

Present: RB MH JS UJ RO NP SN KC TP AH CB BR AT

#### SPORTS CLASS

Background: under the current rules certain gliders fall into Sports Class that perhaps should not.

MH took the opportunity to extract numerous nasal hairs.

RO suggested using aspect ratio under 6:1 as a criteria.

After much discussion, RB presented three options:

- keep the current definition of Sports Class as-is
- use the manufacturer's target pilot guidelines to assign gliders to classes on a per-glider basis
- when a significantly similar gliders are certified under different schemes, use the hottest certification to set the class for that glider

The panel voted by a narrow margin to keep the current definition as-is, citing transparency of the system and the desire to avoid a knee-kerk reaction as the primary motivations.

Actions:  
none

#### SCORING FORMULA

RB noted that the rules still stated the use of GAP 2002 and that this should be changed to be "the scoring formula will be announced at briefing before the first task of the Championships." He also noted that "Competition" is mis-spelled on the Rules' title page.

MH explained why the PWC2008 formula was not a good fit for the British Championships. Everyone agreed that either the formula's parameters should be modified or a different formula should be used in 2009.

A scoring formula sub-committee of UJ, MH, RB and AT and BR if interested should propose a new formula to be put to committee vote.

Actions:  
- RB to update rules with scoring formula announcement and title mis-spelling  
- scoring sub-committee to propose new scoring formula

#### SCORING STOPPED TASKS

MH explained that the current rule of stopped tasks only scoring if a pilot is in goal could pressure the Meet Director to maintain a dangerous task until one pilot is in goal before stopping it to avoid losing the task. He proposed that an alternative criteria using perhaps time could allow tasks to be stopped and still scored without compromising safety.

UJ explained that using a binary valid/invalid criteria might encourage the Meet Director to keep an unsafe task running until the criteria are met. A continuous validity criteria, such as the percentage of the distance completed by the leader, would remove this incentive and allow the task to be stopped at the right time without any "hard points."

It was pointed out that the FAI rules are clear about the scoring of stopped tasks and it was not clear if we could deviate from them and maintain FAI Cat 2 status. MH said that other competitions often introduced local rules which conflicted with FAI rules but problems were avoided by informing them and asking them not to protest.

It was decided that this was closely related to scoring and that it should be part of the scoring subcommittee's investigation.

#### Actions

- scoring sub-committee to propose new scoring stopped tasks rule
- CB to check that alternative stopped task rules can be used

#### BRITISH CHAMPIONSHIPS DECLARATIONS

MH pointed out a possibly undesirable effect due to the normalisation of task scores to 1000 points for the British Championships. If a foreign pilot who is not competing in the Championships wins by a mile then the top British pilot will still score 1000 points. However, if a British pilot who is in the Champs but is not competing for it wins by a mile (e.g. because he is only competing in one of the three rounds) then the top Champs contender will score significantly less than 1000 points.

After a short discussion, it was decided that this was not a problem.

Actions:  
none

#### BRITISH CHAMPIONSHIP REQUIREMENTS

RB explained that the current qualifying requirements for the British Championships were:

- be Advanced Pilot rated
- hold a UK FAI Sporting Licence

He noted that in the current competition there were pilots who had been AP rated in the past but were strictly no longer AP rated because they were no longer members of the BHPA, and also pilots whose had changed their FAI Sporting Licence to a different country. He asked if they should qualify for the Championships.

CB pointed out that the Advanced Pilot rating is required by the BHPA for insurance reasons. CB phoned the BHPA to clarify this and was told that, as far as the BHPA were concerned, having held an AP rating in the past was sufficient. Therefore it was decided to change the requirement from "hold a BHPA AP rating" to "hold or have held a BHPA AP rating."

A longer discussion ensued about FAI cards. It was noted that pilots competing with a British FAI card contributed to the UK's rankings in the WPRS and therefore to the number of team places available at Cat 1 events and similar. British pilots flying with foreign FAI cards contribute to other Nations' rankings. Therefore it was decided to maintain the UK FAI card requirement.

#### Actions:

- RB to update rules with new AP requirements

#### FAILURE TO CHECK IN ON STOPPED TASKS

CB explained that just about the worst thing that a pilot can do from a safety

point of view on a stopped task is fail to check in. The current penalty of zero points for failure to check in is pointless because the task is not scored.

Various alternative penalties were discussed, and it was finally decided that a pilot should be penalised his average task points for that competition, i.e. that the pilot should effectively be penalised one task.

Actions:

- RB to update rules with new failure to check in penalty

## TEAM SELECTION

RB announced that the email vote on whether pilots must be in the top 400 of the WPRS to be considered for the Cat 1 team was passed. During the second meeting on the following day it was decided that this was too strict a rule and that there should be an element of discretion. Therefore, the final wording is "pilots in the top 400 of the WPRS are automatically considered for selection; any remaining places may be filled at the Comp Panel's discretion."

Concerns were raised about the quality of the WPRS as a selection criteria. In particular, currently PWCs are given a very strong weighting that makes it very difficult to for a pilot to rank highly without doing the PWC. For example, winning a high quality Cat 2 is roughly equivalent to coming 40th at a PWC. The WPRS also does not give any extra credence to events where British pilots compete against each other. Overall, it could be considered a PWC attendance record and not suitable for team selection.

MH proposed a simple alternative to the WPRS, where the WPRS is taken as a baseline but British Open events are scaled up to 100 points. CB explained that the WPRS was up for review in February and the likely changes would include both an elimination of the PWC bonus and a higher value for high quality Cat 2s.

