

CIVL Paragliding Accuracy Subcommittee

February, 2009 – Hall, Austria

AGENDA

I. ISSUES REFERRED BY CIVL BUREAU

1. Continental competitions: Should there be some flexibility in the year they can be held? Currently in years alternate to World Championships. Should this be strictly adhered to? (CIVL IRs must be followed – no change to rule that bids should be received 60 days before the CIVL meeting two years ahead of the competition).

2. Safety & Training: A revised incident reporting form, circulated by the S&T Subcommittee should be reviewed and suggested modifications or amendments relevant to PG Accuracy should be noted and returned to the S&T SSC. It is proposed to make the form mandatory for Cat 1s and recommended (later mandatory) for Cat 2 events.

4. S7A, B & C to specify the issues that will attract financial penalties for non-performance in 1st Category events. These must be measurable and provable.

Reason: FAI recommendations.

5. S7A, B & C and OA to include provision for an extra visit by the steward at a specified time before the event, at the organiser's expense, when it is necessary to confirm that recommendations have been followed.

Reason: arising from Serbian PG Euros experience.

Discuss other checks and measures that could be implemented.

II. REVIEW OF LOCAL REGULATIONS

6. World Paragliding Accuracy Championships 2009, Ivanec, Croatia

7. Paragliding Accuracy: World Air Games 2009, Avigliana, Italy

III. RULE CHANGE PROPOSALS FROM SPORTING CODE SUBCOMMITTEE

8. S7C, 2.4.3 The Total Period – amend heading to read “**Duration of Championship**”, replace existing wording with “The total period of the championship shall not exceed 14 days, including the opening and closing ceremonies. Competitors are subject to all rules relating to championship flying throughout this period, whether flying a task or not. ”

Reason: FAI advice to ensure the Competition and Safety Directors can exercise control throughout this period.

9. S7C, 2.3.4 Practice Event – add new paragraph:

Organisers of all practice events (including Pre-WAG) are to apply for Category 2 status for these events (Chapter 4).

Reason: to clarify responsibility.

10. S7C, New paragraph 2.17.2 – All Flying Banned

Both the Competition Director and the Safety Director have the power to ban flying from the site if a task or day is cancelled due to dangerous conditions.

Reason: FAI recommendation to aid safety.

11. S7C, New paragraph 2.17.6 – Pilot Competence

Both the Competition Director and the Safety Director have the power to exclude from the championship pilots who do not demonstrate the necessary skills for safe launching, flight or landing.

Reason: FAI recommendation to aid safety.

12. S7C, 2.16.7 Collision Avoidance

Clarify this as there are no “International rules of the air”.

Reason: request to FAI > can you send me a copy of the "International rules of the air" mentioned > in the SECTOR 7C - CLASS 0 PARAGLIDING ACCURACY CLASSIII 2007 Edition > (Chapter 2.19.7 "Collision avoidance" - pag. 20).-

13. S7C, 4.4 Results

Insert “any available” in front of “unofficial results” in 4th line.

Reason: these results are not always available.

Insert new paragraph “All results should have the CIVL ID number for each pilot recorded. The following formats are acceptable for input to the WPRS:

An Excel format (.xls or .csv) file with the results in the following order:

Name (First name followed by family name) Nation (IOC abbreviated codes)

Total (score) FAI_licence (number) CIVL_Pilot_ID

PDF files are not acceptable.”

Reason: these are the only formats that can be input to the WPRS database without manual reformatting by the CIVL Competition Coordinator.

14. S7C, 7.1.3 Method and Timing of Payment [sanction fees]

In third paragraph delete wording after “announced” and insert “in the CIVL approved local regulations for the event”

Reason: current wording does not reflect what actually happens; LRs are often approved by the Bureau to meet deadlines specified in other S7 rules.

At end of third paragraph add “Any unpaid sanction fees, FAI officials’ expenses and any performance financial penalties may be deducted from these entry fees.”

Reason: to include the reason this measure was introduced and to provide for the introduction of performance penalties.

