been discussing belong in the guidelines, not the rules.

Mr. Geissler – The details of calculating indicated airspeed should be explained.

Mr. Roine – It is not practical to record indicated airspeed in a Flight Recorder.

Mr. Mozer ended the discussion on the amendment from Poland and called for a vote.

The amendment failed by a large majority.

Without objection, it was decided to vote on the proposal. The vote was evenly divided, and Mr. Mozer determined that a precise count could not be made using the online tools at his disposal.

Mr. Henderson (President of Honor) – Mr. President, it is clear the Plenum is evenly divided on this proposal. May I suggest that we return to the suggestion of Mr. Eriksen to bring the proposal back next year with the major objections addressed? If France were to withdraw the proposal now, it would not be lost, and we could consider it again next year.

Mr. Gerbaud thanked the members who participated in the pre-meeting debate on the proposal and expressed his wish that more Delegates had done so. As a result of our lack of consensus at this meeting, and with the belief that energy control at the start is a worthwhile enhancement of the rules, Mr. Gerbaud withdrew the proposal – to be considered again in 2022 as a Year 2 proposal.

Mr. Mozer thanked Mr. Gerbaud and stated that the proposal is deferred to 2022.

Mr. Spreckley (1st Vice President) – This debate and its outcome illustrates the fact that our internal procedure for processing Year 2 proposals still needs work. Our decision to debate the proposals before the meeting was sound, but the results of this experiment were mixed. We will submit a report, with recommendations, to the Bureau.

6.3.1 Application of Energy Control at the Start from 2021 (Germany)

As a result of the deferment of 6.1.7 to 2022, Germany withdrew this proposal.

6.2 Year 1 Proposals

6.2.1 Same day record claims (IGC/SC3 Committee)

Mr. Mills (Sporting Code Committee) – The Sporting Code Committee has introduced this proposal (available [here](#)) as a result of the way independent record claims for flights flown on the same day are currently handled. Rather than processing them in chronological order, we propose to process only the flight with the best performance.

Mr. Georgas – Question: is it proposed to consider the best performance of the day only, regardless of the existing record?

Mr. Mills - Yes.

Mr. Lars Bjernevik (Norway) – What are the criteria for determining the best performance of the day?

Mr. Mills – The same criteria we use in SC3 for exceeding existing records.

Mr. Rutkowski – What if there is a tie?

Mr. Mills – This is covered in the existing SC3. The record would be shared.

Mr. Mozer called for a vote.

The proposal was accepted by a large majority.

6.2.2 Inclusion of the ASW 20B, C in the Club Class Handicap List (Czech Republic)

Mr. Petr Koutny (Czech Republic) introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added – The number of gliders available to club members is decreasing, and the typical gliders types available are changing. The ASW 20B and ASW 20C are good candidates to be added to the Club Class.

Without further discussion, a vote was taken, and the proposal was accepted by a large majority.

After-meeting Note: According to IGC internal procedures for publishing changes to handicaps, this proposal was reclassified as 'Other' proposal and will become effective at the next publication of SC3AH, scheduled for 1 April 2021.

6.2.3 Ranking points for 2-seater crew members (Italy)

Mr. Cernezzi introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added – Currently, IGC grants ranking points only to the more highly ranked pilot in the crew of a 2-seat glider. We consider this not to be fair to P2. Pilots who do not have the highest ranking are not motivated to spend

a flying opportunity as P2, when that will not contribute to their ranking status. As a consequence, very experienced pilots have difficulty finding a qualified copilot for a competition. We propose to share ranking points between P1 and P2 in proportion to their current ranking at the beginning of the competition.

Mr. Vytautas Sabeckis (Lithuania) – Question: How would we handle the case in which P2 has a zero ranking points?

Mr. Cernezzi – This could be handled by the Competition Director.

Mr. Filla (Annex D) prepared a presentation (available [here](#)). The Annex D position follows:

The motivation behind this proposal is understood, and the proposal itself has merit, but not its proposed solution. At first it would seem to have the desired outcome. However, it raises some serious issues.

Today we have the principle of “one plane, one pilot.” Even when we included the 20m Multi-seat class, we held to this principle by considering each Team of two as an individual entity for ranking purposes. The entire ranking system - including the database, the reporting formats, the processing, and the website – depends on this principle. The calculation algorithm is not designed to handle more than one pilot per glider, either. Implementing this proposal will be very costly and labor-intensive – and this is not about the Ranking List team asking for more money, by the way.

The benefit would be small: the proposal would affect on average less than 5% of the total competition results. This brings us to the question of what to do with 2-seat Open Class gliders? And what to do with 2-seat gliders competing in Cat 2 events with mixed classes?

