

ANNEX A SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT For IGC Plenary 2002

Chairman: Bob Henderson

Members: Ake Pettersson, Roland Stuck, and Denis Flament

IGC Competitions During 2001

Four IGC Championships have been held since the March 2001 IGC meeting:

- The 2nd WAG (3rd World Class and 1st 18M Class) in Lillo, Spain
- The 1st World Women's Championships in Pociunia, Lithuania
- The 2nd World Junior Championships in Issoudun, France
- The 27th World Gliding Championships in Mafikeng, South Africa

Feedback From the Championships

A number of issues regarding Rules arose at these Championships. These included:

- Conflicion about the use of the MoP constituting an outlanding
- The desirability that the units of measurement be defined
- A lack of agreement with the requirement to use more than one task-type
- A lack of clarity of regarding starting and the TDT task
- The need to consult different documents and document parts to find a rule
- The need for a competent PR facility
- The need to provide for sustainer-powered MG to provide an FR record
- The way in which multiple start points are organised
- The value of the penalty for airspace infringement
- The desirability of an appendix to explain the scoring methodology

These issues have all, we believe, been dealt with under the proposed amendments submitted to the Bureau for consideration. In addition, one recommendation was that Annex A should be the only document needed for rule interpretation, and this is, in fact, the direction that the Annex is heading.

Amendments to Annex A

A number of proposals to amend Annex A have been tabled with the Bureau. A summary of the amendments is provided identifying the 'Editorial' and 'Substantial' proposals which are intended for implementation on 1 October 2002, the Substantial amendments proposed for implementation in October 2003, and two other non-Annex A proposals from the Committee. The Bureau has reviewed the Editorial proposals while the substantial proposals are tabled for consideration by the Plenary in accordance with the agreed Sporting Code change process.

The significant substantial proposals are:

- A complete revision of the Start, Task and Scoring sections including Place, Distance and Team scoring
- The re-formatting of the Annex A to the same layout as the Sporting Code
- The identification of 'information' as separate text

Three discussion papers have been circulated on the IGC website for consideration. These discuss: possible resolutions to the vexing question of Team Flying and the number of entries per class; the various options for the management of the maximum

allowable Aircraft Weight at championships; and, options for reducing the cost of the International Jury.

As a result proposals have been tabled which request that the Delegates vote on a number of options to determine how we manage the number of entries, whether we place limits on the maximum aircraft weight, and the selection and funding of the Jury. In addition, the IGC Steward Handbook, held over from last year, is tabled for acceptance.

The various proposals have been organised into individual documents to allow the background and justification for the proposals to be developed. The drawback of this is that there are links between some of the proposals. This could result in some subsequent editorial alterations being required, particularly if not all the proposals are accepted.

General

The work on the Annex has, over the last year, been extensive. The development of these proposals has taken up a significant amount of time during the year and I am very grateful to the committee members for their work. I wish to specifically acknowledge the enthusiasm of Denis for his efforts in revising the Tasks and Scoring sections, Ake for his tenacity in preparing the discussion papers on Team Flying and Aircraft Weight and Roland for being ever vigilant and critically reviewed the suggestions and proposals as they have been developed.

We strongly recommend that the Plenary accept the proposals to modify the format of the Annex and to separate the 'rules' from the 'explanatory text' with effect from 1 October 2002. While this will create a significant workload for us this year, it will allow the Annex to mature to what we believe will be a much more user-friendly document, which is vital if it is to be accepted as the only set of Rules which are used for IGC competitions.

We are all available to continue on this subcommittee.

Bob Henderson
Chairman
Annex A Subcommittee

ANNEX A COMMITTEE SUMMARY

10th January 2002

Register of Amendments to Annex A – Submitted to the IGC Bureau

Editorial Amendments – Effective from 1 October 2002 – to be approved by the Bureau

Ref No:	Annex A Reference	Summary	Bureau Decision
0201	Contents of Annex A	Revision of the contents of Annex A into 10 Parts with rules grouped to follow a more logical progression.	
0202	3.1	Addition of statement of approval of Annex A by the IGC plenary and the combination of 3.1 and 3.1.1	
0203	3.2, 3.2.1, 3.3 & 3.4	Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.2.1 are combined; and, paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 are combined	
0204	4.3, 4.4 & 4.5	Paragraphs 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 are combined and reworded	
0205	5.1.1 & 5.1.2	Paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 are combined	
0206	5.2	The addition of text from FAI Sporting Code, General Section, Chap 4, to add heading and note that Stewards and Jury Members may not be involved operationally in the organisation	
0208	5.3.5	Paragraphs 5.3.5.1 and 5.3.5.2 are combined under 5.3.5	
0209	7.5 and 8.1.1	Paragraph 7.5 is moved and combined with 8.1.1	
0210 v2	9.1	Paragraph 9.1 is expanded to clarify the requirement that the competitors be drug free	
0211 v2	10.1, 10.3 & 10.4	10.1.3 deleted; 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 renumbered; and, 10.3 and 10.4 are combined. MoP added to configuration in 10.3.1 as an option	
0212 v2	14.1.1	Clarification of the status of penalties listed in Annex A and reference to the Sporting Code, General Section, 5.2 for guidance	
0213 v2	14.4.4	Deletion of paragraph 14.4.4	
0214	18.1	Addition of requirement to state units of measurement and times at briefing	
0215 v2	19.7 & 19.8	Moving rules regarding task safety to the safety section and clarifying the definition of the minimum leg length	
0216 v2	16.8, 20.2.3, & 20.2.7	Editorial correction to 16.8 and the addition of definitions for release area and contest site	
0217 v3	20.4.9 & 20.4.10	Additional text added to 20.4.9 to prevent the inadvertent crossing of the start line from invalidating a previously valid start and editorial change to 20.4.10	
0218 v2	20.5	The addition of a requirement to avoid placing Turn Points and Assigned Areas close to Start Points and to avoid creating overlapping Assigned Areas	
0219 v3	20.5.4	The definition of an Assigned Area (moved from 19.4.2) plus the addition of an area being defined by GNSS co-ordinates	
0220 v2	20.7	The revision of this section to provide clarity to the finish requirements	
0222	22.1.7 & 22.2.8	Change of name for the list of penalties	
0246	20.3.6	The addition of requirements for providing a FR baseline for gliders with sustainer engines	

Substantial Amendments –Effective from 1 October 2002 – to be approved by the Plenary

Ref No:	Annex A Reference	Summary	Plenary Decision
0207 v2	5.3	Revision of the mechanism for the appointment of Members of the International Jury	
0221 v2	21.2.1	The application of handicapping and World Class requirements to the minimum marking distance	
0223	4.2 and 4.6	Deletion of paragraphs 4.2 and 4.6	
0224	5.2	Consolidation of requirements relating to Stewards	
0225 v2	16.2	The review of the options relating to the imposition of limits on the maximum take-off weight	
0226 v2	19	The revision of the existing section on Tasks to follow-up on IGC plenary requirements from 2001 and to provide clarity <i>[see also 0244]</i>	
0227 v2	20.3 & 20.3.2	Provision of rule to cover the failure of both FRs and change to the GNSS approval date	
0228 v2	20.4.1 & 20.4.4	The revision of rules regarding Start Procedures to provide clarity	
0229	20.4.6	Clarifying the use of the event marker and the 15-minute rule	
0230 v2	20.6	The revision of this section to incorporate the full use of GNSS position and time for determining the final position of the glider and definition of the contest area (transferred from 21.3)	
0231	22.1.7 & 22.2.8	Alignment of penalties for both starting and flying above the altitude limit	
0232 v2	21 & 22	Revision of scoring rules and algorithms as proposed to the Plenary 2001 <i>[see also 0245]</i>	
0233 v2	21 & 22	The inclusion of a “joker” rule for scoring	
0234	All of Annex A	To align Annex A terminology with FAI documents and the application of ‘English’ spelling conventions to the Annex	
0235	Layout of Annex A	Revision of the layout of Annex A to align to the numbering layout of the Sporting Code, and separate the text into “Rules” and “explanatory text”	
0244	19	An alternative amendment to 0226 v2 to simplify the Tasks being offered and the requirements of each Task	
0245	21 & 22	An alternative amendment for Scoring to 0332 v2 to support the Tasks proposed in amendment 0244	

Substantial Amendments – Effective 1 October 2003 – to be approved by the Plenary

Ref No:	Annex A Reference	Summary	Plenary Decision
0236	3.3	Addition to existing text in Rule 3.3 to establish a minimum length for an IGC sanctioned competition	
0237	4.2	Addition of requirement for Organisers to provide competent PR facilities in accordance with the Sporting Code requirements	
0238	5.3	Consolidation of requirements relating to the International Jury	
0239 v2	20.4	Starting Options	
0240 v2	6, 7, & 20	To confirm the status of Champions as individuals or “teams” and reduce the level of gagging	

Non Annex A Proposals – to be approved by the Plenary

Ref No:	Effective	Summary	Bureau Opinion	Plenary Decision
0241	1 Apr 02	The acceptance of the IGC Steward Handbook, draft version 4		
0242	1 Apr 02	The review of the use of IGC sanction fees to assist Organisers fund the International Jury		

Notes:

1. *Versions containing changes, incorporated since the amendments were originally submitted to the Bureau, are denoted by ‘v2’ and ‘v3’*
2. *Amendment 0243 has been incorporated into amendment 0207 v2*
3. *Editorial amendments are provided for information only. The Bureau will approve them.*

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0201	Annex A Contents	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Revision of the contents of Annex A into 10 Parts with rules grouped to follow a more logical progression	Reason: Improve readability of Annex A
--	--

Recommendation: It is recommended that the contents of Annex A be grouped as shown on the attached page.
--

Decision of IGC Bureau: <i>Type of Amendment:</i> <i>Recommendation:</i> Date
--

Background: Annex A has been subject to criticism as being hard to read and difficult to find specific rules. The proposal intends to reorganize the Annex to make it more user friendly. There are no rules changed by this proposal, therefore it is seen as an “editorial change” only.
--

Comment: <i>Annex A Group supports this amendment</i> Note the subjects covered within each Part may vary slightly depending on decisions taken regarding other amendments being proposed to Annex A. Other amendments tabled for Annex A for consideration will retain the existing (1 Oct 2001 edition) numbering to avoid confusion. Refer also to the proposal to separate the rules and explanatory text in amendment 0235.

Annex A - Contents for 2002 Edition

Part 1 - General

Championship
Objectives of the Championships
General Requirements
Championship Classes
Responsibilities of the Organisers
Definitions

Part 2 - Championship Officials

The Championships Director
Stewards
International Jury

Part 3 - National Teams

Selection of Teams
Entry
Qualifications
Insurance
Team Captain's Responsibilities
Registration

Part 4 - Technical Requirements

Gliders and Equipment
Contest Numbers

Part 5 - General Flying Requirements

Safety
Aircraft Weight Limits
External Aid to Competitors
Briefing

Part 6 - General Flying Procedures

General Control Procedures
The Launch Grid
Launching and Aero Tow Procedures
General Start Procedures
Outlandings
General Finishing procedures
Aero Tow Retrieves
Flight Documentation

Part 7 – General Task Procedures

Starts
Turn Point or Assigned Area Procedures
Outlandings
Finishes

Part 8 – Type of Tasks

Tasks

Part 9 – Scoring, Penalties, Complaints, Protests

General Requirements
Common Rules
Calculation of Distance Scores
Calculation of 1000 Point Scores
Calculation of Place Scores
Calculation of team scores
Penalties and Disqualification
Complaints
Protests
Treatment of Protests
Appeals

Part 10 - Results And Prizegiving

Results
Prizegiving

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0202	3.1 & 3.1.1	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Addition of statement of approval of Annex A by the IGC plenary and integration of 3.1.1 into 3.1	Reason: Clarification of the status of Annex A as an approved document and removal of unnecessary paragraphing
--	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that 3.1 be amended by the addition of the words in bold, and 3.1.1 be combined to read as follows:

*3.1 The Championships shall be controlled in accordance with the FAI Sporting Code, General Section and Section 3 (Gliders & Motor Gliders), and specifically with Chapter 7 of Section 3 and with this document which is **approved by the IGC plenary and which** constitutes Annex A to Section 3. ~~3.1.1~~ Any competitor or Team Captain violating or tolerating the violation of these rules shall be suspended or disqualified from the Championships.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

Now that all IGC approved championships are required to be run according to Annex A it is felt that the formal status of the Annex as an IGC approved document needed to be clearly stated.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0203	3.2, 3.2.1, 3.3 & 3.4	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.2.1 are combined; and, paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 are combined	Reason: Unnecessary paragraphing of the text
--	--

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>It is recommended that:</p> <p>a) Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.2.1 be combined to read:</p> <p><i>3.2 The winner in each class is the pilot having the highest total score, obtained by adding the pilot's points for each championships day. In case of a tie, see paragraph 15.2.3. The winner in each class will be awarded the title of World (or Continental eg 'European' etc.) Champion, provided that there have been at least four championship days (see 21.2.1) in that class.</i></p> <p>b) Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 be combined to read:</p> <p>3.3 The total period of the event shall not exceed 16 days including two days on which the Opening and the Closing Ceremonies are held. At least one non-flying rest day shall be given during the period, although the Organizers may declare further rest days for stated reasons such as pilot fatigue. An official practice period of about seven days immediately preceding the opening of the Championships shall be made available to all competitors.</p>

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

<p>Background:</p> <p>Reducing unnecessary paragraphing of the text.</p>

<p>Comment:</p> <p><i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i></p> <p>Consequential amendment – renumbering paragraphs following</p> <p>See also amendment 0236, which proposes a minimum length of contest for paragraph 3.3</p>
--

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0204	4.3, 4.4 and 4.5	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
Paragraphs 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 are combined and reworded	To clarify the responsibilities of the Organisers

Recommendation:

It is recommended that paragraphs 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 be combined (with additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) to read:

4.34.4 *The **Organizers** shall provide:*

- a. **All** facilities necessary for the satisfactory operation of the Championships.*
- b. **Each** competitor and Team Captain with all complementary information upon arrival at the contest site, including a large scale map section showing each of the start, turn and control points, and an electronic version of the start, turn point and control point data base in the IGC standard file format for turn point data files.*
- c. Full meteorological information ~~shall be provided~~ during the Championships, access to which shall be available to competitors and assistants in addition to briefing material supplied to the competitors.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

Reducing unnecessary paragraphing of the text.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Consequential amendment – renumbering follow paragraphs and correct numbering of substantial amendment 0237 which amends paragraph 4.4 to include PR requirements

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0205	5.1.1 & 5.1.2	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 are combined	Reason: Unnecessary paragraphing of the text
--	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.2.1 be combined to read:

5.1.1 The Championship Director shall be in overall operational charge of the Championships and be approved by the IGC. He shall have a Deputy Director and Technical Officials to assist him. The Championship Director is responsible for good management and the smooth and safe running of the Championships.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

Reducing unnecessary paragraphing of the text

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Consequential amendment – renumbering of the paragraphs following

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0206	5.2	Editorial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>The addition of text from FAI Sporting Code, General Section, Chapter 4, to clearly state that Stewards and Jury Members may not be involved operationally in the organisation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>The roles of the Stewards and Jury Members are incompatible with them being directly involved in National team activities or directly assisting the Organisers to run the event. They need to be seen to be impartial and neutral.</p>
--	---

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Add the following text as a new heading at 5.2:</p> <p>5.2 <i><u>Stewards and Jury Members</u></i> <i>Stewards and Jury Members may not be competitors, nor hold any operational position in the organisation.</i></p>
--

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

<p>Background:</p> <p>This statement has been added as a result of feedback on the proposed IGC Steward Handbook that expressed concern that occasionally Stewards and Jury Members had, at previous championships, not been seen to remain impartial and neutral.</p>

<p>Comment:</p> <p><i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i></p> <p>Consequential amendment - renumber paragraphs following for Stewards and International Jury</p> <p>Note, other amendments also change text and numbering of section 5.2 and 5.3. Refer to amendments 0207, 0208, 0224, and 0238</p>
--

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0208	5.3.5	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Paragraphs 5.3.5.1 and 5.3.5.2 are combined under 5.3.5	Reason: Unnecessary paragraphing of the text
--	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that paragraphs 5.3.5.1 and 5.3.5.2 be combined to read:

5.3.5 Dissolution of the International Jury The Jury shall only cease its functions after it has given its decision on all protests that have been correctly made. If no protests are outstanding it shall not cease its functions until the time limit set for the receipt of protests following the last task. The last action of the Jury is to approve the competition results of the Championships and declare the Championships valid, providing they have been conducted in accordance with the rules and the decisions of the Jury.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

Reducing unnecessary paragraphing of the text

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Note the numbering changes that will be effective if amendment 0206 and 0238 are accepted

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0209	7.5 & 8.1.1	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
Paragraph 7.5 is moved and combined with 8.1.1	The content of 7.5 (Conditions of Entry) sits more appropriately with the provisions of 8.1.1

Recommendation:
It is recommended that paragraph 7.5 be incorporated in paragraph 8.1.1 (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) so that 8.1.1 reads: <i>8.1.1 The Team Captain, the competitors and their crew members, by virtue of entering, agree agrees to be bound by these Rules and the Local Procedures issued for the Championship, and by any rulings and requirements stated by the Organisers at any briefings. They are also are deemed to accept, without reservation, any consequences resulting from the event (for instance see 12 on insurance).</i>

Decision of IGC Bureau:
Type of Amendment:
Recommendation:
Date

Background:
Unnecessary separation of requirements.