IV. RULE CHANGE PROPOSALS FROM PGA SC DISCUSSIONS

15. LIGHT HARNESS TOUCH (LHT)

Proposal: To delete LHT option from S7C (4.8) to avoid misunderstanding in judging.

LHT can still be introduced as a local rule in FAI 2 competitions. Discussions of LHT rule in 2008 result in a large majority in agreement.

16. BACK PROTECTION

Proposal to be formulated: To improve the wording of 2.16.5. Back protection should remain a mandatory part of equipment, but need to define it better so it is enforceable and improving safety, but not to take (legal) responsibility with defining exact structure or solution.

17. SAFETY ISSUES

To improve safety awareness and activities, a proposal on safety report is prepared:

At FAI 1 and test competitions: **organiser** will provide a »safety report« **to steward** /CIVL/PGA SC including reports on all safety issues from rules including checks of pilots equipment. CIVL PGA SC will prepare a reporting form to help organiser with this task. (proposal should be in line with item No. 2)

18. COMPLAINTS & PROTESTS:

Proposal: To provide a Protest template that organisers should make available at landing site to help pilots prepare written protests if their complaints are not upheld.

19. VIDEO EVIDENCE

The wording can be shortened to clarify the points:

- 1) the recordings shall be made,
- 2) the organisers do their best (a missing video is not a reason for relaunch)
- 3) the recording can be used in case of the protest (if the jury so decides).

V. REVIEW ISSUES/PROPOSALS ARISING FROM STEWARD & JURY REPORTS:

V.1 From Steward's Report, Pre-worlds PG Accuracy 2008, Ivanec, Croatia:

20. S7C 2.16.5 Harness & other flying equipment

The rule does not say for example what is the measuring point or what materials or material combinations are allowed. The intention of the rule is good, to protect pilots' spines, but the wording should be reconsidered. (already covered)

21. Judging Team : At the moment the S7C requires 9 members of the judging team (+ minimum 2 reserves) and at least two people to operate the video camera that is now mandatory. This adds up to a team of minimum 13 people, costs of whom are paid by the organiser. This may make it difficult for the organiser to invite judges from several countries. The PLA subcommittee should openly consider how judging is organised in other sports/air sport disciplines, how costs are divided, are there technical solutions that can be used instead. New ideas should naturally not be allowed to lower the good standard of today's PLA judging. (See 19, 20. also) (will be discussed)

22. Pilots' Equipment: The organisers of PG Accuracy competitions rarely check pilots' equipment in more detail than the documentation. If new rules are introduced they must be enforced, such as the one for back protection. It is necessary to give equipment check good time before the flying starts and appoint qualified staff to organise it. (combined with point No. 13?)

V.2 From Jury President's Report, European PG Accuracy 2008, Serbia:

23. Clarification of responsibility for appointing Judging team. Also ensuring S7C complies with 'FAI registered' Judges (as per General Section).(will be discussed)

24. Judging Code needs reviewing in terms of numbers and roles and nationality mix (may be different for Cat 1 and Cat 2 events). Also consider need for whole flight observation role. Consider option for 'conditional' reflight award – giving Judging team time to review a flight when less busy, but without delaying the completion of a round. (will be discussed)

25. Consider specifying minimum standards for helmets (will be discussed).
26. Consider adding to Local Regulations template that organiser specifies typical timings for length of flying days, breaks for Judges etc.(will be discussed)
27. Review/clarification of Chapter 2.21.6 Relaunches – ‘abnormal conditions’ can be difficult to define and therefore to rule on. (will be discussed)

V.3 From Steward’s Report, European PG Accuracy 2008, Niska Banja, Serbia:

28. A CIVL PLA judge database is strongly recommended. It is very difficult to organise an effective judging team to a major competition if there is no database where judges’ experience and contact information is available. At the moment it is the Chief Judge’s responsibility to assemble the judges and to see to that there are enough judges during the competition: S7C 13.2.9: “The Chief Judge is responsible for the following ... assembling and briefing all judges prior to the commencement of the Competition.” This may be difficult is the Chief Judge, although he/she is a part of the organisation, is from another country and there is no judge database. (will be discussed)