Furthermore, today the 5 highest ranked pilots finishing in the upper half of result list determine the competition rating - we have no idea what to do if now P1 and P2 both count. We have no idea how it would affect the overall ranking system.

Today we already have complications when P2 is changed during the competition. If P2 is also to receive ranking points this will become even more complex.

And finally: initial analysis shows that with the proposed scheme we end up in a situation where highly-ranked pilots get good ranking points more easily and low-ranked pilots get a good boost to their own ranking by hitch-hiking. This diagram shows maximum active comp result and total ranking points per pilot in 2020 sorted by current rank. Take as example the median pilot with rank 2500 (600 ranking points) who got there by one medium result in one medium-rated Cat 2 event. This pilot can easily stay in this not-so-bad ranking position forever or even advance by hitch-hiking twice a year with a better pilot. Pilots ranked above median will simply have less motivation to fly on their own if it is that easy.

The Annex D Committee as well as the Ranking List team therefore regretfully recommend to reject the proposal (but keep on internal wish list). Mr. Pauwels – The ranking of P1 should be stable throughout the competition.

Mr. Georgas – The reasonable nature of the proposal suggests that our ranking system is not compatible with the goals we generally share. If this proposal is accepted, perhaps the Year 2 proposal could include a feasibility study of the implementation problem.

Mr. Rutkowski – Poland supports this proposal in principle. We need to find a way, somehow, to let both pilots participate.

Ms. Kuijpers – Could we test this idea by creating an independent Ranking List system for 2-seaters only?

Mr. Cernezzi – Responding to the Ranking List Manager, in Italy our Competition Directors and Scorers have been successful at identifying P1 and P2 and assigning relative credit for each pilot of a 2-seat glider. We have experience in the situation in which the copilot changes during the competition. We further contend that there would be more than 5% of total rankings affected (especially because the proposal would have a good effect on participation). We would be happy to cooperate in the development of algorithms.

Mr. Fila (Ranking List) – we can provide any participation statistics needed.

Mr. Mozer called for a vote, and the proposal failed by a narrow margin.

6.2.4 Time penalty for low altitude finish (France)

Mr. Gerbaud introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) and added – The proposal is to substitute a time penalty for the points penalty at the finish. For example, the penalty could be 5 seconds per meter below the minimum finish height. This method is similar to that of the Sailplane Grand Prix.

Mr. Roine - This proposal is problematical because it has a very different effect on a speed day from a distance day. On a long day when there are few finishers and few distance points, there is almost no effect. And the opposite is true on a 1.5-hour AAT. The result is that the penalty exists when we don't need it and doesn't exist when we do.

A vote was taken, and the proposal failed by a large majority.

6.3 Other Proposals

6.3.2 Raising the maximum age of participants in the JWGC (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) by saying that the postponement of the JWGC caused by Covid-19 should not cause pilots to become ineligible due to their age. The proposal pertains to the 2022 JWGC only.

Mr. Øjvind Frank (Representing Denmark) – This proposal may exclude some pilots because of entry limits.

Ms. Kuijpers – Responding to Denmark, the excluded pilots would be young, which allows them another opportunity.

A vote was taken, and the proposal was accepted by a large majority.

6.3.3 Organizing the future WWGC in 3 classes (Germany)

Mr. Geissler introduced the proposal (available [here](#)) by stating that the participation in WWGC is rising, and there is no longer the concern from a few years ago that the quality of the competition may be lowered by increasing the number of classes from two to three.

Mr. Fila – WWGC should not keep pilots from competing in the highest performance gliders.

Ms. Kuijpers – I was in favor of only two classes, but I am now persuaded that three can be supported.

Mr. Georgas – Questions: With regard to currently awarded championships, are the Organisers allowed to change the number of classes? And will three classes be mandatory or optional for future bids?

Mr. Mozer - the next WWGC will not change the number of classes, and the proposal says that the WWGC can be held in three classes, so the answer to your second question is "optional."

Mr. Eriksen (Bid Manager) – If this proposal is approved, then bids for both two and three classes would be accepted for consideration.

Mr. Rutkowski – Statistics from the last two WWGCs provide weak support for this proposal. We should delay this change for a few more years, to see if the trend is real.

Mr. Roine – Finland agrees with Poland. It is too early to reverse a decision we made only three years ago.

Ms. Kuijpers – More women own or have access to 18m Class gliders than before, and many of them do not want to fly in other classes.

Mr. Geissler – The WWGC 2022 will have three classes, and WWGC 2024 will probably also have three classes, so in effect, we have already changed to three classes.