Comment:
<i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i>

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0210 v2	9.1	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Paragraph 9.1 is revised to clarify the requirement that the competitors be drug free	Reason: The existing wording is unclear as to whether the requirements apply to pilots <u>and</u> members of the team.
--	--

Recommendation: It is recommended that paragraph 9.1 be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) so that it reads: <i>9.1 The Team Captain represents his NAC and is the liaison between the Organizers and his team members. He should endeavour to ensure their proper conduct and that the pilots they do not fly if ill or under the influence of alcohol or drugs, or suffering from any disability which might endanger the pilot or others.</i>
--

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Background: Drug testing has become part of international gliding and Annex A needs to reflect the fact that the FAI Sporting Code General Section applies anti-doping requirements to competitors only.
--

Comment: <i>Annex A Group supports this amendment, and notes that the normal rules of the land still apply to the crew regarding being under the influence of alcohol</i> <u>Revision Status:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version 2 revises this amendment to apply specifically to the competitors.
--

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0211 v2	10.1, 10.3 & 10.4	Editorial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>10.1.3 is deleted, 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 are renumbered, and 10.3 and 10.4 are combined. In addition an option is provided to add MoP 10.3.1 as being part of configuration</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>10.1.3 contains suggested advice and most devices now incorporate audio output. The contents of 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 are not sub-parts of 10.1, but do form part of the requirements for scrutineering and the paragraphing of the text into 10.3 and 10.4 is unnecessary.</p> <p>With motor gliders now incorporated with gliders it may be appropriate to note that the MoP is part of configuration and cannot, therefore, be removed during a competition.</p>
---	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that:

- a) Paragraph 10.1.3 be deleted; paragraphs 10.1.1 and 10.1.2 be renumbered as 10.3.2 and 10.3.3; and paragraphs 10.3 and 10.4 be combined as follows (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout):

~~10.1.3 To encourage lookout, audio outputs from variometers, GNSS nav devices and glide computers are strongly recommended.~~

10.3 Each sailplane shall be made available to the Organizers at least 72 hours before the briefing on the first championship day for an acceptance check in the configuration in which it will be flown. This configuration shall be kept unchanged during the whole competition. ~~10.4~~ The Organizers have the right to inspect a competing sailplane at any time during the Championship up to the Prize Giving.

~~10.3.2~~~~10.1.1~~ No instruments permitting pilots to fly without visual reference to the ground may be carried on board, even if made unserviceable. The Organizers may specify instruments covered by this rule.

~~10.3.3~~~~10.1.2~~ Any navigational equipment is permitted.

- b) Paragraph 10.3.1 be amended as follows to include MoP:

*10.3.1 Configuration refers to the shape and dimensions of the primary structure of the sailplane, ~~including~~ and **includes** movable controlling surfaces, landing gear, winglets, and wing tip extensions **and MoP**. The configuration is considered to be changed if the shape or dimensions of the primary structure are altered.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date**Background:**

Unnecessary separation of requirements, and the deletion of redundant information.

The addition of the MoP to the configuration is suggested because the sailplane is required to be scrutineered in the configuration in which it will fly in a contest. If the sailplane is a motor-glider there may be implications about the maximum weight at which it may be flown, for example 850 kg (motor) vs 750 kg (non-motor) in the Open Class. Thus it is suggested that it is not appropriate for the motor-glider to have the MoP removed (or reinstalled) during the contest. This would alter the minimum wing loading and the maximum weight at which the aircraft was operated. The parallel example is for winglets, which competitors are not allowed to remove and install during a contest because they alter the sailplane drag characteristics.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Concern has been expressed at competitions during 2001 that the 72-hour requirement for scrutineering is insufficient. It is noted that the rule states “at least 72 hours before” and that Organisers need to ensure that they commence scrutineering in sufficient time and communicate their requirements to the Team Captains.

Consequential amendment – renumbered paragraphs following

Revision Status:

- Version 2 includes the addition of the MoP as a separate option

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0212 v2	14.1.1	Editorial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>Clarification of the status of penalties listed in Annex A and guidance for Organisers in applying discretionary penalties</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>Concern arose at events during 2001 regarding the value of penalties given for offences and the status of the penalties listed in Annex A. The intention in providing a list of penalties was to provide standard penalties for offences, not as a guide for Organisers to select from as they wished. The proposed wording clarifies this intent and refers Organisers to the Sporting Code – General Section for guidance.</p>
--	---

Recommendation:

It is recommended that 14.1.1 be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) as follows:

*14.1.1 The Championship Director may impose penalties for infringement of the rules. The severity of the penalties **ranges** from a minimum of a warning to disqualification as appropriate to the offence. **The penalties imposed by the Championship Director shall be in accordance with the appropriate list of** ~~Lists of standard~~ penalties ~~stated are given~~ in section 22. Offences not covered by this list may be penalized at the Championships Director's discretion **in accordance with the provisions of the Sporting Code, General Section 5.2.***

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

The FAI Sporting Code, General Section, 5.2 (quoted below) requires that all penalties should carry a loss of points, and some, such as airspace infringements should result in disqualification. Annex A provides a warning as a minimum penalty and follows the guidance of the Sporting Code in the value of penalties stated.

5.2 PENALTIES AND DISQUALIFICATIONS

5.2.1 The Director of a Sporting Event may penalise a competitor as described in the rules for the event. These penalties may be in the form of an operational disadvantage, deduction of points, alteration of placing order, disqualification, or any other penalty designated by the Air Sport Commission concerned.

5.2.2 SEVERITY OF PENALTIES. The severity of the penalties which may be imposed may range from a minimum loss of points to disqualification indicated below, as appropriate to the offence.

5.2.2.1 Technical Infringements. Technical infringements of rules or failure to comply with requirements caused by mistake or inadvertence where no advantage has accrued or could have accrued to the competitor concerned should, as a guide, carry penalties leading to a reduction of not less than 2% of the best score or maximum available score for the task.

5.2.2.2 Serious Infringements. Serious infringements, including dangerous or hazardous actions or repetitions of lesser infringements should, as a guide, carry minimum penalties leading to a reduction of not less than 5% of the best score or maximum score for the task.

5.2.2.3 Unsporting Behaviour. Cheating or unsporting behaviour, including deliberate attempts to deceive or mislead officials, wilful interference with other competitors, falsification of documents, use of forbidden equipment or prohibited drugs, violations of airspace, or repeated serious infringements of rules should, as a guide, result in disqualification from the sporting event.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment. It is noted that concern was raised at one event during 2001 regarding the 'harshness' of a disqualification as a penalty for airspace infringement. The SC-GS 5.2.2.3 establishes this as an appropriate penalty. In addition, the Annex A Group notes that airspace infringements have the potential to create a significant level of risk between a glider and a commercial aircraft.

The Plenary may wish to consider a graded penalty for infringing airspace just as a graded penalty is provided for altitude infringements. However, it is suggested that the task of avoiding altitude restrictions is relatively easy as the necessary information is available directly and very accurately, from the altimeter. The ability of the pilot to position their aircraft on the edge, but clear of, restricted airspace is a rather more difficult navigational task.

This difference is recognised in the management of airspace with commercial aircraft being provided with only 500 ft (152 m) vertical protection from the airspace floor while the lateral protection is 5 nm (9.2 km) from the edge of airspace.

As a result it is suggested that Organisers could establish a 'buffer' around the edges of closed or restricted airspace of, say 0.5km. Competitors entering this buffer could be given a warning. This would, effectively, create a graded penalty for this offence.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 adds further discussion under "Comment"

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0213 v2	14.4.4	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Deletion of paragraph 14.4.4	Reason: Redundant statement regarding the majority for a 3-person jury
---	--

Recommendation: It is recommended that paragraph 14.4.4 be deleted in total: 14.4.4 A protest requires a 2/3 majority to succeed.
--

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Background: This requirement applied to the Representative Jury where all Team Captains at the event formed the Jury. Having a 2/3rds majority requirement avoided decisions being made on a simple majority. The 3-person Nominated Jury has overtaken this requirement because the simple majority is, by default, 2/3rds.
--

Comment: <i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i> Consequential amendment – renumber the following paragraph <u>Revision Status:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Version 2 provides additional “Background”

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0214	18.1	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Addition of requirement for Organisers to state units of measurement and time at briefing if not covered in Local Procedures	Reason: To ensure understanding of definitions of units and time – feedback from 2001 events
---	--

Recommendation: <p>It is recommended that paragraph 18.1 be amended (additions in bold) to read:</p> <p><i>18.1 During the training and championship flying periods, a briefing shall be held each morning at which full meteorological and operational information appropriate to the task of the day shall be given. This shall include units of measurement and times as appropriate if not already stated in the Local Procedures.</i></p>

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Background: This amendment is proposed following feedback from the Officials at the WAG in 2001.
--

Comment: <i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i>
--

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0215 v2	19.7 & 19.8	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Moving rules 19.7 & 19.8, regarding task safety, to the safety section (16)	Reason: Collection of all safety requirements together and clarification of the intended minimum leg length if the task includes Assigned Areas.
--	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that 19.7 and 19.8 be moved to Section 16 – Safety and that 19.8 be amended as shown (additions in bold):

***16.9.2** ~~19.7~~ A task shall not be cancelled unless 16.9 applies, or the weather deteriorates so that the task may not reasonably be attempted.*

***16.10** ~~19.8~~ Where possible the classes shall fly different tasks with turn points or assigned areas chosen to minimise any head-on conflicts on each leg and to avoid legs of less than 50 km **between turn points or the centre of any assigned areas**. This minimum distance requirement shall not apply to the leg from the last Turn Point or control point to the nominated final Turn Point.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

Reducing unnecessary separation of the rules.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Note: Amendment 0219 v3 requires that a central position be nominated for Assigned Areas regardless of the shape of the area. Section 19 is also substantially amended by 0226 v2 and 0244.

Consequential amendment – revise numbering of the remainder of Section 16.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 clarifies the minimum distance between Assigned Areas

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0216 v2	16.8, 20.2.3, 20.2.7	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
The addition definitions for release area and contest site	Clarification is required for these terms in the rules. 16.8 is included to amend “release zone” to “release area” for consistency with the rest of the Annex.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following amendments (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) be adopted:

*16.8 The Organizers shall ensure that the release ~~zones~~ **areas** and the release altitudes for launching are selected to enable competitors to land safely for a relaunch prior to the start, after allowing adequate time and altitude to search for lift after release, within the confines of the designated contest site boundaries (see 20.2.7).*

*20.2.3 Towing patterns, release areas, and release height or altitude shall be given at Briefing. **The Release Area is defined as a geographical area within which the glider must be released from the tow plane, or the MoP must be shut down for a motor glider.** The release areas shall be separated by at least 5 Km and a release area shall only be used by one Class at a time. A release area may be used by a subsequent Class once the start gate for the initial Class in that same area has opened.*

*20.2.7 **The Contest Site Boundary defines the geographical area, or areas, near the departure airfield and the start points, within which a competitor may land, prior to starting, and be entitled to another launch.** A competitor landing outside the contest site boundaries after a regular launch shall not have any further competition launch on that day. Contest site boundaries shall be designated by the Organizers and displayed on a map.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

These definitions are provided to clarify the use of the phrases in the Annex.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 clarifies the definition of the “Release Area”

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0217 v3	20.4.9 & 20.4.10	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: 20.4.9 rewritten to prevent the inadvertent crossing of the start line from invalidating a previously valid start, and editorial change to 20.4.10	Reason: To clarify the definition of a new valid start in 20.4.9 and to redefine the start options in 20.4.10
---	---

Recommendation: <p>It is recommended that the existing 20.4.9 and 20.4.10 be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) as shown:</p> <p><i>20.4.9 A new valid start invalidates all previous performances of the day. Crossing a start line after passing through the observation zone of a turn point or an assigned area is an invalid start unless the crossing time correlates with the pilot nominated start time (see 20.4.7).</i></p> <p><i>20.4.10 If start option 3 or 4 are (c) is used, a valid start at an incorrect start point may be penalized.</i></p>

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Background: <p>Clarifying the selection of a start to avoid subsequent crossing of a start line from deleting performance.</p> <p>The start options in 20.4.10 are revised in line with the proposals contained in amendment 0228 v2.</p>

Comment: <p><i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i></p> <p><u>Revision Status:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Version 2 revises the text in 20.4.9 • Version 3 revises the start options in 20.4.10

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0218 v2	20.5	Editorial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>The addition of a requirement to avoid placing Turn Points and Assigned Areas close to Start Points and to avoid having consecutive Assigned Areas overlapping</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>The use of Assigned Areas and Turn Points close to the start and large and/ or adjacent and overlapping Assigned Areas may create scoring problems</p>
--	---

Recommendation:

It is recommended that a new rule be added as paragraph 20.5.5, as follows:

20.5.5 Organizers must avoid setting Turn Points or Assigned Areas close to Start Points. Assigned Areas that follow one another should not overlap.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

A problem with task-setting/ scoring was identified during 2001 where Organisers had overlapping Assigned Areas. This amendment is proposed to bring this potential problem to the attention of Organisers.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Consequential amendment – renumber the existing 20.5.5 and 20.5.6

Revision Status:

- Version 2 clarifies the amendment

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0219 v3	20.5.4	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
The definition of an Assigned Area (moved from 19.4.2) plus the addition of an area being defined by GNSS co-ordinates	Subsequential amendment to 0226, which rewrote the Tasks section and the need to define a point as the Area Centre to enable task distance calculation.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that section 20.5 be amended (including text from 19.4.2) (additions in bold, deletions in strikethrough) and the definition of an area by GNSS co-ordinates be added for completeness as follows:

20.5 Start, Turn Point, ~~or~~ Area, and Finish Procedures Verification

~~20.5.1 Turn Points shall be identifiable points on the ground.~~

~~20.5.2 The sailplane shall pass through the turn points or areas in the correct sequence if any is required by the type of task designated by the Organizers.~~

~~20.5.3~~ **20.5.1** The Observation Zone for a GNSS Turn Point shall be a cylinder of radius 0.5 km, centered on the turn point.

~~20.5.4~~ **20.5.2** An Assigned Area shall be defined by a GNSS central position, which lies within the boundaries of the Observation Zone, and which shall be formed by:

- a. A circle of a given radius, centred on the central GNSS position, or
- b. A continuous line joining at least three sets of GNSS co-ordinates, with the central GNSS position being equidistant from each side of the Area, or
- c. Two radials originating at the competition site, or any other designated point, intersecting with arcs located between a minimum and/ or maximum distance from the site or from the designated point, with the central GNSS position lying on the bisector of the radials halfway between the minimum and maximum defined distances.