29. The subcommittee could consider if there is a need to rotate the start order. Some team leaders commented that it might well happen that same pilots fly in same conditions a number of days. (already covered)

30. The question of female competition was raised, should female pilots fly in one group. On the other hand many female pilots compete against the male pilots, not necessarily against just other female pilots. (already covered)

V.4 From Steward’s Report from Pre-WAG 2008, Avigliana, Italy:

31. CIVL-appointed Judging Team – This worked extremely well, and should be recommended as normal practice. Once the CIVL Judging database is on line, the Chief Judge should be agreed jointly between the Organisers and Steward or PG Accuracy Chairman, and the Chief Judge can then work with all parties and the database to ensure a well qualified team is appointed, and reserve personnel are available, by a deadline, prior to the (Cat 1) event. (will be discussed)

32. Water/Raft landings – If this becomes common practice (it may!), Section 7C will need updating in terms of pilot equipment and Safety provision. S7C 2.16 Flight Safety – This requires an overhaul, particularly regarding 2.16.5. as is, and also with respect to water landings (specification of life jackets). (will be discussed)

VI. PLENARY PROPOSALS

33. Review relevant proposals to the Plenary from delegates: Austria Proposal, Spain Proposal etc.

VII. COMPETITION BIDS

34. Review, evaluate and comment on bids from Czech Republic & FYR Macedonia for 2011 World Paragliding Accuracy Championships

VIII. OTHER ISSUES FOR SC DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

35. Review of other Paragliding Accuracy Events in 2008

Review of PA World Cup 2008 events and plans for 2009.
Review of Coupe Icare demonstration, France, and plans for 2009
Review of Bali Beach Games, 2008

36. Judging Training plan & proposals for 2009.
Proposal for budget for seminars in 2009 to cover seminars in Austria (already planned for March 2009), China and in North America. See Annex.

37. Judges database.
Review of status and action needed.

38. Records & Badges
Review of Records initiative and action proposals.

39. Growth of the discipline
Discussion on growth of Accuracy, issues and approaches. Information on PGA technique seminars for pilots.

IX. CROSS DISCIPLINE ISSUES THAT MIGHT BE RELEVANT

40. Discussion point: Is it a good idea to encourage future bids for joint Aerobatics and Accuracy competitions? Or even to run joint Cat 2 events at suitable venues?

41. Cross chk to other SSC agenda

Reminder:

SSC Written Report to Plenary should include (brief) review of activity during the year, as well as Minutes from this SSC Meeting.

SSC Verbal Report should focus on proposals & decisions not covered in other reports (ie Sporting Code, Safety & Training), highlighting issues that require a vote of approval, plus comments/recommendations on Plenary proposals and Championship bids. NO NEED to read out whole report at Plenary.

Annex to PG Accuracy SC Agenda, February 2009
CIVL Subcommittee – Paragliding Accuracy – Judging Working Group
Judging Seminars & Training: Summary Report for 2008 (DRAFT)

Judging Training & Seminars

Two Judging Seminars were held during 2008: in Malaysia and Montenegro. Further new Judges were trained at ad hoc training sessions in Italy (pre-WAG), Croatia (pre-Worlds) and Serbia (Europeans), run by qualified trainers, but incurring no costs to CIVL. In total, more than 30 Judges received some training, mostly at the starting level, but several receiving more in-depth coaching and experience at international and Cat 1 levels.

Malaysia:

Seminar run by Anton Tursic (SVN) during the Jugra International Selangor Open 2008. 22 Judges attended the evening seminar and the practical sessions during the competition, allowing for plenty of opportunity for observation and participation with rotation of roles. The Judges were very enthusiastic, spoke good English and learned fast. The competition was extremely well run by Col Basir, 'to the rule book', and with support from the local authorities.

Montenegro:

Seminar run by Uga Jondzic (SRB) at Bijelo Polje, Montenegro at this small country's National Championships. The seminar theory was presented in PowerPoint format, translated into Serbian. Six Judges attended the theory session followed by competition practice. Although the event was small, just 14 competitors, 5 full rounds plus a practice round were completed, affording plenty of practice for the trainees. Montenegro is keen to hold further competitions on its home ground, and to send pilots and Judges to international competitions when possible.