Mr. Casado – Responding to Mr. Geissler, WWGC 2024 will have two classes, as stated in the bid.

Mr. Mozer called for a vote. The proposal was accepted by a large majority.

6.3.4 Removal of periodic calibration of Flight Recorders (France and Denmark)

Mr. Frank introduced the proposal (available here) and added – Comparison of pressure altitude and GPS altitude in the log file is sufficient to confirm that the pressure transducer is working.

Mr. Casado – World records require the highest standard. We should retain the requirement for calibrations for world records.

Mr. Fila – Responding to Denmark, GPS altitude is not accurate enough to serve as a calibration standard. In competitions, we do single-point calibrations at every takeoff, and large errors in the pressure altitude can be easily detected. Sweden supports the proposal and also supports keeping the calibration requirement for world records.

Mr. Georgas – I propose the amendment stated by my colleagues, that this will apply to all flight performances except Records.

The amendment was seconded by Poland, and the amendment was discussed.

Mr. Fila – Question: does this allow calibrations to take place after the record flight?

Mr. Georgas – The amendment is to make no change to the current calibration requirements applicable to Records.

Mr. Ian Strachan (GFAC Committee) stated that a Flight Recorder is considered to be in calibration if it has been calibrated within the previous five years. It is GFAC's opinion that regular calibrations are needed, because pressure sensors do drift. He reminded the Delegates that sufficiently accurate pressure altitude is required for all flight performances, not just altitude achievements, and it is also required for resolving airspace violations. GFAC does not support this proposal.

Mr. Jonker – In my experience, pressure sensors do not drift very much. Perhaps we should get the opinions of some of the Flight Recorder manufacturers before deciding this.

Mr. Frank – Denmark would accept the amendment from Greece as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Gerbaud – France will also accept this amendment.

The amendment was incorporated into the proposal, and discussion of the proposal continued.

Mr. Eriksen – Calibration sheets are used rarely, if at all, in competitions. Requiring them is wasteful.

Mr. Mills (Sporting Code Committee) – In matters involving calibrations of Flight Recorders, the Sporting Code Committee relies on GFAC. Contrary to a statement in the proposal,

calibration certificates are not required for Silver and Gold badge legs. Evidence for these achievements can be provided by uncalibrated Flight Recorders provided the rules for using Position Recorders are followed.

Mr. Roine – Question: what are the specifics of comparing pressure altitude with GPS altitude described in the proposal? Finland supports the proposal.

Mr. Frank – Responding to Mr. Roine, the absence of large discrepancies in a subjective comparison of pressure altitude and GPS altitude provides sufficient confidence in the function of the pressure sensor.

Mr. Georgas – The burden of maintaining calibrations is too high for all applications other than Records. Greece supports this proposal.

Mr. Bjornevik – In competitions, there may be Flight Level (i.e. pressure altitude) limits.

Mr. Fila – Sweden supports the proposal, while we acknowledge the need to use pressure altitude mentioned by Norway. Most altitude measurements in competitions use the relative (MSL) method. This works well and should not be replaced with GPS altitude.

Mr. Jonker - Calibration certificates can be falsified and thus have low value for investigations of airspace violations. South Africa agrees with Sweden that the MSL method used in competitions works well.

Mr. Georgas – The precision in altitude measurements used in gliding far exceeds that of regulatory authorities. We have worked around the inaccuracies in absolute pressure measurements for many years, and the calibrations we have been requiring are not really needed.

Mr. Geissler – Question: if our decision today causes calibration certificates to be no longer produced, will this cause problems for the certification of Records?

Without further discussion, a vote was taken.

The proposal was accepted by a large majority.

Post meeting note: The proposal was mistakenly listed as Other proposal. The issue has been notified by the two committees (SC3 and GFAC). They decided to follow their advice and the proposal will be submitted as an ordinary Y-2 proposal for discussion and consideration by the 2022 IGC plenary.

7 – Presentation of Bids

7.2 Presentation of Bid for 2023 JEGC in Club and Std Classes (Denmark)

Mr. Eriksen presented the Bid from Denmark (available [here](#))

Questions following the bid presentation

Mr. Geissler – Will pilots from outside Europe be invited to this Championships?

Mr. Eriksen – Yes. Pilots from outside Europe are welcome as Hors Concours entries (subject to the entry limit).

Mr. Mozer – Does any Delegate oppose taking a vote on this bid now?

Without objection, a vote was taken, and the Bid from Denmark for the 2023 JEGC was accepted unanimously.

Mr. Mozer recognized Norway to ask a follow-up question about Flight Recorder calibrations (item 6.3.4).