It was agreed to keep the current WPRS based team selection rules in place for the moment and to review the situation when the new WPRS formulae are published.

Actions:

- PR to update website with 400 WPRS rule
- MH to propose tweaks to the WPRS for team selection

## NUMBERS ON GLIDERS

MH asked whether we should enforce numbers on gliders to identify them to make it easier to identify pilots who fly dangerously or in cloud. Although there was a general feeling that numbers would help, concerns were raised about the cost of providing numbers, conflicts with numbers from other competitions, and possible damage to gliders from the numbers themselves (or attempts to remove them). UJ did not see the advantage of glider numbers.

MH stated that the conflict problem could be avoided by asking pilots for their numbers before the competition and using those where possible. Where the same number is used by two pilots a '1' can be added to the start or end of one pilot's number.

Actions:

- BR to investigate cost of glider numbers

## MEET DIRECTOR'S FEE

CB stated that his fee had remained unchanged for the past several years, that it was based on one week of work per competition and that he was doing significantly more than, and that his fee was now lower than what other Meet Directors charged.

It was proposed that the Meet Director take a base fee plus a percentage of the profit of the competition as an incentive to make the competition as efficient as possible. This was countered by the observation that, for example, damage to minibuses directly affected the bottom line but were out of the Meet Director's control. KC observed that the Panel had no idea of the actual budget for a competition and lacked sufficient information to see where savings could or should be made. She also proposed that we should "work smarter, not harder", for example by planning the rounds to avoid excessive equipment transport costs and collaborating with the BPCup in the UK.

Everyone agreed that in principle we would like to increase the Meet Director's fee but currently do not have enough information to do so. The Panel would like to see the budget breakdown of this years' competitions.

Actions:

- RB and KC to obtain budget breakdown of 2008 competitions

#### CHAMPIONSHIP FORMAT 2009

TP asked for a quick show of hands as to whether we should consider changing the format of the Championships in 2009 following the long email discussion over the summer. The outcome was negative so another long discussion was avoided! However, two points were raised. RB suggested closer collaboration with the BPCup and it was agreed that the PWC qualifying rounds should be clearly announced beforehand on the website.

Actions:

- RB to investigate closer collaboration with BPCup
- PR to announce PWC qualifying rounds on the website when decided

#### REGISTRATION AT OPENS

The date, time and location of registration has not been well advertised and consequently pilots have been turning up late, shortly before the first task, and expecting to register which caused problems for the Meet Director.

It was agreed that the registration date, time and location should be announced on the website and that pilots should make all reasonable efforts to be present. In the event of an unavoidable delay, the Meet Director's phone number should be published alongside so that late pilots can warn the organisation.

Actions:

- PR to announce registration details on the website when decided

#### DATES AND VENUES 2009

RB explained that we should try to get the dates and locations of our competitions sorted so that as soon as the PWC announce their dates (expected early November) then we can announce ours without fear of conflict with other Cat 2s. Everyone agreed that this was a good idea.

After a short discussion, the Scottish Borders in May was proposed as the UK leg.

The shortlist of foreign venues for 2009 was whittled down from the initial list of Mayrhofen, Piedrahita, St Jean de Montclar, Bulgaria, Macedonia and Pieve to a slightly shorter shortlist of Piedrahita, Ager, St Jean de Montclar, St André and Bulgaria.

Mayrhofen and Pieve were discounted because Kelly Farina was either unwilling or did not have time to act as a local contact for these destinations. There were also questions about weather reliability at Mayrhofen and accommodation in Pieve. Macedonia was removed from consideration due to a lack of information about the destination and uncertainties about the weather.

NM and Neil Roberts presented Bulgaria. They said that the local organisers could provide a competition for about 100 EUR a head, but there was some uncertainty about the quality of the retrieves using local public transport and the weather reliability. The best time to go seems to be the second half of August and early September.

SH presented Piedrahita, suggesting late June and all of July as the best times to go, with early July being especially good.

NM presented Ager, suggesting the second half of August and the first half of September as the best times to go. Questions were asked about the cost of running retrieves since this had to be done by minibus.

TP presented St Jean de Montclar, suggesting August as the optimal time. Others asked how it was different to St André.

AT suggested a return to St André.

A vote was held to see which destinations were the most popular with two votes per Panel member. The results were:

- St Jean de Montclar (10 votes)
- Ager (9 votes)
- Piedrahita (5 votes)
- Bulgaria (3 votes)

Given the principle of one new destination and one tried-and-tested destination per year, RB suggested the following options:

Option 1:

- Borders in May
- Piedrahita in July
- St Jean de Montclar in August

Option 2:

- Borders in May
- Ager in June or September
- St Jean de Montclar in August

The discussion was adjourned, pending more information about the destinations.

Actions:

- NM to investigate retrieve options in Ager
- NM to investigate weather reliability in Bulgaria

#### ACTION SUMMARY

- RB to update rules with scoring formula announcement and title mis-spelling
- scoring sub-committee to propose new scoring formula
- scoring sub-committee to propose new scoring stopped tasks rule
- CB to check that alternative stopped task rules can be used

comps-panel -minutes-2008-08-20.txt

- RB to update rules with new AP requirements
- RB to update rules with new failure to check in penalty
- PR to update website with 400 WPRS rule
- MH to propose tweaks to the WPRS for team selection
- BR to investigate cost of glider numbers
- RB and KC to obtain budget breakdown of 2008 competitions
- RB to investigate closer collaboration with BPCup
- PR to announce PWC qualifying rounds on the website when decided
- PR to announce registration details on the website when decided
- NM to investigate retrieve options in Ager
- NM to investigate weather reliability in Bulgaria