

## 2009 S10 Proposals, Sub-committee comment

Proposal	Chapter	Orig No.	Title	From	Affects	RMH comment	Tomas Backman comment	Carlos Trigo Comment	JLE Comment	S10 Sub-Committee conclusion
1	0	3	Clarification of S10 wording.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	Obvious action	Supported	Supported	Supported
2a	1.4	10a	Introduction of a new class of Electrically powered Microlights and Paramotors.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	No comment	Undecided. I support the creation of electric sub-classes, and I was the person who suggested the name "Thermal" engine, so I agree with the definitions. However I am not sure if this proposal is the best solution for the organisation of the Classes names	Not supported This creates an inconsistency with previous names. I prefer to stay with previous names and APPEND new subtypes.	Undecided
2b	1.5.2	10b	Introduction of a new class of Electrically powered Microlights and Paramotors.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported. Tomas - you are correct, there is an editorial error in the proposal and the fourth row down should be RALE2 and the text suitably amended. I will do this for the final version.	Yes, but you missed out the ALT2	Undecided. I am not sure if this is the best solution for the organisation of the Classes names	I support the introduction of electric subclasses. I don't support the proposed naming system	Undecided
3a	1.5.1	13a	Extension of class names.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Not supported. Despite my best efforts to get JLE to revise it to a form like in proposal 2 which is 'universal' he wanted to keep it as is. This creates an exception in class names in S10 which will lead to confusion and a complete mess in S10 which can only get worse in future years.	Not supported. The gender of the pilot has nothing to do with the class of aircraft you are flying and this list and chapter is just about microlight/paramotor classes	Undecided. Leaning towards NOT supporting it, because I'm not fond of the idea of creating a separate gender sub-class	Supported. Appending new letters is the only method to create a naming system which is consistent with previous ones. Also, if proposal 27 is accepted, we need a name for female classes. R ia a microlight or paramotor RP is a paramotor RPL is a paramotor trike RPL1 is a single seater paramotor trike RPL1f is a single seater paramotor trike flown by a woman	Not supported
3b	1.5.1	13b	Extension of class names.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Not supported Reason as 3a	Not accepted, First the suggested new character meaning any engine is a bit premature, secondly the characters are written as small letters	Undecided. Leaning towards supporting it, because I prefer this criteria of proposal 3 over the one from proposal 2	Supported. Same as 3a RPL1 is a single seater paramotor trike RPL1e is an electric single seater paramotor trike RPL1ef is an electric single seater paramotor trike flown by a woman The idea of using small letters is to make clear that they are appended to classic names and can be put in any order.	Not supported

## 2009 S10 Proposals, Sub-committee comment

Proposal	Chapter	Orig No.	Title	From	Affects	RMH comment	Tomas Backman comment	Carlos Trigo Comment	JLE Comment	S10 Sub-Committee conclusion
4	1.5.3	11	Change to the designation of amphibians	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	Not supported. It works on a aerodynamically controlled landplane, as the characters will sound as an abbreviation of "Amphibian" AM1, but for a wheightshift "WM2" there is no such likeness	Undecided	No decision	Undecided
5	2.2.2	4	Amendment to the Ann Welch Diploma.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
6	2.3.2	32	Recording of Colibri awards	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
7	3.1	15	Female PF1 class in records.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Not supported Reason as 3a	Not supported, In my veiw I think the girls are doing well as it is, in China for instance they won 2 or three tasks. In my view flying shall be gender free	Undecided.	Supported	Not supported
8	3.8.7	2	Definition of turnpoints in record attempts.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
9	3.17.8	8	Alter the rules for the two slalom championship records to fit the new definition of the tasks.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
10a	4.3.2	18a	Championship validity.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Supported	Supported	Defining what is "ready to fly the first task" can be very controversial and even not controlable, therefore not resolving the problem of fake crews.	Supported	Supported
10b	4.3.2	18b	Championship validity.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Not supported. We know there is a problem, but I think 10a is enough.	Not supported, I think 10a is enough	In line with my comment to 10a, this version "who fly the first task" is uncontroversial and perfectly controlable, therefore better than 10a	Not supported.	Not Supported
11	4.3.2	25	Change RAL1 championship class validity	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate	Microlights	Not supported. It increases the minimum numbers for a valid class, which could be a problem, but if there is a valid class with only 3 nations it could have a significant undesirable effect on the team prize - makes it even easier for the local team to win it.	Not supported. If the class is of no interest by the competitors I see no reason why CIMA should keep it alive by artificial breeding.	This proposal was made to provoke the discussion about this dying class, and reach to a conclusion about the will of the majority of Delegates about an artificial way to maintain it alive. I note that I increased the minimum number of competitors, although reducing the minimum number of countries	Not supported	Not Supported
12	4.5.3	19	Airfield infrastructure ready during official practice days.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Supported, reluctantly. Not sure it will really make a difference.	Supported	Supported, but not sure if it will work	Supported. Although we need to find ways to punish organisers...	Supported