Mr. Bjornevik – Question: Does our recent decision eliminate all calibrations, or only the recurring calibrations?

Mr. Georgas – Only the recurring calibrations. The initial calibration from the manufacturer is still required.

10 - Reports not requiring voting

10.1 Report from OSTIV

Prof. Radespiel referred to the OSTIV Report (available [here](#)) and stated that the next OSTIV Congress will take place in August, either at the WGC in Stendal, or online.

10.2.1 Report from the Sporting Code Committee

Mr. Mills referred to the Report from the Sporting Code Committee (available [here](#)) and agreed to convey the thanks of the President to all the members of the Committee for their continued fine work.

10.2.2 Report from the Annex A Committee

Mr. Sheppe referred to the Report from the Annex A Committee (available [here](#)) and thanked the members of the Committee for their work.

10.2.2 Report from the Handicaps Subcommittee

Mr. Geissler referred to the Report from the Handicaps Committee (available [here](#)) and stated that the Committee has been working on the addition of the ASW-20 variants to the Club Class list. He thanked his colleagues for their work.

Mr. Sabeckis – Questions: Will the addition of the ASW-20 variants raise the upper limit of handicaps? Also, what is the procedure for adding new gliders to the list?

Mr. Geissler – We don't yet know the answer to the first question. The procedure for adding new gliders is that they must be properly proposed and then accepted by the Plenum.

Mr. Bruno Ramseyer (Ireland) – Do we have the new handicap values for the ASW-20 variants?

Mr. Geissler – No, not yet.

10.2.3 Report from the Annex D Committee

Mr. Fila had nothing to add to the written Report from the Annex D Committee (available [here](#)) and thanked Mr. Bjornevik for his work on the Ranking List during the past year.

10.2.4 Report from the Air Traffic, Navigation, and Display Systems Committee (ANDS)

Mr. Sheppe had nothing to add to the written Report from the ANDS Committee (available [here](#)) and recognized Member Casado to speak on the status of the OGN Tracker project.

Mr. Casado – We have on hand 50 OGN Trackers. We have on order 70 additional Trackers that will be delivered at the end of March or early April. Trackers will be tested at the SGP in La Cerdanya, Spain beginning at the end of May. After that, all the Trackers will be sent to Stendal for the WGC in July, where I will supervise their use. If the Organisers of the WGC in Montluçon wish to use them, we will send the Trackers there. And we have an agreement to use the Trackers at the SGP Final in St. Auban in September.

After-meeting Note: The Montluçon Organisers did express their intention to use the OGN Trackers at their WGC.

10.3.1 Report from the Stewards Working Group

Ms. Kuijpers referred to the written Report from the Stewards Working Group (available [here](#)), and stated that further online meetings of the WG are planned. She agreed with President Mozer that more frequent online meetings will be valuable in the future.

10.3.2 Report of the Safety Working Group

Mr. Vidal referred to the written Report from the Safety Working Group (available [here](#)), Annex 1 (available [here](#)), and Annex 2 (available [here](#)). He stated that the WG supports organization level safety training for the stakeholders in our Championships (Officials, Safety Officer, Stewards). We have a few options for doing this, and we will continue to develop this idea. We will continue to encourage the use of the “electronic safety box.”

10.3.3 Report from the Scoring Software Working Group

Mr. Casado – The WG’s efforts this year were focused on “Realtime Scoring.” We have defined a protocol and a data format. We are a bit frustrated with the responsiveness of some of our third-party developers. We will continue to push this project forward.

10.3.6 Report from the IGC Media Working Group

Mr. Spreckley had nothing to add to the written Report from the IGC Media Working Group (available [here](#)).

10.3.7 E-Concept Report

Mr. Spreckley referred to the E-Concept Report (available [here](#)) and reported on the successful E-Concept competition held last year in Germany. In communications with manufacturers of FES-equipped gliders, we have learned that the demand for these gliders is in the club and private recreational markets, with less demand amongst pilots who race conventional high-performance gliders. There is room for growth here, but for the moment, there is no pressure to introduce E-Concept into our FAI-sanctioned competitions.

10.5.1 Report of the Trophy Manager

Ms. Weinreich referred to the Trophy Manager’s Report (available [here](#)) and stated that there may be an undefined situation for the World Soaring Cup if one or both WGCs do not take place in 2021.

10.5.2 On-Line Contest Report

A new online portal will be used in Germany this season. This will provide some competition for OLC.

10.4.4 Report from the FAI Medico-physiological Commission (CIMP)

Dr. Kneuppel referred to his presentation and Organizing Checklist for competitions (available [here](#)) and encouraged Organisers to use the checklist.