~~20.5.5~~ **20.5.3** A **Start, Turn Point or Area rounding, or a Finish**, is valid if the GNSS FR shows a valid fix or a straight line between two subsequent valid fixes **crossing the Start Line**, within the Observation Zone, **or crossing the Finish Line, respectively.**

~~20.5.6~~ **20.5.4** If there is no proof that the competitor passed through the Observation Zone ~~of a turn point or a area, or crossed the Start or Finish Line~~, the rounding **of the Turn Point or Assigned Area, or crossing of the Line** may be validated if the competitor was within 500m of the boundary of the ~~turn point or area~~ Observation Zone, **Start Line or Finish Line**, but a penalty shall be applied.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date**Background:**

Amendment 0226 proposes new definitions of Tasks, and the use of the centre point of an Assigned Area is part of the simplification of measuring the distance flown by the competitor. The definition of an Assigned Area by latitude and longitude is included for completeness.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment. However, for simplicity, the Group would prefer that Assigned Areas be defined by circles based on a GNSS position.

Consequential amendment – renumbering paragraphs in 19.4

Revision Status:

- Version 2 – dated 18 November 2001 – clarified this amendment in parallel with amendment 0226 – Tasks and 0232 – Scoring.
- Version 3 deletes reference to geographical co-ordinates and defines the centre of the Assigned Areas

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0220 v2	20.7	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: The revision of this section to provide clarity to the text regarding finish procedures, and the deletion of redundant text	Reason: Sections of the existing text are repetitive and do not reflect current practice
--	--

Recommendation: It is recommended that section 20.7 (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) be amended as follows: 20.7 <u>Finishing</u> 20.7.1 <i>General</i> 20.7.1.1 The finish line shall be either The Organizers shall select one finish procedure for every task from the following options: a) Finish Line: <i>A straight line at the elevation of the airfield clearly identifiable on the ground. The straight finish line may not exceed 1,000 m in length, and The finish line shall be so placed that sailplanes can safely land beyond it. A maximum altitude (QNH) and a minimum height (AGL) should be imposed for crossing the finish line.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A finish is valid if the sailplane crosses the finish line, unassisted, in the direction specified at briefing.</i> <i>Competitors crossing the finish line below the minimum height, except for straight-in landings, shall be penalized.</i> <i>The Organizers may establish a number of final Turn Points (control points) to align the sailplanes with the desired direction of finish.</i> b) Finish Ring: <i>A ring of specified radius around the finish point at a specified distance. The finish ring shall be at least of 3 km radius and encompass encompassing the airfield and the landing circuits. Maximum and minimum altitudes (QNH) shall be imposed for crossing the finish ring.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>A finish is valid if the sailplane crosses the ring above the minimum altitude.</i> <i>Competitors crossing the finish ring below the minimum altitude, except for straight-in landings, shall be penalized.</i>
--

~~20.7.1.1.1 The Organizers may establish a number of final turn points or control points prior to the finish line to align the sailplanes with the desired direction of finish.~~

~~20.7.1.2 When the straight line option is used a finish is valid if the sailplane crosses the finish line unassisted, in the direction specified at briefing. However, a sailplane landing back at the airfield without crossing the finish line shall be deemed to have finished and shall be given as finish time the time at which the glider stopped moving plus five minutes. A maximum height for crossing the finish line shall be stated in the Local Procedures, and a minimum height may be imposed. Non-compliance may be penalized.~~

~~20.7.1.3 When the ring option is used a finish is valid if the sailplane crosses the ring boundary unassisted and at a minimum QNH altitude specified in the Local Procedures. This minimum altitude should be significantly higher than the landing circuit altitude so that sailplanes can safely come back to the airfield and land after crossing it. Crossing the finish ring below minimum altitude shall be penalized.~~

20.7.1.2 The Goal is the center of the finish line or the finish ring. The last leg distance is assessed from the defined position of the last Turn Point or Assigned Area, to the Goal, less the radius of the finish ring in option (b).

- **The finish time is defined as the time the sailplane first crosses the finish line or finish ring after completing the task.**
- **A sailplane landing back at the airfield without crossing the finish line, or finish ring, shall be deemed to have finished and shall be given as finish time the time at which the glider stopped moving plus five minutes.**

20.7.1.4 3 Competitors shall announce their arrival on the finish line frequency by giving their contest number and the distance to go. The acceptance reply will be the contest number. The Local Procedures shall state the procedure in detail.

~~20.7.1.5 4 All crossings of the finish line shall be manually timed. as backup for the GNSS timing.~~

20.7.1.6 5 The finish line officials shall repeatedly announce strength and direction of the wind, together with other significant meteorological data at the contest site.

20.7.1.7 6 The finish line shall be closed at sunset, or when all competitors are accounted for, or when there is no more possibility of gaining speed points, or at a set time announced at briefing. Competitors still on task after closure of the finish line shall be considered as outlanded at the last valid GNSS fix immediately preceding the closure time.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Background:

These changes are made to provide clarity. The length of the finish line is deleted, as are the complex requirements for closure of the finish line, and the requirements existing at the time of the closure of the finish line are consolidated.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 consolidates information about maximum and minimum altitudes and heights for the line and ring

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0222	22.1.7 & 22.2.8	Editorial	1 October 2002

Summary: Change of name for the list of penalties	Reason: To clarify the fact that the penalties are IGC approved
---	---

Recommendation: It is recommended that the names of the rules be changed as follows (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout): a) 22.1.7 List of Approved Standard Penalties b) 22.2.8 List of Approved Standard Penalties
--

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Background: This amendment follows on from 0212 in ensuring that Organisers and competitors understand that the Annex A penalties are approved by the IGC Plenary, and that they are to be imposed as stated.

Comment: <i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i> Consequential amendment – all references to these rules that use the word “standard” Note amendment 0232 (Scoring) deletes the table at 22.2.8

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0246	20.3.6	Editorial	1 October 2001

Summary:	Reason:
The inclusion of sustainers in the requirement to run MoP prior to a start and the inclusion of the requirement to leave the FR switched on after an engine-run on the ground	The rules do not include gliders with sustainer engines and the need to run the engine prior to starting to place a baseline trace on the FR

Recommendation:
It is recommended that 20.3.6 be amended as follows (additions in bold; deletions in strikethrough): <i>20.3.6 FRs shall be switched on for at least two minutes before take off to establish an altitude baseline. On motor gliders having an MoP capable of being started in flight (including sustainer MoP) the engine must be started and run for at least two minutes either before the launch, or immediately after release even if the motor glider is launched by aerotow. This is required to provide a positive record on the GNSS trace. The FR must remain switched on following and engine run on the ground.</i>

Decision of IGC Bureau:
Type of Amendment:
Recommendation:
Date

Background:
The lack of control for sustainers and the need to require FRs to remain on after an engine run on the ground, was recognised at Mafikeng at the 27 th WGC

Comment:
<i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i>

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0207 v2	5.3	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
Revision of the mechanism for the appointment of Members of the International Jury	Providing flexibility in the appointment of the International Jury to assist in reducing costs to the Organisers

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Annex A 5.3 be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikethrough) as follows:

Option 1 –

5.3 International Jury The International Jury (IJ) deals with protests made by competitors. A nominated jury, ~~normally of three members including one who will act as President, shall be appointed by IGC.~~ **shall consist of the President of the Jury plus two Members. The President shall be appointed by the IGC. Both Members shall normally be appointed by the IGC, except that, in exceptional circumstances, the Jury President may be empowered to appoint one Member, in consultation with the President of the IGC, from amongst persons present at an event. One or both Members may be absent from the event provided:**

(i) They are able to attend at the event site as required by the Jury President to hear a Protest, and

(ii) They are present at the event site for the final day of competition to hear any Protests arising from the last day of competition, and to attend the final Jury Meeting to confirm the results.

Option 2 –

5.3 International Jury The International Jury (IJ) deals with protests made by competitors. A **representative** jury, ~~normally of three members including one who will act as President, shall be appointed by IGC.~~ **shall consist of the President of the Jury plus the Team Captains. The President shall be appointed by the IGC.**

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

The IGC Plenary, in 2001, tasked the Annex A Committee with proposing options to reduce the costs of the International Jury to Championship Organisers. A proposal to reduce the costs of the International Jury (dated 14 October 2001) has been prepared by the Annex A Committee and posted on the IGC website.

Two mutually exclusive options are provided for consideration.

Option One – Nominated Jury

This option is developed from the paper posted on the IGC website. The Sporting Code already permits the replacement of a Juror at short notice due to unavoidable absence. This option draws on that provision, but provides additional flexibility should a suitable nomination of a third Jury Member not be available at the appropriate IGC Meeting.

Option Two – Representative Jury

This option has been included for completeness. The white paper only considered variations to the formation of a ‘nominated jury’ consisting of the President plus two Members. Option Two allows for the return to use of a ‘representative jury’ consisting of the President plus all Team Captains.

The last time a representative jury was used at the 24th WGC at Omarama, NZ. The development of GNSS at that event and the ability that FR records provide for flight analysis have altered the task of the jury somewhat in that much more investigative work may need to be undertaken than was necessary in the past. The use of a nominated jury, it is suggested, enables a depth of investigation into a protest that a representative jury may not be able to achieve.

However, the use of a representative jury would significantly reduce costs for organisers. The option is, therefore, included in this proposal for a representative jury to be reinstated for IGC sanctioned championships.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports Option One

Note - numbering changes will be required as a result of the editorial amendment number 0206.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 alters this proposal to “Substantial”; makes the appointment of a nominated Jury Member on site the exception rather than the norm; provides for one or two Members to be absent under specific circumstances; and includes option two to return to the ‘representative jury’.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0221 v2	21.2.1	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary: The application of handicapping and an appropriate minimum marking distance for the World Class	Reason: An appropriate marking distance was not provided for the World Class and handicapping is included for the Club Class
--	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that 21.2.1 be amended (additions in bold) as follows:

21.2.1 Championship Day In order that a day may be counted as a championship day, a launch opportunity shall have been given to each competitor in the class in time for the competitor to carry out the task of the day in question. A Championship day is defined as one on which more than 25% of the competitors in the class, who had a competition launch on that day, fly a marking distance of at least 100 km, or for the World Class, a marking distance of at least 60 km. The marking distance shall be calculated after any handicapping is applied.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

The provision of a shortened marking distance for the World Class recognises the lower performance of this class relative to the other classes. The original 100 km distance was established during the reign of the current "Club Class" gliders so it is suggested that no amendment is required to accommodate the Club Class. The addition of the provision to calculate the marking distance in terms of a 'handicapped' distance covers the Club Class championship.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

It is suggested that this amendment could be approved for implementation on 1 October 2002, if agreed by the Plenary, to cater for the World Gliding Championships - World Class - in February 2003.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 alters this amendment to "Substantial" and includes handicapping.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0223	4.2 & 4.6	Substantial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>Deletion of paragraphs 4.2 and 4.6</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>The requirement that competitions be run in accordance with Annex A has overtaken rule 4.2.</p> <p>Rule 10.9 requiring sailplanes to carry data transmitters to enable the display of GNSS flight records during competition flights has overtaken rule 4.6.</p>
--	---

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>a) It is recommended that 4.2 be deleted in total:</p> <p><i>4.2 — Any matter intended to have the force of a competition rule must have been approved as a minimum by the IGC Bureau, if necessary by post. Only minor matters may be approved by the method.</i></p> <p>b) It is recommended that 4.6 be deleted in total:</p> <p><i>4.6 — The meteorological, GNSS and other flight data from a championships are the property of the Organizers. Such data shall be treated as confidential and only passed on to persons or organisations approved by IGC.</i></p>
--

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

<p>Decision of IGC Plenary</p> <p>Date</p>
--

<p>Background:</p> <p>These rules have both become redundant subsequent to other decisions made at IGC in 2001.</p>
--

<p>Comment:</p> <p><i>Annex A Group supports this amendment.</i></p> <p>Consequential amendment – renumbering other paragraphs in section 4</p> <p>Note editorial amendment number 0204 previously altered the numbering of this section</p>

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0224	5.2	Substantial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>Consolidation of the requirements relating to Stewards.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>Much of the detail in 5.2 is information and is now located in the draft IGC Steward Handbook and proposed for acceptance by the IGC in 2002 in submission 0239.</p>
---	---

Recommendation:

It is recommended that 5.2, and subsequent paragraphs, be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) as shown:

5.2 Stewards

5.2.1 *The Organizers shall nominate two Stewards of nationalities different to that of the Organizers, except that in the event of a last minute failure to attend, a replacement Steward of any nationality and acceptable to the other Stewards may be invited. The nominations shall be approved by IGC. **Stewards must understand and be able to speak English, must possess a thorough knowledge of the FAI Sporting Code, General Section and Section 3, the IGC Steward Handbook and Rules and Local Procedures for the Championships, and have extensive experience of soaring competitions.***

5.2.2 ***The Stewards are to conduct themselves in accordance with the guidance provided in the IGC Steward Handbook.** One Steward shall be present at the contest site throughout all major operational activities. ~~such as task setting, launching, inspections, time keeping, checking of flight verification evidence, etc.~~*

~~5.2.3 Stewards are advisors to the Championship Director. They have no executive powers. They may neither be competitors nor hold any additional position in the organization.~~

5.2.4

~~5.2.5~~ **Duties of the Stewards**

5.2.5.1 *They watch over the conduct of the Championships and report to the Director any unfairness or infringement of the Rules and Procedures or behaviour prejudicial to the safety of other competitors or the public or in any way harmful to the sport.*

5.2.5.2 *They assemble information and facts concerning matters to be considered by the International Jury.*

5.2.5.3 *They advise the Championship Director on interpretation of the Rules and Procedures and on penalties.*

~~5.2.5.4 Stewards may attend the meetings of the International Jury as observers or witnesses.~~

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date**Decision of IGC Plenary****Date****Background:**

This amendment is raised to consolidate the requirements for Stewards in anticipation of the IGC Steward Handbook being approved by the Plenary, 2002.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Consequential action – if the IGC Steward Handbook is not approved by the Plenary in 2002, this text will need to be retained in Annex A

Note editorial amendment number 0206 already altered the numbering of section 5.2

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0225 v2	16.2	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
The review of the options relating to the imposition of limits on the maximum take-off weight for each Class	To establish requirements (if any) for maximum aircraft weight

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Plenary accept, from the options listed, those that it deems appropriate for future Championships:

1. Open Class:

- a. Retain the existing mix of sailplanes in the Open Class (ie pure gliders and motor-gliders), **and**
 - i) Impose no limit, but require that organisers ensure take-off performance for the gliders and tow-planes is not compromised, **or**
 - ii) Impose a limit of 750kg, with the exception that two-seater motor gliders which exceed this limit with two crew members on board will be allowed to compete, but may not take disposable ballast, **or**
 - iii) Impose a limit of 750kg, **or**
 - iv) Impose a limit of 850kg, in conjunction with a submission to amend the JAR-22 requirement to 850kg.
- b. Split the Open Class into two sub-classes, one for pure gliders, and one for motor-gliders, and impose no limits, but require that organisers ensure take-off performance for the gliders and tow-planes is not compromised.

2. 18M Class:

- a. Impose no limit, but require that organisers ensure take-off performance for the gliders and tow-planes is not compromised, **or**
- b. Impose a limit of 600kg.

3. 15M Class:

- a. Impose no limit, but require that organisers ensure take-off performance for the gliders and tow-planes is not compromised, **or**
- b. Impose a limit of 525kg.