## 2009 S10 Proposals, Sub-committee comment

Proposal	Chapter	Orig No.	Title	From	Affects	RMH comment	Tomas Backman comment	Carlos Trigo Comment	JLE Comment	S10 Sub-Committee conclusion
13	4.6.1.1	26	Alteration to what is supplied as part of the entry fee.	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
14	4.22	33	Promote pilot's navigation planning skills.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Supported, reluctantly. Not sure it will really make a difference.	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
15	4.24.3	24	Task proportions in microlights	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Microlights	Supported	Supported	Fully Supported	Supported	Supported
16	4.29.1	28	Alteration to the requirements for score sheets.	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
17	4.29.1	29	Alteration to the way penalties are applied.	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate	All	Originally I supported this, but having read JLE's comments I agree with them and will say NOT supported.	Supported	Supported	NOT supported. It is false that the proposed method is "indifferent for all competitors except for the one placed first in the task", as the proposal says. In our current method, (apply penalties after normalizing to 1000) if the first pilot gets a 20% penalty he scores 800, and the score of the rest is not affected: eg. a second pilot with 900 points becomes first, but stays with 900 points. In the proposed method, the pilot with 900 becomes the reference and is normalised to 1000, and the penalised pilot gets his score normalised to 889. The rest of the pilots are also affected. The proposal does not provide any reasons to change the method that has always been used.	Undecided
18	4.29.1	34	Results deadline.	Márton Ordody, HUN delegate.	All	Not supported. I understand the reason for this proposal, but slow results is a management problem which should not be answered by something totally impractical like this which will just lead to many invalid championships.	Not supported, it will jeopardize too many championships	Not supported. I understand the intention, and I even know the reason why this proposal came from Hungary, which I sympathize and agree with. However this is not the good way to solve the problem.	Not supported. I can imagine many ways for a team to slow down the production of official results. As in 12, we need to find ways to punish organisers.	Not supported
19	4.29.1	35	Results deadlines to be published on provisional score sheets.	Márton Ordody, HUN delegate.	All	Not supported. Reason as 18	Not supported	Not supported. Reason as 18	Not supported	Not Supported

## 2009 S10 Proposals, Sub-committee comment

Proposal	Chapter	Orig No.	Title	From	Affects	RMH comment	Tomas Backman comment	Carlos Trigo Comment	JLE Comment	S10 Sub-Committee conclusion
20	4.29.3	17	Team scoring in paramotor classes.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
21	4.30	30	Alteration to complaints deadlines.	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
22	4.30.1	36	Absolute complaints deadline.	Márton Ordody, HUN delegate.	All	Not supported. Reason as 18	Not supported	Not supported. I obviously prefer proposal 21	Not supported. I think 21 is better.	Not supported
23	4.30.2	31	Alteration to protest deadlines.	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported. This is one of the many possible arrangements to comply with proposal 24.	Supported
24	AN3 1.9.7	20	Deadlines for protests	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Not supported. I think 23 does a better job of it.	Not supported	Not supported. I obviously prefer proposal 23	Supported. Less intrusive than 23.	Not supported
25	AN2 5.5	1	Inclusion of some new provisions from the 2008 General Section.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
26	AN3 1.4	16	No extra female team member when competition includes PF1f class.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	This proposal should only be put for voting if proposal 27 is approved	Supported	Supported
27	AN3 1.8	14	Female PF1 class in championships.	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Not supported Reason as 3a	Not supported,	Undecided.	Supported.	Not Supported
28	AN3 1.14.2	37	Delete penalty for tactical protests.	Márton Ordody, HUN delegate.	All	Not supported.	Not supported	Fully Supported. If evidence can be provided, it is of basic fairness and elementary justice to reach sporting truthfulness. In all other sports that I'm aware, every competitor can call the attention of the Referee, the Jury or the Sport justice instances for the wrong doing of its oponents, or to some error in scoring that affects sport veracity, as long as it is correctly founded.	Supported. There must be some way to complain or protest when a pilot from other team commits an infraction and evidence can be submitted.	Undecided
29a	AN4 3	23a	Addition of three precision tasks for paramotors	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
29b	AN4 3	23b	Addition of three precision tasks for paramotors	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
29c	AN4 3	23c	Addition of three precision tasks for paramotors	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported

## 2009 S10 Proposals, Sub-committee comment

Proposal	Chapter	Orig No.	Title	From	Affects	RMH comment	Tomas Backman comment	Carlos Trigo Comment	JLE Comment	S10 Sub-Committee conclusion
30a	AN4 3.2.4	12a	Automatic kick-stick sensor devices.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
30b	AN4 3.2.4	12b	Automatic kick-stick sensor devices.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
31	AN4 3B2	9	Revision of the laps task	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
32	AN4 3C2	5	Delete Paramotor task S10 AN 4 3.C2. PRECISION CIRCUIT IN THE SHORTEST TIME	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	I don't see the need to delete it	Supported	Supported
33	AN4 3C3	6	Delete Paramotor task S10 AN 4 3.C3.FAST / SLOW SPEED (Original variant).	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
34	AN4 3C4	7	Delete the option of landing markers in PL2 precision tasks.	Richard Meredith-Hardy CIMA S10 Editor	Paramotors	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported
35	AN6 8	22	Criteria for track analysis	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate	All	Supported	Supported	Supported	Supported. But I have a problem with the wording: After reading my proposal again, I don't know if it is clear that I'm proposing to replace the line that says Designers of track analysis programs and their users should follow these guidelines with a line saying This guidelines are written to establish common criteria for track analysis in microlight and paramotor championships.	Supported
36		21	Withdrawn	José Luis Esteban, ESP delegate						
37		27	Withdrawn	Carlos Trigo, PRT delegate						

The sub-committee conclusion is calculated on the following basis:

A blank = "no opinion"

3 or 4 no opinion = "no opinion"

Undecided if there's a dead-heat of opinion (ie 2 x support and 2 x not support).

Otherwise a majority of what the opinion is: Supported or Not supported