Mr. Mozer stated that the checklist has been given to the Organisers of the two upcoming WGCs. He thanked our friend Dr. Kneuppel, who now holds the title of CIMP President of Honor.

10.5.3 Youth Gliding

Ms Shalneva reported that Youth Gliding competition rules have been developed, but so far, the rules are available in Russian language only. After translation, the rules will be circulated within IGC for consideration and comment.

10.4.2 European Gliding Union Report

Mr. Pauwels referred to his EGU Report (available [here](#)) and reported on the recently concluded EGU Congress. We are all invited to visit the new EGU website (<https://glidingunion.eu/>).

Closure (Mr. Mozer)

Mr. Mozer briefly described tomorrow's objectives and then closed Session 2.

Please see the next page for the Summary of Session 3.

Summary of Session 3 on 6th March 2021 (13:30 – 15:30 UTC)

1. Opening

IGC President Eric Mozer opened the 3rd day of the IGC Plenary and passed the floor to the IGC Secretary.

1.1 Roll Call

37 votes very present, including one proxy to Russia

1.2 Administrative matters

The Secretary excused that he had been unable to attend the 2nd day and thanked those that had helped organizing the meeting in his absence and continued to the Roll call.

New version of the Agenda (ver. 4) and additional papers were made available in the FAI Cloud.

1.3 Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Mr. Foltin declared a conflict of interest, being employed by EASA, the European Aviation Safety Agency.

2. Minutes of previous meeting (Budapest 6-7-March 2020)

The president invited the delegates to comment on the distributed minutes.

Mr. Pauwels had proposed rephrasing. The Secretary confirmed that this change already had been included in the version available in the Cloud.

There were no other remarks to the minutes. The president then asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Spreckley made a motion to accept the minutes, this was seconded by Sweden.

The minutes were then approved with no votes against.

3.1 Bureau decisions since last plenary meeting

The President presented the list of decisions taken by the Bureau since the last plenary meeting. See below:

Number	Decision
1-2020	Publication of updated Sporting Code Section 3
2-2020	Publication of updated Annex A to the Sporting Code Section 3
3-2020	Publication of updated Annex B to the Sporting Code Section 3
4-2020	Publication of updated Annex D to the Sporting Code Section 3
5-2020	Authorization of order and payment for 120 IGC trackers
6-2020	Update of FAI/IGC Championship Calendar due to COVID-19 pandemics
7-2020	Change of location of 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2020 to Montluçon, France
8-2020	Location of the 2022 IGC Plenary meeting in Copenhagen, Denmark
1-2021	Approved that the IGC Champion pilot of the year 2020 Melanie Gadoulet (FRA) may keep the World Soaring Cup Trophy for one more year

3.2 Discharge of Bureau responsibilities for decisions since last Plenary meeting

There was a motion from Greece to discharge the Bureau, seconded by Italy.

The discharge adopted with no votes against. The Bureau was discharged responsibilities for decisions since last Plenary meeting.

11 Championships

11.1 Report from past Championships

No championships had been conducted since the last meeting.

11.2 Report on future Championships

The Championships Working Group Chairman, Mr. Peter Eriksen reported on the revised dates for future championships. See the dates below.

2021:

- 36th WGC, Stendal, Germany, 18m, 20m, Open Classes, 18th – 31st July
- 36th WGC, Montluçon, France, Club, Std. & 15m Classes. 7th – 22nd August
- 5th JEGC, Pociunai, Lithuania, Club & Std. Classes, 10th – 24th July
- 4th PAGC, Luis Eduardo Magalhaes, Brazil, Std. & Handicapped Classes, 11th–25th September

2022:

- 37th WGC, Matkopuszta, Hungary, 18m, 20m, Open Classes, 25th July – 8th August
- 12th JWGC, Tabor, Czech Republic, Std. & Club Classes, 31st July – 14th August
- 11th WWGC, Husbands Bosworth, Great Britain, Club, Std & 18m Classes 13th – 27th August
- 21st EGC, Pociunai, Lithuania, Club, Std & 15m Classes 2nd – 16th July
- 4th WGC 13,5 m Class, Pociunai, Lithuania, 2nd – 16th July

2023:

- 21st EGC, Leszno, Poland, 18m, 20 m & Open Classes, 31st July – 14th August
- 12th WWGC, Garray, Spain, Club & 18m Classes, 1st – 15th July
- 37th WGC, Narromine, Australia, Club, Std & 15m Classes, 2nd – 16th December
- 5th PAGC, Hutchinson, USA, Club & Handicapped Classes, 6th 17th June

2024

- 38th WGC, Uvalde, USA, 18m, 20m & Open Classes, 25th Aug – 7th September
- 13th JWGC, Ostrow, Poland, Club & Std. Classes, 28th July – 10th August

Mr. Eriksen thanked the organizers for their flexibility and willingness to work with IGC on the rescheduling of Championships.