<p>4.</p> <p>a.</p> <p>b.</p> <p>5.</p> <p>a.</p> <p>b.</p> <p>c.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>a.</p> <p>b.</p> <p>7.</p> <p>a.</p> <p>b.</p> <p>8.</p> <p>a.</p> <p>b.</p>	<p>Standard Class:</p> <p>Impose no limit, but require that organisers ensure take-off performance for the gliders and tow-planes is not compromised, or</p> <p>Impose a limit of 525kg.</p> <p>Club Class:</p> <p>i) Allow the use of water ballast up to maximum certificated weight, or</p> <p>ii) Do not permit the use of disposable ballast.</p> <p>Define a weight range (+/- kg) in Annex A and establish penalties for exceeding the limits of the range.</p> <p>i) Require daily aircraft weight checks, or</p> <p>ii). Require the nomination of fixed ballast and check conformance against this declaration daily.</p> <p>World Class:</p> <p>Define a weight range (+/- kg) in Annex A and establish penalties for exceeding the limits of the range.</p> <p>i) Require daily aircraft weight checks, or</p> <p>ii). Require the nomination of fixed ballast and check conformance against this declaration daily.</p> <p>Weight Range and Penalties for Club & World Class</p> <p>i) Range of +/- 5 kg, or</p> <p>ii) Range of +/- 10 kg</p> <p>i) Penalties equivalent to the existing overweight, or</p> <p>ii) Penalties as a proportionate adjustment to handicap.</p> <p>Team Class (if appropriate)</p> <p>Specify the same limits as the applicable FAI Class (Open, 18M, 15M, or Standard) depending on the aircraft permitted in the Class, or</p> <p>Develop separate limits for this Class.</p>
--	---

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

<p>Decision of IGC Plenary</p> <p>Date</p>
--

Background:

The IGC Plenary, in 2001, tasked the Annex A Committee with “determining whether specific maximum weights should be stated in this rule (16.2)”.

The Annex A Committee has prepared a white paper on the Maximum Take-Off weight for Gliders in Championships. The paper has been posted on the IGC website.

The paper explores the issues surrounding imposing, or not imposing, limits on aircraft weights and the recommended options have been developed from the paper.

Subsequent suggestions, following the publication of the white paper, have led to the addition of Options 1a and 1b for the Open Class. It is possible that the future direction of the Open Class is with a pure gliding class and a separate motor class and it is suggested that the Plenary should consider these alternatives in conjunction with the various options regarding weight limits.

In addition, suggested options for weight limits and penalties for the Club and World Class have been proposed, and also maximum weight limits have been proposed for the potential Team Class (refer to amendment 0240)

It is noted that these options are not mutually exclusive; rather they form a suite of options from which IGC may create whatever menu of competition that it desires. It is also noted that Class definitions are stated in the Sporting Code, Section 3, not in Annex A.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment. The Group's preferred options are:

- *Open Class - Option 1a(ii), and review Options 1a(iv) and 1b*
- *18M, 15M and Standard Classes - Options 2a, 3a, and 4a respectively*
- *Club Class – Options 5a(ii) plus 5b plus 5c(ii)*
- *World Class – Options 6a plus 6b(ii)*
- *Team Class – Option 8a*

Consequential amendment – depending on the decisions taken by the Plenary, paragraph 16.2, and other paragraphs (such as Section 22 - Penalties and 10.3 - scrutineering) may require amendment to incorporate the decision(s).

Revision Status:

- Version 2 adds the option of splitting the Open Class into two sub-classes and corrects the reference to the Sporting Code

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0226 v2	19	Substantial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>The revision of the existing section on Tasks to follow-up on IGC plenary requirements from 2001 and to provide clarity</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>The Plenary, in 2001, required a review of speed points for non-finishers on the AST and the marking distance for TDT, and the section required editing for clarity.</p> <p>This amendment, and amendment 0244, are mutually exclusive.</p>
---	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the existing Section 19 be replaced completely by the following text:

19 TASKS

19.1 Definitions

- a. *Task - is the course set by the Organizers from the Start to the Goal. The task may require the achievement of either:*
 - (i) *A designated distance via allocated Turn Points (Assigned Speed Task – AST), or*
 - (ii) *A designated minimum time via any allocated Turn Points (TP) or Assigned Areas (AA) (Task in Designated Time –TDT, or, if extra distance flown at the same speed, after the end of the time, yields a bonus - Distance and Speed Task – DST).*
- b. *Task Distance - is the distance from Start Point to the Goal via all assigned Turn Points, or the center of all Assigned Areas (including any optional areas), as appropriate.*
- c. *Marking Time - is the time elapsed between the competitor's recorded Start Time and their Finish Time or outlanding time, as appropriate.*
- d. *Marking Distance and Marking Speed - is the distance or speed (as appropriate) the competitor achieved on the task, assessed as prescribed for the type of task, to determine the score as defined in section 21.*

19.2 Task Selection *The Organizers shall set one of the AST, TDT/AA, DST/AA, TDT/TP, or DST/TP types of task each day and at least two different types of task during a Championship. A single task type should not be used for more than 67% of the Championship days.*

19.3 Assigned Speed Task (AST)

- a. *The competitor has to complete the task via assigned Turn Points, in the required sequence, and to achieve the highest speed.*
- b. *Any Start Option (a), (b), or (c) may be set and finish line or finish ring may be used.*
- c. *If Start Option (c) is used the Start Point which yields the greatest distance shall be used to assess the Task Distance.*
- d. *Marking Speed - is the distance from the competitor's actual Start Point to the Goal via all assigned Turn Points, minus the distance from the outlanding position via any Turn Points not achieved, to the Goal, divided by the Marking Time.*
- e. *Marking Distance – for a finisher, is equal to the Task Distance, regardless of the actual Start Point, or, for a non-finisher, is the distance from the competitor's actual Start Point to the Goal via all assigned Turn Points, minus the distance from the outlanding position via any Turn Points not achieved, to the Goal.*

19.4 Task in Designated Time with Assigned Areas (TDT / AA)

- a. *The pilot has to complete the task via Assigned Areas, in the required sequence, and to achieve the highest speed for the designated time.*
- b. *The last Assigned Area(s) may be optional, to provide flexibility should the weather conditions be significantly different to those forecast when the task was set, and should be established in the general direction of the Goal from the last Assigned Area.*
- c. *Any Start Option (a), (b), or (c) may be set and finish line or finish ring may be used.*
- d. *If Start Options (c) is used the Start Point which yields the greatest distance shall be used to assess the nominal Task Distance.*
- e. *Marking Distance - is the distance achieved from the competitor's Start Point to the Goal, via all Assigned Areas (achieved or not), minus, for a non-finisher, the distance from the outlanding position via any Assigned Area not achieved, to the Goal.*
 - (i) *For each achieved Assigned Area the Marking Distance is determined by using the valid GNSS FR fix which yields the greatest distance. For each non-achieved Assigned Area the centre of the Area is used to determine the distance not achieved.*
 - (ii) *If there are optional Assigned Areas the Marking Distance for a non-finisher is assessed without taking these Areas into account.*
- f. *Marking Speed – is equal to the Marking Distance divided by the Marking Time, or the designated time, whichever is the longer.*

19.5 Distance and Speed Task with Assigned Areas (DST / AA)

- a. *The pilot has to complete the task via Assigned Areas, in the required sequence, and to achieve the highest speed for as long as possible but at least for as long as the designated time.*
- b. *The last Assigned Area(s) may be optional, to provide flexibility should the weather conditions be significantly different to those forecast when the task was set, and should be established in the general direction of the Goal from the last Assigned Area.*
- c. *Any Start Option (a), (b), or (c) may be set and finish line or finish ring may be used.*
- d. *If Start Options (c) is used the Start Point which yields the greatest distance shall be used to assess the nominal Task Distance.*
- e. *Marking Distance - is the distance achieved from the competitor's Start Point to the Goal, via all Assigned Areas (achieved or not), minus, for a non-finisher, the distance from the outlanding position via any Assigned Area not achieved, to the Goal.*
 - (i) *For each achieved Assigned Area the Marking Distance is determined by using the valid GNSS FR fix which yields the greatest distance. For each non-achieved Assigned Area the centre of the Area is used to determine the distance not achieved.*
 - (ii) *If there are optional Assigned Areas the Marking Distance for a non-finisher is assessed without taking these Areas into account.*
- g. *Marking Speed – is equal to the Marking Distance divided by the Marking Time, or the designated time, whichever is the longer.*

19.6 Task in Designated Time with Turn Points (TDT / TP)

- a. *The pilot has to complete the task via free Turn Points inside the Contest Area and to achieve the highest speed for the designated time.*
- b. *A maximum of 10 Turn Points, from a list assigned by the Organizers, may be utilized in any order. However the pilot may not return to a Turn Point before having rounded two other Turn Points, except when finishing at the Goal.*
- c. *The Organizers may:*
 - (i) *Impose the same mandatory first and/ or last Turn Point, for all competitor's, and/ or*
 - (ii) *Declare certain Turn Points ineligible as first and/ or last Turn Points, and/ or*
 - (iii) *Require the competitors to declare their first Turn Point prior to take-off.*
- d. *Start option (a) or (c) may be set. Start option (b) may only be set if the first Turn Point is mandatory.*

- e. *Finish ring shall be used, unless the Organizers impose a mandatory last Turn Point in which case the finish line may be used.*
 - f. *Marking Distance - is the distance from the competitor's actual Start Point to the Goal, or to the outlanding position, via all achieved Turn Points.*
 - g. *Marking Speed – is equal to the Marking Distance, divided by the Marking Time, or the designated time, whichever is the longer.*
- 19.7 *Distance and Speed Task with Turn Points (DST / TP)*
- a. *The pilot has to complete the task via free Turn Points and to achieve the highest distance inside the Contest Area and to achieve the highest speed for as long as possible but at least for as long as the designated time.*
 - b. *A maximum of 10 Turn Points, from a list assigned by the Organizers, may be utilized in any order. However the pilot may not return to a Turn Point before having rounded two other Turn Points, except when finishing at the Goal.*
 - c. *The Organizers may:*
 - (i) *Impose the same mandatory first and/ or last Turn Point, for all competitor's, and/ or*
 - (ii) *Declare certain Turn Points ineligible as first and/ or last Turn Points, and/ or*
 - (iii) *Require the competitors to declare their first Turn Point prior to take-off.*
 - d. *Start option (a), (c) or (d) may be set. Start option (b) may only be set if the first Turn Point is mandatory.*
 - e. *Finish ring shall be used, unless the Organizers impose a mandatory last Turn Point in which case the finish line may be used.*
 - f. *Marking Distance - is the distance from the competitor's actual Start Point to the Goal, or to the outlanding position, via all achieved Turn Points.*
 - g. *Marking Speed – is equal to the Marking Distance, divided by the Marking Time, or the designated time, whichever is the longer.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

Each task is defined so that they are available as ‘stand-alone’ tasks and do not require cross-reference to other parts of the Tasks section to determine how the task is conducted.

One substantial change is introduced by this amendment. This is to introduce more flexibility in the Assigned Area task by allowing one or several optional areas. This is to allow the Organizers the flexibility of setting optional Areas to enable pilots to modify the distance flown if the weather conditions are significantly better, or worse, than the forecast rather than setting very large Areas. Large Areas, while providing the opportunity to modify the distance flown, may be restricted at sites with restricted contest areas.

Without this possible flexibility, there may be a risk that even when flying the maximum distance possible around an AA task, pilots may finish before the expiry of the designated time. The alternative is that they do not complete the task despite attempting to fly the minimum distance possible. These situations have occurred at National Championships.

Optional areas should ideally be set between the last Assigned Area and the Goal to avoid pilots being penalised if they attempt, but fail, to reach an optional area that does lie in the general direction of the Goal.

All other changes proposed by this amendment are editorial in nature.

Comment:

Annex A Group Opinion.

The definition of the Tasks has been simplified as much as possible, which means that reference must be made to section 21 - Scoring to gain a full picture of the differences between the tasks.

We are concerned that there is perhaps insufficient differentiation between the TDT and DST tasks. Should we reduce the choice of tasks to the AST (classic speed task), TDT/AA (effectively a speed task around assigned areas) and TDT/TP (effectively a cats cradle)? We understand that at least one NAC is intending to propose this as an amendment.

As a result of this concern, and after feedback from the 27th WGC at Mafikeng, amendment 0244 has been developed as an alternative to this amendment. These two amendments are mutually exclusive and Delegates should review each carefully to determine which they support.

This amendment needs to be read in conjunction with:

- a. Amendment 0220 v2 (Finishing)
- b. Amendment 0228 v2 (Start Procedures)
- c. Amendment 0229 (Outlandings)
- d. Amendment 0232 v2 (Scoring)

Revision Status:

- Version 2 clarifies Marking Distance and Optional Areas for TDT and DST, the aim of the task for DST, and Marking Speed for TDT and DST, and deletes previous reference to a assigned start points as one start option.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0227 v2	20.3 & 20.3.2	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
Provision of a rule to cover the failure of both GNSS Flight Recorders and a change to the GNSS approval date	The provisions of a rule covering the failure of both FRs, and a recommendation to adjust the time limit for the approval of the FRs.

Recommendation:
<p>It is recommended that the following amendment be made to 20.3.2 (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) and that rule 20.3.8 be added and 20.10 deleted:</p> <p><i>20.3.2 All GNSS FRs approved by the IGC up to two months weeks prior to the Opening Day shall be accepted. A valid calibration certificate must be provided for each FR..</i></p> <p>20.3.8 If both recorders fail and the flight record is interrupted for a period longer than one minute, then the glider shall be considered as having outlanded unless satisfactory evidence can be provided that the glider did not, during the interruption of the FR record, violate airspace or, in the case of a motor glider, use the MoP.</p> <p>20.10 "Procedures in Case of Failure of Both GNSS FR's</p>

Decision of IGC Bureau:
Type of Amendment:
Recommendation:
Date

Decision of IGC Plenary
Date

Background:
<p>The Plenary, in 2001, agreed to the provision of a rule covering the failure of both FRs, and also required that GNSS FRs be approved no later than the deadline for a class change (two months).</p> <p>20.3.8 covers the failure of both GNSS units.</p> <p>A review of the two months deadline by the GFAC has identified that a two-week deadline would be more appropriate and this change is proposed for 20.3.2.</p> <p>The reasons given to support the change are that: the approval of the FR includes the hardware and software for the unit and requires that free software be available for downloading to a PC and for validating the integrity of the IGC flight file; as a result, Organisers can be provided with all the software required to support newly approved GNSS</p>

units prior to the commencement of the championship; and, the necessary software may be available before the official date of IGC approval through the GFAC Chairman.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment, but is concerned that the two-week period for the GNSS FR approval may place pressure on Organisers to accept late modifications to other software programs such as the scoring program.

Revision Status:

- Version 2 expands on the background reasons for the change to two weeks.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0228 v2	20.4.1 & 20.4.4	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
The revision of rules regarding Start Procedures to provide clarity	Changes to the Start procedures for clarity and incorporating possible future changes for assigned start times.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the existing section 20.4.1 be deleted and replaced completely, and that 20.4.4 and 20.4.10 be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) as follows:

20.4 Start Procedures

20.4.1 General *The Organizers shall select one start procedure for every task from the following options:*

(a) **Start Ring** *An area, formed by a circle around a start point, of sufficient radius to encompassing the departure airfield and all release areas.*

(b) **Start Line** *A straight line perpendicular to the track to the first Turn Point or the center of first Assigned Area, or an arc at a constant distance of the first Turn Point or the center of first Assigned Area.*

(c) **Optional Start Point** *Multiple groups of start areas, defined by circles of 0.5 km radius around each start point, set approximately in a circle around the departure airfield. Each pilot shall be allocated one start point in each group each day.*

20.4.2 Definitions

- *Start Point - is the center of the start ring, start line, assigned start point, or selected start point used by the competitor, as appropriate. The first leg distance is assessed from the Start Point to first Turn Point or Assigned Area, except that, if option (a) - Start Ring is used, the first leg distance is from the center of the start ring to the first Turn Point or Assigned Area minus the radius of the start ring.*
- *Start Time - is the time the competitor leaves the start ring or start point, or crosses the start line, except that if Start Times are assigned, the Start Time shall be the assigned time.*

20.4.4 *A maximum altitude ~~of 2000 m AGL~~, expressed in QNH, ~~should~~ **shall** be imposed prior to the opening of the start gate and shall be announced by the Organizers. The ~~maximum~~ altitude(s), ~~if any~~, shall be specified at the briefing. The Organizers must describe the altitude procedures before starts in the Local Procedures. At the time of opening the start gate the Organizers may:*

(a) *Keep the altitude limit unchanged; or,*

- (b) *Raise the altitude limit to an altitude at least 300 m below the main cloud base; or,*
- (c) *Delete the altitude limit.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

Feedback has suggested that the Start Procedures required revision for clarity.