2008 Objectives:

- To ensure Paragliding Accuracy Judging Teams operate consistently and to high standards across different nations.
- To provide a Judging training programme and process for countries new to the sport
- To encourage more Judges to train to international standards
- To promote the sport of Paragliding Accuracy to other countries

Direct Results:

- More than 30 people from at least 5 countries attended various Seminar theory and practical training sessions. Most were completely new to Paragliding Accuracy Judging, while at least 5 have now received more advanced training and valuable additional experience.
- Valuable judging experience provided by the seminar training contributed to the success of a high profile Paragliding Accuracy competition in Malaysia. The trainer reported that the organiser is keen to hold further competitions next year.
- Some of these new trainees went on to share their knowledge and experience at further competitions in Indonesia and later at the Bali Beach Games.

- In Montenegro, organisers and newly trained Judges are now far more confident about holding Cat 2 events at an international level. The seminar has increased pilot knowledge of the Rules, which will help Montenegro field a competitive team in international events, including the 2009 World championships.

Indirect/follow on results:

- Judges are beginning to be better recognised for their expertise and professionalism. The International Judging Database will be useful for organisers selecting Judging teams.
- Highlighting of expanded area of current Judging responsibility, observing early part of flight, and its impact on target approach. Plus other areas currently being addressed by the Subcommittee (reflights, safety equipment etc)
- Pilots new to Accuracy, as well as trainee judges attracted to competitions running seminars (Greece, Montenegro).

Future development:

For 2009, we have identified the following needs:

- Broaden the geographic scope of the Seminars to North America
- Consolidate and expand in Europe, particularly aiming at countries new to the sport including possibly Switzerland, France, Greece and others
- Establish high level, international discussions among Senior Judges.
- Ensure that International Judging Log Books are used at all Cat 1 & 2 events
- Ensure judging teams are selected from those on the International Judging Register.

For 2009:

In terms of budget for 2009, the Subcommittee would (still) like to run a seminar in North America (US) and further interest has now been received from Mark Dowsett in California, who is running informal events on the beach!

We also have a request from China to run a seminar alongside one of their planned regional competitions in 2009. China plans to send pilots to the 2009 World Championships for the first time, and has a Wild Card entry to the 2009 World Air Games PG Accuracy event in Avigliana.

In Europe, there is strong interest from Switzerland, Austria and Greece. A Judging seminar is planned in early 2009 in Stubai, Austria, which will also prove an excellent opportunity to promote the discipline in the broader PG community.

Provisional expenditure for CIVL/ARISF Paragliding Accuracy Judging Training in 2008

Budget Allocated	3,800 €		
Expenditure	Travel & Subsistence	Amount in €	Totals
Seminar 1 - Malaysia, May 2008			
Air fare & subsistence, Anton Tursic	€1074.67	€1074.67	€1074.67
Non refundable element of Violeta's cancelled flight	£582.50	€699	€699*
Seminar 2 – Montenegro, November 2008			
Travel km claim (720km -Uga Jondzic)	€222	222.00€	€222.00
Total		1995.67 €	1995.67 €

NB Final figures for 2008 expenditure not known at this time. But likely to be less than budget allocated. Estimated at around 2000€.

*Violeta Masteikeine was originally scheduled to run this Seminar but had to cancel due to health problems. Despite insurance, not all of the flight costs were refunded.

Budget request for 2009 CIVL/ARISF Paragliding Accuracy Judging Training Seminars

1. Travel & Subsistence to China for Judging Trainer (date to be agreed)	1200€
2. Travel & Subsistence to USA for Judging Trainer	1200€
3. Travel & subsistence for European trainer from Slovenia to Austria	300€
Total:	<u>2700€</u>

It is proposed that CIVL contribution is 50% of this sum, the other 50% funded by ARISF from unspent funds allocated over the past 4 years.