It was also noted that the 37th WGC in Narromine now has moved into December 2023, so the correct year according to the IGC calendar.

There is still a risk for the four Championships in 2021. The Bureau has discussed this. It is up to the organizers to decide in cooperation with the national and local authorities, if the

conditions allow holding these championships. There will be no penalty from FAI/IGC if they decide not to go ahead. This is force majeure, and there is no pressure from IGC to either hold or cancel an event.

If organizers decide to go ahead, the conditions for having a valid championship are the ones stated in the FAI Sporting Code Section 3. A minimum of 10 participants from at least 5 NACs shall participate at the start of the competition to have a valid championship in a class.

The President suggested to defer the discussion on the 2021 Championships to later during the meeting.

11.3 Sailplane Grand Prix

Mr. Brian Spreckley, Chairman of the SGP Working Group reported on the SGP.

The SGP qualifying competitions have also been hit by the COVID-19 crises. 3 competitions took place in 2020, the rest are now planned for 2021, but it is uncertain if they can take place. The program is available on the SGP website. (www.sgp.aero)

In the previous two reports, Mr. Spreckley mentioned the development of the SGP into an entity that could establish a partnership with a commercial partner. This has not been a success and the strategy has changed. The aim is now to bring new and younger people into the SGP management group to see if they can come up with new ideas.

In 2020 two new members have joined the team, Claire Heliot, who is working on social media and Antoine Hervet who is focusing on E-sport.

The SGP final will be held in St. Auban, France, in September 2021.

There has been a couple of meetings with FFVP (the French Federation). There is contact to the technical team on how to address the technical challenges. The Director will be Regis Kuntz and the Referee will be Roland Stuck.

Three pilots and the reigning champion are already qualified.

There is excitement about the possibilities in E-sport and there will be a parallel E-sport event with the SGP in order to attract young people and in particular the young gamer generation into gliding. This could increase the value of the SGP to potential partners.

Gliding is a perfect fit for E-sport and the global E-sport population is growing from about 395 million people in 2018 to about 650 million people in 2023.

A live virtual competition will be conducted along with the SGP final for 20 selected pilots. They will fly the same race as was flown during the day, with the same weather pattern. In parallel an open competition will be organized, where the conditions will be set so that anyone can compete.

To give an idea about the potential, the Vendée Globe sailing race has just taken place, and there were 7.000 who participated in the parallel E-sport race.

The next (11th) series of Qualifying Grand Prix will take place in 2022, the World Final will take place in 2023. The bid documents are available on the SGP website, and the bids are to be submitted by 31st October 2021. Delegates will receive more information about this.

Ms. Nina Shalneva asked if there were conditions under which the SGP final and also Qualifying GPs could be postponed.

Mr. Spreckley responded that the situation was depending on the national situation in the various countries. If the national authorities allow the competitions to take place, we are happy about that. The same applies to the SGP final, but we cannot say anything before April at the earliest if the SGP final will take place. With regard to the Russian GP, we will have to

communicate when we get closer, but you will take the decision based on the conditions in Russia.

Ms. Shalneva responded that Russia would like to postpone the Russian GP, if the GP Final was postponed, to allow foreign pilots to participate.

Mr. Spreckley responded that he was fairly confident the SGP Final would happen as planned.

Ms. Kuijpers confirmed that there was an active E-competition community in The Netherlands, and there was a wish to get E-competitions organized at World Championship level. Last winter there were 145 participants in the national E-gliding championships, a mix of national team members, ordinary glider pilots and people to whom gliding was new. Some of these have now started glider flying.

Mr. Georgas supported the view of Mr. Spreckley and Mrs. Kuijpers and hoped the E-gliding would grow into formalized championships at world level.

Ms. Valéria Caselato (Brazil) reported that also in Brazil the National Championships are paralleled by an E-gliding competition that gives pilots a good possibility to practice competition flying.

Mr. Spreckley was sure that the discussion on E-gliding would come back at the next Plenary, as it has great potential for IGC.

The President thanked Mr. Spreckley and his team for his report and his work on the SGP.

12 Confirmation and approval of IGC officers

12.1 Confirmation of Committees and Working Groups, Representatives and Specialists

The President informed the meeting that new Bureau will nominate these after the Plenary meeting.