The requirement for Assigned and Multiple Start Points to ring the departure airfield is included to allow Organisers to set start points for pilots which allow very similar track distances to be flown on the first leg, which will minimise any effects of strong cross-winds on the first leg.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Consequential amendment – renumbering of the paragraphs following and delete reference to ‘Start option (c) – Assigned Start Point’ in amendments 0226

Additional starting procedures are proposed in amendment 0239 for Imposed Start Times (reference 20.4.2 definitions).

This amendment needs to be read in conjunction with:

- a. Amendments 0226 v2 and 0244 (Tasks)
- b. Amendments 0232 v2 and 0245 (Scoring)
- c. Amendment 0239 v2 (Starting Options)

Revision Status

- Version 2 deletes Assigned Start Points as being redundant; requires Optional start points to ring the departure airfield; and mandates the application of a maximum altitude prior to the opening of the start gate.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0229	20.4.6	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary: Revision of the use of the event marker and the 15-minute rule	Reason: To clarify the use of the event marker, and allow the Organisers to extend the 15-minute time interval or allow only a single start.
---	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that 20.4.6 be amended (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) as shown:

20.4.6 If the ~~Organizers require~~ event marker is to be used, a minimum interval of at least 15 minutes is imposed between two consecutive starts for each competitor. A subsequent start is invalid if done more than one and less than 15 minutes after a proceeding valid start. The Organizers may set a longer time interval or allow only a single start.

A start is valid only if an event mark is recorded by the GNSS FR after the opening of the start gate and before the start.

A subsequent start is invalid if:

- *Only a single start only is allowed, or*
- *The interval between the preceding valid start and the subsequent start is less than the minimum interval stated by the Organizers, or*
- *No event mark has been recorded since the last valid start.*

If no start has been marked the competitor's last completed start shall be validated as a start but a time penalty of 15 minutes shall be added to the competitor's Marking Time. ~~a time penalty of 15 minutes shall be added to the competitors last crossing of the designated start line.~~

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

The use of the event marker to initiate the 15-minute rule required clarification.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0230 v2	20.6	Substantial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>The revision of this section to incorporate the full use of GNSS position and time for determining the final position of the glider and the definition of the contest area (transferred from 21.3)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>The use of GNSS has matured since this section was originally written, the provisions of 20.6.1.1.2 are redundant</p>
--	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following amendments be made to section 20.6 and 21.3 (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) as shown:

20.6 Outlandings The Contest Area Boundary is defined by a line joining the geographical bounds of the contest area and includes all designated turn points and assigned areas. The Organizers shall score the pilot to the real or virtual outlanding position, inside the contest area boundary, that yields the longest Marking Distance.

~~20.6.1.1.2 If a number of sailplanes all outlanded within the boundaries of the same field, airstrip or airfield, they shall all be scored as having landed at the same position as that which yields the average distance for all aircraft in the group.~~

~~20.6.1.1.3~~ **20.6.1.1.2** The starting of a motor glider's MoP, **except as allowed by 20.3.6, or a complete failure of the GNSS flight record (see 20.3.8),** is regarded as an outlanding. ~~The outlanding position and time shall be the last virtual outlanding before the start of the MoP.~~

20.6.1.2 The position ~~of the sailplane after~~ **and time of a real** outlanding shall be determined from the last valid fix on the GNSS flight record when the aircraft comes to rest, **before the starting of the MoP, or before the recorder failure, whichever occurs first.**

20.6.2 Virtual Outlandings A virtual outlanding is an event that occurs if the marking distance at any valid GNSS fix registered during the flight is greater than the distance measured to the actual landing point. **The position and time of a virtual outlanding may be any valid fix on the GNSS flight record preceding a real outlanding or a valid finish.** ~~If a virtual outlanding occurs, the Organizers shall score the pilot to the point that yields the longest marking distance.~~

~~21.3 If a competitor lands out outside the boundary of the contest area, or if he is outside the boundary when the designated task time expires, he will be considered as outlanded at the last fix inside the contest area. The contest area shall encompass all turn points and assigned areas.~~

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date**Decision of IGC Plenary****Date****Background:**

20.6.1.1.2 originated when the outlanding position was taken from the declared GNSS position. Maturation of the scoring software now enables the software to determine the exact position and “grouping” landings is no longer necessary.

The other changes covered by this amendment, similarly reflect the maturation of GNSS scoring and the collection of similar information together in the rules.

The provision allowing motor-gliders to run their MoP prior to starting, to establish a baseline on the FR, is also covered by this amendment.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Revision Status

- Version 2 moves the ‘inside the contest area boundary’ requirement to 20.6; allows the MoP to be operated in accordance with 20.3.6; and, deletes earlier discussion relating to the definition of “Marking Distance”.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0231	22.1.7 & 22.2.8	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
Alignment of penalties for both starting and flying above altitude limits	To provide a consistent penalty for this type of offence

Recommendation:			
It is recommended that the following amendments (additions in bold, deletions in strikeout) be incorporated:			
a) 22.1.7 <i>List of Standard Penalties</i>			
<i>Type of Offence</i>	<i>First Offence</i>	<i>Sub. Offence</i>	<i>Max Penalty</i>
<i>Starting above the altitude limit</i>	<i>1 5 pts/m</i>	<i>1 5 x n pts/m</i>	<i>Day Disqualification</i>
b) 22.2.8 <i>List of Standard Penalties</i>			
<i>Type of Offence</i>	<i>First Offence</i>	<i>Sub. Offence</i>	<i>Max Penalty</i>
<i>Starting above the altitude limit</i>	<i>0.1 0.2 pts/m</i>	<i>0.1 0.2 x n pts/m</i>	<i>Day Disqualification</i>

Decision of IGC Bureau:
Type of Amendment:
Recommendation:
Date

Decision of IGC Plenary
Date

Background:
The start limits are established to prevent an unfair advantage and climbing above altitude restrictions provides an unfair advantage. Also, the altitude limit on the start may prevent competitors entering, or climbing above, cloud in the start areas. However, it is suggested that altitude penalties be the same whether they apply at the start point or on track.

Comment:
<i>Annex A Group supports this amendment. However the Plenary is asked to consider whether a violation of the altitude limit for the start should be penalised more than other altitude violations to discourage deliberate altitude “busts” and possible safety issues.</i>
This amendment is proposed as part of the 2001 required review of the 1000-point scoring system. Note, amendment 0232 – Scoring retains the 1000-Point system penalties (22.1.7) as

the “approved penalty list” with other scoring systems deriving penalties from this list.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0232 v2	Sections 21 & 22	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary:	Reason:
Revision of scoring rules and algorithms as proposed to the Plenary 2001	The addition of scoring rules and algorithms, as detailed in the explanation attached. This amendment and amendment 0245 are mutually exclusive.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Section 21 and Section 22 be deleted in total and replaced with the following text and that one of the two options for section 21.4.1 – 1000-points scoring for AST - be selected:

SCORING

21 General Requirements

21.1 The Championship shall be scored according to:

- a. Distance Scoring*
- b. 1000-Point Scoring*
- c. Place Scoring*
- d. Team Scoring*

Only one of the scoring systems (a), (b), or (c) may be used for primary individual rankings to select a Champion. This system shall be the same for the duration of the Championships.

Scoring systems (c) and/ or (d) may be used concurrently for secondary rankings to determine individual or team rankings.

21.2 Common Rules

21.2.1 Championship Day In order that a day may be counted as a championship day, a launch opportunity shall have been given to each competitor in the class in time for the competitor to carry out the task of the day in question. A Championship day is defined as one on which more than 25% of the competitors in the class, who have had a competition launch on that day, fly a marking distance of at least 100 km [, or for the World Class, a marking distance of at least 60 km.- Reference Amendment 0221]

21.2.2 Each competitor shall be given daily points based on his performance on each

championship day. The score given to each competitor shall be rounded to the nearest whole number, the value of 0.5 being rounded up.

21.2.3 If handicaps are used, they shall be applied to the competitor's Marking Speed only for finishers in an AST, or to the competitor's Marking Distance only for all other cases, before any other scoring calculation, as follows:

- a. Highest Performance glider has lowest handicap - multiply the Marking Speed or Distance (assessed in accordance with Section 19) by the glider handicap, and then dividing the result by the lowest handicap in the class.
- b. Lowest Performance glider has lowest handicap - divide the Marking Speed or Distance (assessed in accordance with Section 19) by the glider handicap, and then multiply the result by the highest handicap in the class.

21.2.4 Flights that have been disqualified shall be given zero points for the day, but shall be included in the scoring formula. Any penalties shall be deducted from the competitor's score after it has been calculated in accordance with section 22.

21.2.5 Cumulative and final scores shall be calculated by adding the points obtained each day on the nominated scoring system.

[21.2.6 Joker Rule – see amendment 0233]

21.2.7 Common Definitions

Dt = Task Distance (for AST only)

Td = Task Time (for TDT or DST)

D = Competitor's Marking Distance

T = Competitor's Marking Time. (Note: in TDT and DST; $T \geq Td$)

V = Competitor's Marking Speed (for AST only)

F = Competitor's Finish Factor as follows:

F = 1.00 for a finisher

F = 0.90 for a non-finisher, except that –

F = 0.92 for a non-finisher landing on any designated airfield from list provided by the Organizers – which will normally be a landing within an area of 1 km radius around the designated GNSS coordinates of the airfield.

D1 = Best Marking Distance of the Day, which is the highest Marking Distance achieved, after handicapping if appropriate.

Dm = Minimum Distance, which is equal to 100 km, except for the World Class where it is equal to 60 km.

V1 = The highest Marking Speed (for AST Only) of any competitor having completed the task.

Vo = The Marking Speed (for AST only) of the competitor who, regardless of whether

they have completed the task or not, has the best product of $(F \times V \times D)$.

21.3 Distance Scoring

The competitor's score (S) is expressed in distance units (e.g. km), and is equal to:

$$\text{For AST} \quad S = F \times (V/V_0) \times D$$

$$\text{For TDT} \quad S = F \times (T_d/T) \times D$$

$$\text{For DST} \quad S = F \times (3/4 \times (T_d/T) \times D + (1/4 \times D))$$

21.4 1000-Points Scoring

The pilot's score (P) is expressed in points.

The maximum score available (P_m), in points (subject to correction by the Day Factor, f) is the least of:

$$P_m = 1000, \text{ or}$$

$$P_m = 5 \times \text{best Marking Distance (in km)} - 250, \text{ or}$$

$$P_m = 400 \times \text{best Marking Time (in hours)} - 200$$

21.4.1 Assigned Speed Task (AST)

Two versions are provided here for the assessment of speed on the AST. Version 1 is the usual 1000-point scoring and is provided as a reference. Version 2 is an alternative which is intended to provide a greater level of homogeneity between scores obtained on AST and scores obtained on TDT and DST. Further explanation is provided in "background" below.

Version 1

$$P_u \text{ (uncorrected points)} = P_d + P_v$$

$$P_d \text{ (distance points)} = R_d \times (1 - (2 \times R_n)/3) \times P_m$$

$$R_d = D/D_1$$

$$R_n = \frac{\text{number of competitors exceeding } 2/3^{\text{rd}} \text{ of best speed } (V > (2/3 \times V_1))}{\text{number of competitors with a competition launch on the day}}$$

$$P_v \text{ (speed points)} = 2 \times (R_v - 2/3) \times R_n \times P_m$$

$$R_v = V/V_1$$

P_v shall be ignored if it is negative and also for non-finishers.

Version 2

The competitor's marking performance (D_p) is equal to:

$$D_p = F \times (V/V_o) \times D$$

$P1$ = best marking performance for the day

$$R_d = P/P1$$

R_n = number of pilots exceeding 2/3 of best marking distance
number of pilots with a competition launch that day

The competitor's uncorrected score (P_u) is equal to:

$$P_u = R_d \times P_m \times (1 - R_n/2) \quad \text{If } R_d < 2/3$$

$$P_u = 2/3 \times P_m \times (1 - R_n/2) + (R_d - 2/3) \times P_m \times (1 + R_n) \quad \text{If } R_d > 2/3$$

21.4.2 Other Tasks (TDT and DST)

The competitor's marking performance (P) is equal to:

$$\text{TDT} \quad P = F \times (T_d/T) \times D$$

$$\text{DST} \quad P = F \times (3/4 \times (T_d/T) \times D + (1/4 \times D))$$

$P1$ = best marking performance for the day

$$R_d = P/P1$$

R_n = number of pilots exceeding 2/3 of best marking distance
number of pilots with a competition launch that day

The competitor's uncorrected score (P_u) is equal to:

$$P_u = R_d \times P_m \times (1 - R_n/2) \quad \text{If } R_d < 2/3$$

$$P_u = 2/3 \times P_m \times (1 - R_n/2) + (R_d - 2/3) \times P_m \times (1 + R_n) \quad \text{If } R_d > 2/3$$

21.4.3 Day Factor

Day Factor (f) = $1.25 \times n / N$ (when f exceeds 1 it shall be taken as 1)

n = number of pilots who exceed the Minimum Distance (D_m)

N = number of pilots having had a competition launch that day

Pilot's score: $P = P_u \times f$

21.3 Place Scoring

Each competitor shall be assessed on their daily score according to scoring system (a) or (b).

The maximum Place Scores (PS_m) available shall be the least of:

$$PS_m = 20, \text{ or}$$

*PSm = half the number of pilots with a competition launch on that day, or
PSm = the number of pilots who exceed the Minimum Distance (Dm) plus 1*

The Day winner shall be given a Place Score equal to PSm.

The second placed pilot shall be given (PSm – 1) points, and so on each pilot being allocated one less place score than the pilot preceding him.

The last placed (20th) pilot shall be given a Place Score of 1 (assuming that there were more than 40 pilots who received a competition launch and at least 19 pilots exceeded Dm). All other pilots shall receive a Place Score of 1, except that pilots who did not have a competition launch or who did not achieve any distance or who were disqualified shall not receive any Place Scores.

In case of a tie of two or more pilots, all tied pilots receive the same number of place scores, being one less than the next placed pilot above the tied group. The place scores of lower ranking pilots are unchanged.

21.4 Team Scoring

Each team shall be assessed daily on the mean of the scores of all of their pilots having had a competition launch that day, according to scoring system (a), (b) or (c).

PENALTIES

22.1 Penalties shall be imposed for non-compliance with any Rule or Local Procedure in accordance with the following table, which gives the approved penalties applicable to the 1000-Point scoring system.

22.2 For distance scoring, a penalty of 1 km shall be applied for each equivalent 5 points in the 1000-Point Score table. For Place Scoring and Team Scoring, penalties shall be applied in accordance with the scoring system being used before allocating final Place or Team Scores.

22.3 Other violations shall be penalised according to the FAI Sporting Code, General Section, Chapter 5.2.

22.4 List of Approved Penalties [refer to existing table at 22.1.7]

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

At the IGC plenary meeting 2001 “an adjustment to the ratio of speed versus fastest speed”

was supported, because “the existing scoring formula generated strange results for DST” (recommendation 1.15), giving speed points to non finishers in AST was not supported (recommendation 3.7).