12.2 Approval of Competition Officials

12.2.1 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2021, Stendal-Borstel, Germany

Jury president: Peter Ryder

Remote Jurors: Marina Vigorito, Bob Bickers

Chief Steward: Robert Danewid

Steward: Lasse Virtanen

12.2.2 36th FAI World Gliding Championships 2021, Montluçon-Guéret, France

Jury president: Bob Henderson

Remote Jurors: Bruno Ramseyer, Peter Eriksen

Chief Steward: Frouwke Kuijpers

Steward: Enrique Lippe

12.2.3 5th FAI Junior European Gliding Championships 2021, Pociunai, Lithuania

Jury president: Juha Silvennoinen

Remote Jurors: Reno Fila, Aldo Cernezzì

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels

Steward: Milan Kmetovics

12.2.4 4th FAI Pan-American Gliding Championships 2021, Luís Eduardo Magalhães, Brazil

Jury president: Alfonso Soto

Remote Jurors: Bruno Ramseyer, Rene Vidal

Chief Steward: John Godfrey

Steward: tba

12.2.5 - 2022 Championships

37th WGC, Hungary, Matkópuszta

Jury president: Marina Vigorito

Chief Steward: Patrick Pauwels

11th WWGC, UK, Husbands Bosworth,

Jury president: Rick Sheppe,

Chief Steward: Mandy Temple

12th JWGC, Czech Republic, Tabor,

Jury president: Wojciech Scigala

Chief Steward: Enrique Lippi

21st EGC, Lithuania, Pociunai

Jury President: Angel Casado

Chief Steward: Dick Bradley

There were no questions to the list of officials from the Plenary, and the list was unanimously adopted.

12.3 Proposal for Remote Jurors (late proposal)

FAI Sporting Code Section 3, Annex A, para

Mr. Eriksen reported that the Bureau had a late proposal for inclusion of procedures for Remote Jurors in the Sporting Code. IGC has been using Remote Jurors for quite some time, but this is not described in the Sporting Code.

The proposal, if adopted by IGC, will be brought forward to CASI, to see if these procedures shall be for IGC exclusively, or shall be part of more general FAI procedures.

Mr. Henderson would like to know if these procedures for Remote Jurors were to pick up the requirement in the FAI Jury Handbook and guidelines, which was confirmed by the President.

Mr. Henderson supported that this could be handled by the Bureau, as it was to pick up FAI procedures in IGC.

Mr. Vidal informed new delegates about the background of the proposal. several appeals are in process as an outflow from the last WWGC in Australia, where an International Tribunal is looking at this.

The president confirmed that this work still was ongoing, but the Bureau and the Championship Committee had studied some of the material and had come to the conclusion that the missing procedures for Remote Jurors may have been a factor. Gliding is one of the few sports using Remote Jurors. It has served us well and kept the cost down. We hope these new procedures will help clarify some of the things we have discovered.

The President asked the new Bureau to get these procedures formalized and into the Sporting Code.

13 Election of Officers

13.1 IGC President

The President asked Visa-Matti Leinikki (FAI) to explain the voting process.

The first vote will be an absolute majority. With the current 38 delegates, an absolute majority requires 20 votes. If no one receives 20 votes, a second round will be launched. In the 2nd round, only a simple majority is required.

There were two candidates nominated:

Mr. Peter Eriksen (DEN)

Mr. Brian Spreckley (UK)

Both candidates gave a short presentation before the election. There were no other candidates.

The secret ballot then took place.

Mr. Peter Eriksen (Denmark) was elected new IGC president

13.2 1st IGC Vice-president

Only one delegate, Ms. Frouwke Kuijpers accepted nomination, and was elected 1st Vice-president.

13.3 IGC Vice presidents

The following delegates were nominated and accepted the nomination:

Sushil Bajpai (India), Lars Bjørnevik (Norway), Aldo Cernezzi (Italy), Angel Casado (Spain), Christof Geisler (Germany), Alexander Georgas (Greece), Sylvain Gerbaud (France), Vytautas Sabeckis (Lithuania), Rick Sheppe (USA), Brian Spreckley (UK), Mandy Temple (Australia), David Richter-Trummer (Austria), René Vidal (Chile).

The result of the vote was that the following 5 delegates were elected IGC Vice presidents.

Brian Spreckley, Christof Geissler, René Vidal, Rick Sheppe, Angel Casado.

13.4 IGC secretary

Only one candidate, Mr. Vladimir Foltin (Slovakia), accepted nomination and was re-elected IGC Secretary. The President thanked Mr. Foltin for his strong support to IGC in the past years.

13.5 Treasurer

Only one candidate, Mr. Patrick Pauwels (Belgium), accepted nomination and was re-elected Treasurer. The president was happy that Mr. Pauwels was ready to continue his good work.

14 IGC Awards

The president reminded the meeting about the procedures for Awards. No recordings or minutes shall be taken during the awards process.

Eric Mozer, IGC President was awarded the Lilienthal Medal and was at the same time appointed as IGC Honorary President.

16 AOB

16.1 Late proposals

The president asked the meeting to accept that late proposals from the organizers of the 2021 WGCs to modify the entry fee due to the COVID-19 pandemic could be tabled. Late proposal requires a 2/3rd majority to be tabled at the meeting.

16.2 Entry fee request WGC 2021 (Germany)

With majority of votes in favor, it was accepted to let Germany table the proposal.

The President asked Christof Geissler to present the proposal.

The proposal is to increase the entry fee for the WGC in Stendal from 850€ to 1.000€

Mr. Geissler referred to the written proposal (available [here](#)). The extra effort, a need to reserve hotel rooms for quarantine purposes, test equipment, no visitors and several other things had increased the organizer cost. Mr. Geissler was amazed that the organizers still had the energy to carry on and found it a fair request that he recommended.

There was no discussion on the proposal.

The proposal was adopted by a large majority. The proposal was carried.

16.3 Entry fee and acceptance of 3 pilots per nation per class at WGC 2021 (France)

The other proposal (available [here](#)) was from France concerning the WGC in Montlucon. It was accepted to table the proposal.

Mr. Gerbaud presented the proposal. France wished to withdraw part two of the proposal, increasing the number of participants from 2 to 3 per class. With already 115 pilots registered, the organizers were no longer worried that the number of participants would be too low.

The proposal is to increase the entry fee from 750 to 900€. The reason is additional cost of facilities, more cleaning, larger tents for restaurants.

There was no discussion.

The amended proposal, with part two withdrawn, only covering the entry fee was accepted by a large majority.

16.1 Start altitude Relationship to finish (UK)

The President then asked the meeting if they would accept to table the proposal from UK on Start altitude relationship to finish. This was accepted with a large majority of votes.

The President asked Mr. Spreckley to present the proposal (available [here](#)).

Mr. Spreckley said that when the meeting discussed the French proposal for Energy Management, it contained a buffer. This was removed, as it was considered a new idea and should be presented as a separate proposal. We would like to have this as a Year-1 proposal and ask the Annex A Committee to work on the proposal and come back with a Year-2 proposal next year on how we can overcome the problem with pilot workload.

Prof. Peter Ryder (IGC President of Honor) had earlier proposed a new type of competition, which is just a distance competition. One element of this was the idea that could solve the problems with dangerous starts and finishes, requiring the finish energy to be as high as the start energy, and he urged the proposers to include this in the work.

Mr. Jonker suggested to use a height loss rule like with records, where the Competition Director defined the maximum height difference on the task.

Mr. Rutkowski would like to hear more about the ideas the proposers had.

Mr. Spreckley responded that if a pilot started a few meters above the maximum start height, he could finish higher than the minimum, and it that way avoid the penalty.

Mr. Roine was concerned that pilots always would start as high a possible and that this in reality was an increase of the start height.

Mr. Fila agreed with Finland and had the same concern but looked forward to working on the proposal.

Mr. Ramseyer suggested that penalties should be severe to avoid advantages.

Ms. Shalneva wanted to know what would happen if the pressure changed during the day.

Mr. Spreckley responded that pressure changes also would be a problem with the current rules and a fixed height.

Mr. Geissler did not like the severe penalties proposed by Ireland. Penalties shall eliminate sporting advantages but not be unnecessary severe.

Mr. Foltin supported the proposal and felt that the proposal also could contribute to the problems with leeching and gaggles.

Mr. Fila (agreed with Mr. Foltin and expected UK to consider this also when working with the Annex A Committee on the proposal.

Mr. Jonker would like the proposer to consider a time-based penalty.

Mr. Mozer, seeing no further comments, called for the vote.

The proposal was adopted by a large majority.

17 Meeting wrap-up and Closure

President congratulated the new Bureau and thanked all he had been working with during his time as IGC President. He then wished everyone good health and hoped that all would come safely through the pandemic.

The new elected President Peter Eriksen rounded the meeting off, by thanking Eric Mozer for his great effort, congratulated him with the Lilienthal Medal, and said that it would be difficult to keep the same high standard in the future. The new President looked forward to meeting everyone in Copenhagen in March 2022.

End of the meeting minutes.

Vladimir Foltin

IGC Secretary