The Annex A group was charged with:

- Investigating further the proposals to award speed points to non finishers and to assess the marking distance in TDT (recommendation 3.4), and
- Ensuring that scoring using distance, place time and speed are available to organisers (recommendation 3.8).

Special attention has been paid to set a formula for each task that is easy to understand. It also ensures that, even in DST, a reasonably simple assessment of scores can be achieved. This will enable pilots to compare their performances after flight without waiting the results are displayed, and scorers to be able to assess which fix in a given flight record would yield the better score (the original aim of a virtual outlanding).

This amendment needs to be read in conjunction with:

- Amendment 0221 (Minimum distance for World Class)
- Amendment 0226 (Tasks)
- Amendment 0233 (Joker Rule)

Explanation of the Changes Incorporated in the Amendment

For TDT (either TDT/AA or TDT/TP), the scoring algorithm is similar to that used in area tasks (DT-AAT) in WGC 2001 in Mafikeng. In this case the marking distance was calculated by dividing the distance flown by the competitor's time. This avoid the “sharp end” of the flight at the end of the task designated time, which has been generally considered as unsafe and unfair in championships where TDTs were first set.

The principal difference is that the penalty for outlanding does not depend on the number of pilots that land out. The penalty is now only 200 points, out of a 1000 points score, at a same speed, compared to 666.6 points or more in the classical AST formula. As a result it has been felt unnecessary to further reduce that penalty when few pilots get home. The advantage is that a competitor's score is independent of all pilots ranked after him in the day's task across the whole scoring system.

For DST (either DST/AA or DST/TP), the formula is the same as for TDT, except that the marking distance is the distance flown in the task minimum time (that would be the marking distance in a TDT) *to which is added 25% of the distance flown after expiration of the task minimum time*. This is to fulfil the aim of the DST to encourage pilots to fly the longest task possible - provided that they can still fly home and maintain a good speed - while making score assessment much easier than with the classical formula (speed points and distance points).

Variant for AST 1000-point Scoring

For AST, **Version 1** of section 21.4.1 retains the classical 1000-point scoring formula.

Version 2 of section 21.4.1 retains the same principles as the 1000-point scoring system and provides exactly the same resulting scores as the classical formula for the pilots who finish with more than 2/3 of the best speed. However it amends the formula so that results are consistent with those provided by TDT and DST scoring, as well as with the distance scoring

system.

The purpose of this version is to ensure that the penalty for outlanding is consistent between AST and other tasks and to consider speed for non-finishers, while keeping the same 1000-point scoring for the finishers. It is suggested that it is both illogical and unfair for an outlanding at the end of a task to cost 667 points in an AST and only 200 points in a TDT or DST.

No task designated time is defined for AST (one cannot impose both distance and time restraints) so the possibility of using the best finishers' time was considered. This would not suit the spirit of an AST (at the same speed, a pilot would have the same score whatever his distance to the goal is, if his time is greater than the best time) and would make virtual outlanding assessment almost impossible. The speed of non-finishers, if their times are lower than the best finishers time, doesn't count.

For AST, it is proposed to use the same formula as for TDT. The purpose is that the spread of points (the cost of a minute in points) should be consistent between AST and other tasks. Also, the penalty for outlanding should be consistent between AST and other tasks while keeping the same 1000-point scoring for the finishers. It is argued that it is unfair for an outlanding at the end of a task to cost 667 points in an AST and only 200 points in a TDT or DST. As no task designated time is defined (one cannot impose both distance and time restraints), the best finishers' time is used instead. The speed of non-finishers, if their times are lower than the best finishers time, doesn't count.

In any task, the case of an early outlanding, and even more in the case of the classical AST 1000 pt formula (for any outlanding even close to the Goal at high speed), the penalty for outlanding (the number of points per km) may be too high and lead to an excessive spread of points. This problem may be solved by the "joker rule" which is proposed to avoid a very poor result (or a very good one!) having a significant impact on a pilot's cumulative scores (*see amendment 0233*).

The scoring system - Distance Scoring, 1000-Point Scoring or Place Scoring - has to be selected by the organiser. The relative day rankings will be the same in all three scoring systems, which differ only by the expression of the score in distance unit or in points (with Version 2 of 21.4.1). The best day score is either the best marking distance, or 1000 points (or less for shorter tasks, as usual), or a number of places.

For cumulative scores, the Distance Scoring will give more importance to tasks with a longer distance (usually those that are flown with the best weather) – and less importance for shorter tasks (that used to be more prone to luck factors) than the 1000-Point system. As a result, Distance Scoring seems the fairer, and least complex, system to use for all competitions. Of course 1000-Point Scoring may continue to be used.

If Place Scoring is used, the onus is put on the day ranking and not on the performance gap. As a result bad performances (such as early outlandings) are not penalised as much as with the other two scoring systems. Place Scoring may be used as primary ranking system (to select the Champion) or for secondary ranking and awards.

Comment:

Annex A Group Opinion.

We are concerned that the scoring options are becoming confusing. As a result of this concern, and after feedback from the 27th WGC at Mafikeng, amendment 0245 has been

developed as an alternative to this amendment.

Amendment 0245 provides 1000-point classical speed scoring for finishers only for AST and options of 1000-point classical speed scoring for finishers only or 1000-point distance scoring only for TDT.

These two amendments are mutually exclusive and Delegates should review each carefully to determine which they support.

Consequential Amendments – renumbering of the paragraphs as appropriate.

Other amendments have proposed changes to specific rules in Sections 21 and 22. These changes are not incorporated in this amendment. For reference they are:

- Amendment 0221 changing rule 21.2.1 (adding a minimum marking distance for the World Class)
- Amendment 0222 changing rules 22.1.7 and 22.2.8 (the names of the penalties)
- Amendment 0231 changing rules 22.1.7 and 22.2.8 (the value of the penalty for exceeding the start altitude)
- Amendment 0233 adding the Joker Rule to 21.2

Amendment 0240 proposes an additional “Team Class”. Scoring proposals for this class are in the embryo stage, but would revolve around similar scoring mechanisms used in other “team” sport events. The basic idea is that the members of the “team” should be encouraged to work as a team (“one for all, and all for one”). Examples of possible scoring rules are:

- Start Time may be the time of the first member of the team, or a Regatta Start may be used (see 0239)
- Finish Time could be the time of the last member of the team to cross the finish line
- Outlanding Position could be the position of the first team member to land
- In addition, the Team may be considered to have all landed out if one member of the team lands out
- These provisions could be allied with Distance Scoring depending on the type of task set

Revision Status:

- Version 2 contains reference to amendment 0245 as an alternative Scoring rule.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0233 v2	21.2	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary: The inclusion of a “joker” rule in scoring	Reason: To reduce the negative effect on an individual’s score as a result of a poor performance on one day, or an exceptional single performance by another competitor.
---	--

Recommendation: It is recommended that the following text be incorporated as a sub-section under 21.2 – Common Rules: <i>21.2.6 <u>Joker Rule</u> Each competitor shall be credited with the points difference between their individual score and the winner’s day score on one championship day, as nominated by the competitor before the Day results become Official. The Local Procedures shall state whether the Joker Rule is to be used.</i>

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Decision of IGC Plenary Date

Background: <p>This rule is proposed in accordance with the 2001 Plenary requirements that various scoring options be provided.</p> <p>The Joker Rule is intended to reduce the negative impact of a pilot having a very bad day, or one, or a few pilots having a single very good day relative to the rest of the field. This may occur because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An early outlanding or a bad choice of flight area in a cat's cradle (TDT/TP or DST/TP), or ▪ A bad turning point choice in an Assigned Area task (TDT/AA or DST/AA), or ▪ A bad strategy (too short or too a long flight) in a DST. <p>A large differentiation in points, especially if this occurs early in a competition, is likely to cause a loss of motivation for the pilot(s) concerned, as it is very difficult to make up a large</p>

deficit in points.

Although consistency is the key skill for winning a gliding title, there is still a degree of luck involved in both the setting and flying of a task (especially with the new type of tasks).

As there is only one Joker for the whole contest, it is unlikely that this rule would encourage pilots to risk outlanding. Even a very consistent pilot will benefit from this rule (except if he/she wins all days!), thus there will still be a disadvantage to outlanding, but it will not be as dramatic as before.

The original thought was to allow the Joker to apply to the day on which there was maximal points difference between the individual competitor and the day winner. However, the effect of this would be that the Final Results would not be able to be published until the last championship day.

As a result the proposal has been modified to require pilots to nominate the day on which they will use the Joker.

The Joker Rule fits well with new tasks and their scoring, but it is suggested that the decision to allow the Joker should be up to the Organisers and this decision should be stated in the Local Procedures.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment but is concerned that the use of the “Joker” may delay publication of results

This amendment needs to be read in conjunction with Amendment 0232 v2 and 0244 replacing Section 21 – Scoring

Revision Status

- Version 2 requires pilots to nominate the day to which the Joker applies

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0234	All of Annex A	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary: To align Annex A terminology with FAI documents and the application of 'English' spelling conventions to the Annex	Reason: To standardise terminology and spelling with other FAI documents
---	--

Recommendation: <u>Terminology</u> It is recommended that Annex A terminology be aligned with the FAI Sporting Code terms of 'glider', 'gliding', and 'motor gliding'. <u>Spelling Conventions</u> It is recommended that 'English' spelling conventions be used throughout Annex A.

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Decision of IGC Plenary Date

Background: <u>Terminology</u> Annex A refers to 'sailplane(s)' and 'soaring'. The FAI Sporting Code, General Section and Section 3, both use the terms 'glider' and 'gliding', and, paradoxically, 'soaring' when referring to performance. All three documents use the term 'motor glider'. <u>Spelling Conventions</u> The FAI Sporting Code, General Section and Section 3, both use 'English' spelling conventions for words such as 'organise' and 'penalise'. Annex A uses the American spelling convention of '...ize.'
--

Comment: <i>Annex A Group supports this amendment</i> These changes to the terminology and spelling conventions for the Annex should be carried out at the same time as the change to the content of the Annex (amendment 0201) and the reformatting and separation of rules and explanatory text (amendment 0234) to provide a total revamp of the Annex.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0235	Layout of Annex A	Substantial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>Revision of the layout of Annex A to align to the format and numbering of the Sporting Code, and to separate the text into “Rules” and “explanatory text”.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>To standardise the format with other FAI documents and improve the readability of the “Rules”</p>
--	--

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>It is recommended that the layout of Annex A be amended to:</p> <p>a) Conform to the document format and numbering layout of the Sporting Code as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">1. MAIN HEADING IN BOLD CAPITALS</p> <p>1.1 Side Heading In Bold Title Format</p> <p>Main paragraph with:</p> <p>a. Sub paragraphs, which may include:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) Sub-sub paragraphs.</p> <p>b) Separate the “rules” from the “explanatory” text by either:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">i) Insetting the explanatory text from the left-hand margin, or</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ii) Incorporating the explanatory text as “hidden” text within Annex A, or</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">iii) Publishing the explanatory text in a separate document</p> <p><i>c) Print the “explanatory” text in a smaller font than the main text if included in Annex A</i></p>
--

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

The FAI documents should all follow the same format and numbering layout.

The readability of Annex A, and subsequently the identification and interpretation of the “Rules” as separate from “explanatory text” would be improved if they were identified in a different format. Significant proportions of the existing text are merely an explanation of what is required. For example:

- 4.8 on the role of the Safety Committee;
- 5.2.3 etc on the role of the Stewards;
- 10.3.1 describing “configuration”; and
- 19.1 describing the various tasks.

It is recommended that the “explanatory text” be inset from the left-hand margin and written in italics, in smaller font, following the rule that the text amplifies.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment

This amendment should be carried out in conjunction with the revisions to the Contents (0201) and the clarification of terminology and spelling (0234). This will provide a reformatted and much clearer Annex A for use from 1 Oct 02 and will enable the use of explanatory text to assist Organisers in determining appropriate Tasks, Start Procedures, and Scoring protocols.

Ideally the formatting and numbering of the Annex should allow Organisers to select and print the specific rule options (Tasks, Starts, Finishes, Scoring etc) that will apply to their event.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0244	19	Substantial	1 October 2002

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>The revision of the existing section on Tasks to follow-up on IGC plenary requirements from 2001 including the deletion of the DST-task types</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>The Plenary, in 2001, required a review of speed points for non-finishers on the AST and the marking distance for TDT. Feedback from organisers and competitors has suggested that the various task options are too complex and that we need to simplify the task options. This amendment is an alternative amendment to 0226 v2.</p>
---	--

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the existing Section 19 be replaced completely by the following text:

19 TASKS

Competitors are required to complete the task. The task may require the achievement of:

- a. *The maximum speed over a designated distance via allocated Turn Points (Assigned Speed Task – AST), or*
- b. *The maximum speed in a designated minimum time via any allocated Assigned Areas (AA) or Turn Points (TP) (Task in Designated Time –TDT/AA and TDT/TP).*
- c. *The maximum distance in a designated maximum time via any allocated Assigned Areas (AA) or Turn Points (TP) (Task in Designated Time –TDT/AA and TDT/TP).*

The Organizers shall set one of the AST, TDT/AA, or TDT/TP types of task each day and at least two different types of task during a Championship. A single task type should not be used for more than 67% of the Championship days. The Organisers shall designate the scoring program (speed or distance) to be used for the TDT tasks.

19.1 Definitions

- a. *Task Distance - is the distance from the Start Point to the Finish Line via all assigned Turn Points, or the center of all Assigned Areas (including any optional areas), as appropriate.*
- b. *Marking Time –*
 - (i) *For AST is the time achieved by the individual competitor;*
 - (ii) *For TDT it is the longer of the time achieved by the individual*

competitor or the maximum designated time

- c. *Marking Speed - is the distance from the competitor's actual Start Point to the Finish Line, via all Assigned Areas or assigned Turn Points, divided by the Marking Time.*
- d. *Marking Distance – is the distance from the competitor's actual Start Point to the Finish Line, via all Assigned Areas or assigned Turn Points, minus, for a non-finisher:*
 - (i) *AST - the distance from the outlanding position via any Turn Points not achieved, to the Finish Line, or*
 - (ii) *TDT – the distance from the outlanding position to the Finish Line*
- e. *Bonus Distance – applies only to TDT for distance only and is a proportional reduction in the distance from the outlanding position to the Finish Line determined either: by the distance the pilot achieves towards the Finish Line; or, by the altitude of the glider above the departure airfield, at the expiry of the designated time.*

19.2 Assigned Speed Task (AST)

- f. *Any Start Option (a), (b), or (c) may be set and finish line or finish ring may be used.*
- g. *If Start Option (c) is used the Start Point which yields the greatest distance shall be used to assess the Task Distance.*

19.3 Task in Designated Time with Assigned Areas (TDT/ AA)

- f. *Any Start Option (a), (b), or (c) may be set and finish line or finish ring may be used.*
- g. *If Start Option (c) is are used the Start Point which yields the greatest distance shall be used to assess the nominal Task Distance.*
- h. *A Minimum Task Time is set for the speed scoring option. A Maximum Task Time is set for the distance scoring option.*

19.4 Task in Designated Time with Turn Points (TDT / TP)

- a. *A maximum of 10 Turn Points, from a list assigned by the Organizers, may be utilized in any order. However the pilot may not return to a Turn Point before having rounded two other Turn Points, except when finishing at the Goal.*
- b. *The Organizers may:*
 - (iv) *Impose the same mandatory first and/ or last Turn Point, for all competitor's, and/ or*
 - (v) *Declare certain Turn Points ineligible as first and/ or last Turn Points, and/ or*
 - (vi) *Require the competitors to declare their first Turn Point prior to take-off.*

- c. *Start option (a) or (c) may be set. Start option (b) may only be set if the first Turn Point is mandatory.*
- d. *Finish ring shall be used, unless the Organizers impose a mandatory last Turn Point in which case the finish line may be used.*
- e. *A Minimum Task Time is set for the speed scoring option. A Maximum Task Time is set for the distance scoring option.*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

The purpose of this alternative amendment (to 0226 v2) is to simplify the task requirements and to focus on the types of tasks that experience has shown pilots and organisers prefer.

This amendment has been developed, in parallel with amendment 0245 – Scoring, following feedback on a survey distributed at the 27th WGC at Mafikeng. The fine detail of the wording may need further development. The intention of the Annex A Committee is to obtain approval by the Plenary to fully develop the Tasks section (and the Scoring section) in conjunction with the Bureau, for implementation on 1st October 2002.

Changes to the past Tasks section

The DST task has been deleted it is felt that there is little interest in this task because of the complexity of having to maximise distance and speed. Organisers and pilots have shown no interest in using this task when it has been available, while the TDT/AA task has been generally well received, especially when flown as a speed task.

This amendment provides three task types: AST – scored for speed; TDT/AA, which may be scored for speed **or** distance; and, TDT/TP which may be scored for speed **or** distance.

Using the AST, TDT/AA and TDT/TP still provides a degree of flexibility to organisers and quite different challenges to the pilots.

Speed points are only awarded for finishers in the AST and a scoring option allows speed points to be awarded for finishers in the TDT/AA and TDT/TP. In all tasks, non-finishers are awarded distance only.

When the TDT/AA and TDT/TP tasks are set as speed tasks then a minimum time must be set. Pilots reaching the goal in less than the minimum time are penalised by having their speed calculated by dividing their achieved distance by the nominated minimum time. Pilots failing to reach the goal (landing out) can only be scored maximum distance points in accordance with the scoring formula.

When the TDT/AA and TDT/TP tasks are set as distance tasks then a maximum time must be

set. Pilots are scored the distance achieved in the time allowed. A maximum time is necessary to prevent pilots feeling they must fly all the hours

Provision of a Bonus

A challenge for the TDT-type task, when flown as a distance only task, is to encourage pilots to fly safely at the end of the time and to discourage them from flying the last few minutes at high speed to a very low altitude to maximise the distance achieved. Various options may encourage pilots to retain sufficient altitude to return to the departure airfield. These include:

- a. Providing a distance bonus for landing back at the departure airfield. It is suggested this bonus has little relevance to the distance achieved on task and therefore only rewards the pilots ability to get home at the end of the day.
- b. Providing a distance bonus for achieving additional distance, in the direction of the Goal, after the end of the designated time.
- c. Providing a distance bonus for the altitude that a pilot has in hand at the end of the designated time, and to convert this altitude to distance.

Two options are offered in this amendment.

The first allows pilots to minimise the distance lost if they land short of the Goal. This option would reduce the distance between the landing point and the finish line by a percentage of the distance flown towards the finish line after the expiry of the designated time. A Day factor could be applied to this percentage adjustment so that, if all pilots land out, there is no percentage reduction applied.

The second option converts the altitude that a pilot has in hand, above the departure airfield, at the end of the designated time to distance. The altitude is converted to distance at an appropriate glide ratio by allowing additional marking distance for every complete 20m of altitude. This glide ratio needs to be less than the glider should achieve to encourage the pilot to fly for distance rather than altitude. Retention of altitude at the end of the designated time will also assist pilots return to the departure airfield.

Comment:

Annex A Group Opinion. This amendment is an alternative to 0226 v2 and either this amendment or 0226 v2 should be accepted by the Plenary.

This amendment needs to be read in conjunction with:

- a. Amendment 0220 v2 (Finishing)
- b. Amendment 0228 v2 (Start Procedures)
- c. Amendment 0229 (Outlandings)
- d. Amendment 0245 (Scoring)

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0245	Sections 21 & 22	Substantial	1 October 2002

Summary: Revision of scoring rules and algorithms as proposed to the Plenary 2001	Reason: The addition of scoring rules and algorithms, as detailed in the explanation attached, to support the Tasks proposed in amendment 0244.
---	---

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Section 21 and Section 22 be deleted in total and replaced with the following text and that one of the two options for section 21.4.1 – 1000-points scoring for AST - be selected:

SCORING

21 General Requirements

21.1 The Championship shall be scored according to:

- e. Distance Scoring*
- f. 1000-Point Scoring*
- g. Place Scoring*
- h. Team Scoring*

Only one of the scoring systems (a), (b), or (c) may be used for primary individual rankings to select a Champion. This system shall be the same for the duration of the Championships.

Scoring systems (c) and/ or (d) may be used concurrently for secondary rankings to determine individual or team rankings.

21.2 Common Rules

21.2.1 Championship Day In order that a day may be counted as a championship day, a launch opportunity shall have been given to each competitor in the class in time for the competitor to carry out the task of the day in question. A Championship day is defined as one on which more than 25% of the competitors in the class, who have had a competition launch on that day, fly a marking distance of at least 100 km [, or for the World Class, a marking distance of at least 60 km.- Reference Amendment 0221].

21.2.2 Each competitor shall be given daily points based on his performance on each championship day. The score given to each competitor shall be rounded to the nearest whole

number, the value of 0.5 being rounded up.

21.2.3 If handicaps are used, they shall be applied to the competitor's Marking Speed only for finishers in an AST, or to the competitor's Marking Distance for AST for non-finishers and for TDT, before any other scoring calculation, as follows:

- c. Highest Performance glider has lowest handicap - multiply the Marking Speed or Distance (assessed in accordance with Section 19) by the glider handicap, and then dividing the result by the lowest handicap in the class.
- d. Lowest Performance glider has lowest handicap - divide the Marking Speed or Distance (assessed in accordance with Section 19) by the glider handicap, and then multiply the result by the highest handicap in the class.

21.2.4 Flights that have been disqualified shall be given zero points for the day, but shall be included in the scoring formula. Any penalties shall be deducted from the competitor's score after it has been calculated in accordance with section 22.

21.2.5 Cumulative and final scores shall be calculated by adding the points obtained each day on the nominated scoring system.

[21.2.6 Joker Rule – see amendment 0233]

21.2.7 Common Definitions

Dt = Task Distance (for AST only)

Td = Task Time (for TDT)

T = Competitor's Marking Time if $T < Td$

D = Competitor's Marking Distance

D1 = Best Marking Distance of the Day, which is the longest Marking Distance achieved, after handicapping if appropriate.

Dm = Minimum Distance, which is equal to 100 km, except for the World Class where it is equal to 60 km, after handicapping if appropriate.

V = Competitor's Marking Speed (for AST only)

V1 = The highest Marking Speed (for AST Only) of any competitor having completed the task.

21.3 Distance Scoring

The competitor's score (S) is expressed in distance units (e.g. km), and is equal to:

For AST $S = (V/V1) \times D$

For TDT $S = D$

21.4 1000-Points Scoring

The competitor's score (S) is expressed in points.

$$S = P_u \times f$$

The maximum score available (Pm), in points (subject to correction by the Day Factor, f) is the least of:

$$P_m = 1000, \text{ or}$$

$$P_m = 5 \times \text{best Marking Distance (in km)} - 250, \text{ or}$$

$$P_m = 400 \times \text{best Marking Time (in hours)} - 200$$

$$\text{Day Factor (f)} = 1.25 \times n / N \text{ (when f exceeds 1 it shall be taken as 1)}$$

$$n = \text{number of pilots who exceed the Minimum Distance (Dm)}$$

$$N = \text{number of pilots having had a competition launch that day}$$

21.4.1 Scoring for Speed (AST and TDT)

$$P_u \text{ (uncorrected points)} = P_d \text{ (distance points)} + P_v \text{ (speed points)}$$

$$P_d = D/D1 \times (1 - (2 \times R_n)/3) \times P_m$$

$$P_v = 2 \times (V/V1 - 2/3) \times R_n \times P_m$$

$$P_v = 0 \quad \text{if it is negative and for non-finishers.}$$

$$R_n = \frac{\text{number of competitors exceeding } 2/3^{\text{rd}} \text{ of best speed (V1)}}{N}$$

21.4.2 Scoring for Distance (TDT)

$$P_u \text{ (uncorrected points)} = D/D1 \times P_m \times (1 - R_d/2)$$

If $D/D1 < 2/3$

$$P_u \text{ (uncorrected points)} = 2/3 \times P_m \times (1 - R_d/2) + (D/D1 - 2/3) \times P_m \times (1 + R_d)$$

If $D/D1 > 2/3$

$$R_d = \frac{\text{number of competitors exceeding } 2/3^{\text{rd}} \text{ of best marking distance (D1)}}{N}$$

Correction for outlanding and Day Factor to be developed.

21.5 Place Scoring

Each competitor shall be assessed on their daily score according to scoring system (a) or (b).

The maximum Place Scores (PSm) available shall be the least of:

$$P_{Sm} = 20, \text{ or}$$

$$P_{Sm} = \text{half the number of pilots with a competition launch on that day, or}$$

$$P_{Sm} = \text{the number of pilots who exceed the Minimum Distance (Dm) plus 1}$$

The Day winner shall be given a Place Score equal to PSm.

The second placed pilot shall be given (PSm – 1) points, and so on each pilot being allocated one less place score than the pilot preceding him.

The last placed (20th) pilot shall be given a Place Score of 1 (assuming that there were more than 40 pilots who received a competition launch and at least 19 pilots exceeded Dm). All other pilots shall receive a Place Score of 1, except that pilots who did not have a competition launch or who did not achieve any distance or who were disqualified shall not receive any Place Scores.

In case of a tie of two or more pilots, all tied pilots receive the same number of place scores, being one less than the next placed pilot above the tied group. The place scores of lower ranking pilots are unchanged.

21.6 Team Scoring

Each team shall be assessed daily on the mean of the scores of all of their pilots having had a competition launch that day, according to scoring system (a), (b) or (c).

PENALTIES

22.1 Penalties shall be imposed for non-compliance with any Rule or Local Procedure in accordance with the following table, which gives the approved penalties applicable to the 1000-Point scoring system.

22.2 For distance scoring, a penalty of 1 km shall be applied for each equivalent 5 points in the 1000-Point Score table. For Place Scoring and Team Scoring, penalties shall be applied in accordance with the scoring system being used before allocating final Place or Team Scores.

22.3 Other violations shall be penalised according to the FAI Sporting Code, General Section, Chapter 5.2.

22.4 List of Approved Penalties [refer to existing table at 22.1.7]

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary (if appropriate)

Date

Background:

The purpose of this alternative amendment (to 0232 v2) is to simplify the scoring requirements and to focus on the types of tasks that experience has shown pilots and organisers prefer.

This amendment has been developed, in parallel with amendment 0244 – Tasks, following feedback on a survey distributed at the 27th WGC at Mafikeng. The fine detail of the wording may require further development. The intention of the Annex A Committee is to obtain approval by the Plenary to fully develop the Scoring section (and the Tasks section) in conjunction with the Bureau, for implementation on 1st October 2002.

At the IGC plenary meeting 2001 “an adjustment to the ratio of speed versus fastest speed” was supported, because “the existing scoring formula generated strange results for DST” (recommendation 1.15), giving speed points to non finishers in AST was not supported (recommendation 3.7).

The Annex A group was charged with:

- Investigating further the proposals to award speed points to non finishers and to assess the marking distance in TDT (recommendation 3.4), and
- Ensuring that scoring using distance, place time and speed are available to organisers (recommendation 3.8).

Special attention has been paid to set a formula for each task that is easy to understand. It also ensures that, even in DST, a reasonably simple assessment of scores can be achieved. This will enable pilots to compare their performances after flight without waiting the results are displayed, and scorers to be able to assess which fix in a given flight record would yield the better score (the original aim of a virtual outlanding).

This amendment needs to be read in conjunction with:

- Amendment 0221 v2 (Minimum distance for World Class)
- Amendment 0233 v2 (Joker Rule)
- Amendment 0244 (Tasks)

Explanation of the Changes Incorporated in the Amendment

For TDT (either TDT/AA or TDT/TP) the scoring algorithm, for speed scoring, is intended to reference the individual performance of a pilot to the maximum distance achieved on the day. This avoids the possibility of a deliberately shortened flight (flying for less than the designated minimum time) achieved at high speed, from winning the day.

1000-point Scoring

For AST and TDT speed scoring, section 21.4.1 retains the classical 1000-point scoring formula. Feedback at the 27th WGC suggests that the majority prefer to retain the existing system of scoring speed only for pilots who finish the task.

The scoring system - Distance Scoring, 1000-Point Scoring or Place Scoring - has to be selected by the organiser. The relative day rankings will be the same in all three scoring systems, which differ only by the expression of the score in distance unit or in points (with Version 2 of 21.4.1). The best day score is either the best marking distance, or 1000 points (or less for shorter tasks, as usual), or a number of places.

For cumulative scores, the Distance Scoring will give more importance to tasks with a longer distance (usually those that are flown with the best weather) – and less importance for shorter tasks (that used to be more prone to luck factors) than the 1000-Point system. As a result, Distance Scoring seems the fairer, and least complex, system to use for all competitions. Of course 1000-Point Scoring may continue to be used.

If Place Scoring is used, the onus is put on the day ranking and not on the performance gap. As a result bad performances (such as early outlandings) are not penalised as much as with the other two scoring systems. Place Scoring may be used as primary ranking system (to select the Champion) or for secondary ranking and awards.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment.

Consequential Amendments – renumbering of the paragraphs as appropriate.

Other amendments have proposed changes to specific rules in Sections 21 and 22. These changes are not incorporated in this amendment. For reference they are:

- Amendment 0221 v2 changing rule 21.2.1 (adding a minimum marking distance for the World Class)
- Amendment 0222 changing rules 22.1.7 and 22.2.8 (the names of the penalties)
- Amendment 0231 changing rules 22.1.7 and 22.2.8 (the value of the penalty for exceeding the start altitude)
- Amendment 0233 v2 adding the Joker Rule to 21.2

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0236	3.3	Substantial	1 October 2003

Summary: Addition to existing text in 3.3 to establish a <u>minimum</u> length for an IGC sanctioned competition	Reason: To prevent unreasonably short contests occurring at World level
--	---

Recommendation: <p>It is recommended that 3.3 be amended by the addition of the words in bold to set a minimum length for an IGC sanctioned competition:</p> <p><i>3.3 The total period of the event shall be not less than 10 days and shall not exceed 16 days including two days on which the Opening and the Closing Ceremonies are held. At least one non-flying rest day shall be given during the period, although the Organizers may declare further rest days for stated reasons such as pilot fatigue.</i></p>

Decision of IGC Bureau: Type of Amendment: Recommendation: Date
--

Decision of IGC Plenary Date

Background: <p>This proposal arises from concerns expressed at the length of the WAG event in 2001 and the desire that the Annex A Group believe the IGC Plenary have to ensure that the duration of international gliding events is not dictated by organisations outside the IGC.</p>

Comment: <p><i>Annex A Group supports this amendment</i></p> <p>Note amendment 0203 amends paragraph 3.3 by combining 3.3 and 3.4</p>

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0237	4.2	Substantial	1 October 2003

Summary: Addition of requirement for Organisers to provide competent PR facilities in accordance with the Sporting Code requirements	Reason: Competent and appropriate media support and reporting is critical to the success of international events
--	--

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p><i>It is recommended that a new section 4.2 d., plus explanatory text, be incorporated:</i></p> <p><i>4.2 The Organizers shall provide:</i></p> <p><i>d. Appropriate facilities and personnel to enable the prompt and efficient publication of results and news from the Championship on the Internet and through other forms of news media in accordance with the FAI Sporting Code, General Section 4.3.4.3</i></p> <p><u>Explanation:</u> Organizers should consider appointing a Public Relations Officer (PRO) who is responsible for publicising the event as widely as possible using printed, visual and electronic media. The PRO has no executive powers in the running of the event although he may be a member of the event organising committee. The PRO may not attend meetings of the International Jury except if called as a witness. At the conclusion of the event, the PRO should submit an article to the Event Director. This article should use appropriate printed, visual and electronic media, be included in the official report to the NAC and FAI, and used separately for publicity as required.</p>

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

<p>Decision of IGC Plenary</p> <p>Date</p>
--

<p>Background:</p> <p>This proposal arises from concern about the lack of PR coverage at some events during 2001. This requirement could, alternatively, be part of the “bid” package with Organisers being required to detail their PR plans for the event before the bid is forwarded to the Plenary for consideration.</p>
--

<p>Comment:</p> <p><i>Annex A Group supports this amendment</i></p> <p>Note amendment 0204 combines 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5 as bullet points under 4.2.</p>
--

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0238	5.3	Substantial	1 October 2003

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>Consolidation of requirements relating to the International Jury</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>Most of the detail in the existing 5.3 and subsequent paragraphs is, in fact, information, and is redundant in Annex A as it is located in the FAI Jury Handbook</p>
--	---

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>It is recommended that 5.3, and subsequent paragraphs, be amended (deletions in strikeout) as shown:</p> <p>5.3 <u>International Jury</u></p> <p>5.3.1 <i>A member of the Jury must understand and speak English and must possess a thorough knowledge of: the FAI Sporting Code, General Section and Section 3; the FAI International Jury Members Handbook, and, Rules and Local Procedures for the Championships. The Jury members shall at all times take care not to get involved in the running of the Championships. They must strive to be neutral and independent of the Championships Director's decisions. However, they should be prepared to give advice and answer queries regarding interpretation of the rules and the general running of the event if raised by officials of the event.</i></p> <p>5.3.4 Meetings of the International Jury</p> <p>5.3.4.1 Attendance at Jury meetings is compulsory for Jury members, except for special reasons such as illness or emergencies. In such cases the Jury President may accept an eligible replacement nominated by the Jury member concerned.</p> <p>5.3.4.2 Jury meetings are to be conducted in accordance with the FAI International Jury Members Handbook.</p> <p>5.3.4.3 Decisions by the Jury shall be reached by simple majority. The President of the Jury shall report the details of any protest to FAI.</p>
--

<p>Decision of IGC Bureau:</p> <p>Type of Amendment:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Date</p>

<p>Decision of IGC Plenary</p> <p>Date</p>
--

Background:

This amendment is proposed to reduce the amount of unnecessary text in Annex A and to consolidate the requirements for the International Jury. Paragraph 5.3.4.3 is redundant as the Jury of three must reach a majority decision.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment

Note amendments 0206 and 0208 proposed changes to 5.2 and 5.3, which this amendment logically follows.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0239 v2	Section 21	Substantial	1 October 2003

<p style="text-align: center;">Summary:</p> <p>Imposed Start Times are proposed as alternatives to the usual start procedures to suppress leeching and most gaggle flying, to establish start procedures better suited to team championships, and to improve public interest. Four variants of the Imposed Start Time are offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regatta start • Race against time (RAT) • Inverted race against time (I-RAT) • Imposed time slots (ITS) 	<p style="text-align: center;">Reason:</p> <p>See 'Background'</p>
--	---

Recommendation:

Four options for Imposing Start Times are provided for discussion. As this is a new substantial amendment proposal, only the principles are discussed here. Detailed rule wording will have to be completed later for consideration and implementation in 2003, depending on the decisions of the Plenary.

1 - Regatta Start

The start time is the same for all competitors, as in a yacht regatta or bike race. It is the time of opening of the start.

It may be used with any competition class. The launch must be managed to ensure all gliders are dropped in the immediate vicinity of the others in the same group.

If a start circle (typically of 10 to 30 km of diameter) is in use, all competitors have to be within the circle at the opening of the start, and the start point for each competitor will be his position at the time of opening. The pilot has only to reach the maximum allowed altitude at the nominated start time. This will better suit TDT and DST Tasks with turn points (TDT/TP or DST/TP) or Assigned Areas (TDT/AA or DST/AA) because the start point is different for each pilot, as are the turn point, and each pilot may choose both his start position and a first turn point in any direction, to prevent following.

If a start line is in use, all competitors have to cross the start line after the opening. The start line has to be large enough in relation to the number of gliders in the class (it cannot be used if there are too many). This will better suit the AST Task, because in this case the first glider home will be the winner. This proposal will not prevent gaggles, because even if spaced on the start line the gliders will converge to the first turn point, but it will prevent leeches getting an advantage by starting 2 or 3 minutes after another pilot and leeching all the way to finish together. After all, there are days when everybody is waiting for the others to start, and all pilots eventually start within 1 or 2 minutes just before start closure. The regatta start will

have the same effect, without the two hours waiting at the start and watching each other in a single gaggle. The regatta start for AST will be better used on cumulus days, where the difference of speeds will cause a natural spacing of all gliders.

The regatta start was used to good effect at Gawler, in January 2001, where gliders were started from a small start circle in small groups (5 or 6) on an AST task. Having the gliders racing in small groups reduced gagging.

Regatta start are perfect for the last day of a Championship, to ensure early finishes, or for public or media events, using TDT, to know exactly the time when the finishes will begin.

2 – Race Against Time (RAT)

Each pilot is allocated a different start time, in the reverse order of their current overall standings; in the same manner as bicycle races against time, car rallies, and reverse order saloon car racing.

The interval between two consecutive pilots needs to be large enough to minimise the chance of the latter catching up the former at the first thermal, but not so large that the weather conditions are significantly different for the two pilots. An interval of 6 minutes seems suitable. If the task is extensive, the class may be divided into two or three groups (based on current overall standing, eg. group A is 1st, 4th 7th, etc; group B is 2nd, 5th, 8th, etc, group C is 3rd, 6th, 9th, etc), and one glider of each group start alternatively at 2 or 3-minute intervals. Using this technique a class of 50 competitors, in two groups, would take 100 minutes to start.

The first pilots (the last in the ranking) may start before all gliders have been launched, but each glider shall be launched well before it's allocated start time. A sufficient time delay should be provided to enable a climb to the maximum altitude after the launch.

The option of setting Start Time equal to Release Time should not be used in a Championship, because there would be too much chance involved.

RAT will perfectly suit AST, because one knows at once which pilot has won the task, knowing the start interval between two pilots, and because the last pilot in the standings are given more time to complete the same tasks. It can be used also in Tasks in Designated Time (TDT/TP or TDT/AA), but not in Distance and Speed Tasks (DST/TP or DST/AA), because the first pilots to start would be given an opportunity to fly much longer than the Minimum Time of the task.

In a Team Championship, all gliders of one team will be allocated the same start time. As there are fewer teams than individual gliders, there would be no need to separate the class in several subgroups in this case. Therefore Race Against Time would suit a Team Championships.

3 – Inverted Race Against Time (“Fox Hunt”) (I-RAT)

As for Race Against Time, except that pilots start in the order of current overall standings (the first pilot overall starts first).

This has the advantage that the fastest pilots start first and do not overtake the slowest pilots, or form a gaggle with them (in some bicycle races it is prohibited for competitors to stay together when one overtakes the other, but it seems impossible to implement such a rule in soaring!). The disadvantage of starting first is to the first overall pilot, in terms of weather conditions. If the first pilot to start wins again, one can be sure that he has won by himself, not

by following others! The task has to be short enough, so that the last ranked pilots (who are probably also the slowest) have a reasonable chance to get home.

This start system might be used not only as an individual task procedure, but also as a ranking system. The first half of the contest would be used to provide overall standings, with conventional starts, and the second half would use inverted races against time, the first-ranked starting first of each remaining tasks, and the new overall ranking after each task would be the finish order of this task, until the last day! Therefore every pilot would retain his chance of winning until the last day... and the final winner would certainly have won by himself, not by following others, because he has to be the first to cross the line!

The system of combining conventional start with I-RAT starts might be difficult to be accepted by pilots for conventional Championships. However, it may be of great interest for Team Championships – the performance difference between teams may be higher than individuals and the use of the I-RAT team over the last few days will retain interest in the competition because lower placed teams have an opportunity to close the points gap.

4 – Imposed Time Slots (ITS)

Each pilot is allocated a set of start times, which significantly separate - in time - pilots of consecutive ranking, but allowing them to choose to start sooner or later as usual, by selecting one slot among several separated by half an hour.

If H is the time of opening, the first pilot in overall ranking will be permitted to choose his start time among the following slots: H, H + 30', H + 60', H + 90', etc.; the second-ranked pilot will be allocated H + 12', H + 42', H + 72', etc.; the third pilot, H + 24', H + 54', etc.; the fourth pilot, H + 6', H + 36', etc; the fifth pilot, H + 18', H + 48', etc. The sixth pilot may then be set the same slots as the first pilot, and so on,

Each pilot is, therefore, separated by 12 minutes from the pilots preceding him and following him immediately at the overall standings, and by 6 minutes from the pilots with 2 ranks of difference. As a result leeching opportunities are reduced because the pilots who have the same start slots are significantly different in their rankings (and therefore performance).

Although there is less time separation between pilots than with Race Against Time, this start system allows both time separation and choice of the start time, which is an important tactical choice. It should be preferred when the weather is uncertain or not constant during the period needed for a Race Against Time.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

Existing competition procedures using different start points for each competitor, imposing a 15 minute interval between two starts, and setting new types of tasks (where the course flown is up to the choice of competitors), among other rules, may reduce leeching and gagging, but have not proved sufficiently effective in ensuring that one competitor cannot follow another.

Imposing start times is a more radical method that will efficiently separate competitors, provided that it is used with care to keep the game as fair as possible. It is not intended that start times be imposed for the whole contest, but it should be used in one or a few days, when the weather conditions remain constant for a long part of the day, so that each competitor would be given the same chances.

It will put the onus on pilot's soaring skills on task, when flying alone (or with his teammate only, if it is a team Championship), not on his ability to choose the best start tactics.

It may also add some extra fun to contest flying and improve its comprehension for public or media, by analogy to yacht or bicycle races, as already seen at the Grand Prix flown at Gawler, 2001.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment. It is noted that a considerable effort will be required to ensure that these variations are defined adequately and that they are simple to apply to avoid confusion and enhance their usage.

Revision Status

- Version 2 makes some minor editorial amendments to the text

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001
Amendment to Annex A
Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Amendment No.	Annex A Reference	Type of Amendment	Date of Implementation
0240 v2	Sections 6, 7 & 20	Substantial	1 October 2003

Summary:	Reason:
The review of the options relating to Team Flying and the number of entries per Class with a view to provide fair competitions and reduce the likelihood of gaggle flying	To confirm the status of Champions as individuals or “teams” <u>and</u> reduce the level of gagging

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the IGC accept the options below that it deems appropriate for future Championships.

Options for future IGC International Championships Classes:

- 1) Retain the present FAI Classes
- 2) Establish a Team Class with specific categories (such as male/ female pilots; experienced and youthful pilots; juniors only; etc) and where the “team”, not individuals gains the score

Options for future the IGC International Championships calendar:

- 1a) Retain the existing IGC Championships calendar, **or**
- 1b) Re-organise the IGC Championship calendar to provide one single multi-class event every year so that all classes/ categories compete every two years,
This would provide, perhaps, up to six classes at each event – for example:
Year One: Open, 18M, 15M, Std, Juniors (2 classes);
Year Two: Club, World, Women’s (3 classes), Team, **or**
- 1c) Re-organise the IGC Championship calendar to provide one single multi-class event every year so that all classes/ categories compete every three years
This would provide, perhaps, up to four classes at each event – for example:
Year One: Open, 18M, 15M, Std;
Year Two: Club, World, Juniors (2 classes);
Year Three: Women’s (3 classes), Team

Options for the Number of Pilot Entries at IGC Championships:

- 1a) Retain the present absolute limit of 120 entries at a Championship event, **or**

- 1b) Reduce the absolute limit for the number of entries at a Championship event
- 2a) Retain the status quo (*two pilots per NAC in multi-class events, and more in single-class events depending on the Organisers ability to ensure safety*), **or**
- 2b) Permit only one entry per NAC per Class, **or**
- 2c) *Permit only one entry per NAC per Class except for either two or three entries per NAC in a dedicated Team Class*

Options for Reducing Gaggling at IGC Championships:

- 1a) Formally prohibit team flying, **or**
- 1b) Accept that team flying is a part of the sport
- 2a) Require that a single radio frequency only be used (mono frequency), **or**
- 2b) Allow the use of multiple radio frequencies
- 3) Provide penalties for all pilots who join a thermal already occupied by a glider
- 4) Provide bonuses for being:
 - a) The first pilot home, **and/ or**
 - b) The first pilot at a Turn Point, **and/ or**
 - c) Starting within a certain time limit after the start gate opens.
- 5) *Use multiple start points*
- 6) *Impose individual start times for pilots*
- 7) *Use the “grand prix” starting technique with groups of gliders being towed to a common release point together and having an imposed start time*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Type of Amendment:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

The IGC Plenary, in 2001, tasked the Annex A Committee with proposing options regarding the numbers of pilots per NAC per Class.

The Annex A Committee has prepared a white paper reviewing the history of Team Flying and Gaggle Flying in Soaring Championships. The paper has been posted on the IGC website.

The attached options have been developed from the paper. It is noted that these options are not mutually exclusive; rather they form a suite of options from which IGC may create whatever menu of competition that it desires.

The proposals cover alternative competition formats, including a new Team Class and possible conjoint hosting of various classes; provide alternatives for the acceptable number of competitors per class; and, provide suggested mechanisms that may be effective in reducing the incidence of gagging.

A number of alternative starting options have been offered for consideration under amendment 0239.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this amendment. The range of options represents the range of views from the Group. The Group generally supports the concept of a Team Championships, multi-class championship, 120 entries maximum, and 2 pilots per NAC per class. In terms of reducing gagging we believe that it is not possible to prohibit team flying or to use mono frequency, but that gagging should be discouraged by other means such as task types and start procedures.

There is a direct conflict between enhancing safety by reducing pilot numbers, and the need to have an adequate number of entries to ensure the economic viability of a competition. The future of a single-class competition should therefore, be given careful consideration.

Depending on the decisions taken on these proposals, a number of subsequent amendments may have to be prepared for the Annex A sections referenced by this amendment.

Revision Status

- Version 2 expands the Annex A Group comment

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001

Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Proposal No.	Reference	Date of Implementation
0241	IGC Steward Handbook	1 April 2002

Summary:	Reason:
The acceptance of the IGC Steward Handbook	The provision of guidance for IGC Stewards

Recommendation:

It is recommended that Version 4 (dated 22 November 2001) of the draft IGC Steward Handbook be adopted.

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

Three drafts of the IGC Steward Handbook have been available on the IGC website during 2001. Each draft has been amended as a result of feedback from the gliding community.

The latest version (V 4) was dated 22 November 2001.

This handbook parallels the FAI Jury Handbook, and provides information and guidance to IGC Stewards to assist them in their role. The acceptance of the Handbook will also enable significant portions of explanatory text to be removed from Annex A.

Comment:

Annex A Group supports this proposal

Note the implementation of the IGC Steward Handbook is immediate.

SUBMISSION TO IGC BUREAU 2001

Proposed by the Annex A Committee

Proposal No.	Reference	Date of Implementation
0242	International Jury - Costs	1 April 2002

Summary:	Reason:
The review of the use of IGC sanction fees to assist Organisers fund the International Jury	The requirement to have three Jurors is expensive

Recommendation:

The IGC Plenary, in 2001, tasked the Annex A Committee with proposing options to reduce the costs of the International Jury to Championship Organisers.

A proposal to reduce the costs of the International Jury (dated 14 October 2001) has been prepared by the Annex A Committee. The paper has been posted on the IGC website.

The paper recommends that the IGC reviews the amount of sanction fees and either:

- a) Reduces the level of sanction fees to assist Organisers fund the International Officials, or
- b) *Uses funds generated by sanction fees to offset the costs of funding International Officials*

Decision of IGC Bureau:

Recommendation:

Date

Decision of IGC Plenary

Date

Background:

Comment:

Annex A group has no specific opinion on this proposal except to support the intention to reduce costs for Organisers.

