ESTC Minutes from meeting, Nice, France. Saturday 9th June, 2018

Present:

Rodolfo Saccani (Chair)	RS	Italy
Laszlo Szollosi	LS	Hungary
Steff Istuon	SI	Hungary
Laszlo Kerekes	LH	Hungary
Arne Hillestad	AH	Norway
Runar Halling	RH	Norway
Miroslav Fejt	MF	Czech Republic
Franco Kessel	FK	Switzerland
Martin Kinzl	MK	Switzerland
Beni Stocker	BS	Switzerland
Jens Voetmann	JV	Denmark
Allan Diye	AD	Denmark
André Bizot	AB	Netherlands
Pedro Chapa	PC	Spain
Boyan Zizmond	BZ	Slovenia
Jose Viomar	JVr	Slovenia
Dave Thompson	DT	United Kingdom
Karl Slezak	KS	Germany
Marion Varner	MV	France
Mark Shaw	MS	United Kingdom

Guest speaker:

Bruce Goldsmith (BGD), representing APPI.

Item	Notes	Action
	RS welcomed everybody to the meeting. Pre-agenda items. JV requested that the email addresses were cleaned up so that meeting attendees received all the communications. AB requested that any information relevant to future meetings was sent out well in advance of the actual meeting date.	
1.0 1.1	**DHV Back protection study** KS presented a slide on research of the effectiveness of back protection in relation to spinal injuries, with information from the European Accident / Incident Database. The "Factor" column illustrates the category with the higher the risk of injury. KS made the following points: • From DHV perspective, 10cm foam is unlikely to pass the LTF drop test (where a dummy is dropped from a height of 165cm and the force transmitted to the dummy is measured.). • It would appear that an airbag or a combination airbag/foam provides better protection in a vertical impact, but they have their own issues: - displacement of the airbag (especially in a lateral impact) - the 'filling' requirement, where the airbag does not become effective until it is exposed to sufficient airflow to fully inflate it • pre-filled airbags have greater effectiveness as they do not require an airflow to inflate them, and provide the pilot with reasonable protection even during take-off.	

1.2	RS raised the point that there is a huge difference in the quality and performance of impact protectors on the market.	
1.3	MS raised the point that it would be of value if the DHV published the data, with additional explanatory information that is accessible and can be easily understood by pilots. KS agreed to consider publishing the table and an explanation.	KS
1.4	There was discussion amongst the group on the LTF impact pad test. MS updated the meeting on the revised EN 1651 Harness Standard, including the incorporation of the LTF impact pad test into EN 1651. MS explained that no test has been devised to measure the impact damping properties of lateral or front impact pads; and although the revised EN standard impact pad test is limited to a vertical impact test, the standard encourages manufacturers to extend the impact pads more widely.	
1.5	MS suggested that the European Accident / Incident database could be updated to collect additional information about the harness (age of protector, etc.). KS agreed to consider additional fields for harness / protector information.	KS
1.6	DT discussed the recent safety notice about the Advance Progress 3 harness emergency deployment system. ESTC members generally agreed that a European safety notice system would be worthwhile and should be put on the agenda for a future ESTC meeting.	RS
2.0	**IPPI card – tandem pilots**	
2.1	KS introduced the topic, saying that there was a concern regarding an FAI IPPI card that could be used by pilots coming from abroad to fly commercially.	
2.2	Bruce Goldsmith representing APPI gave a presentation illustrating tandem accidents and incidents. Bruce's view is that the popularity of tandem flying is increasing worldwide. He identified European 'mega sites' as being Annecy, Interlaken and Oludeniz; and worldwide as Timbis (Bali), Pokara (Nepal), Queenstown, Medillin and Puli (Taiwan). He raised his concerns about some countries (outside EU) issuing of FAI IPPI tandem cards to pilots who have not received suitable training, and that had no adequate tandem training system. His concern was that the FAI IPPI tandem card might be taken to be a professional qualification, and that pilots without proper tandem training could potentially acquire an IPPI tandem card and use it to make commercial tandem flights in other countries, putting passengers at risk. In general the delegates thought Bruce had raised valid concerns. Bruce stated that an SIV course was a pre-requisite for an APPI tandem qualification. The APPI tandem course is a one-week residential course. For the APPI tandem qualification – if a pilot is a European resident then 3rd party insurance coverage is 1.6M Euros. There is no insurance coverage for APPI tandem pilots resident outside Europe. APPI's requirements for its 'amateur/ non-commercial' tandem licence is not as strict as its commercial licence. Bruce led a discussion on the background and functions of APPI, and stated that APPI promotes a "worldwide united education system, primarily for use in countries where no national authority manages pilot training and licencing".	

	This was discussed amongst the group. LS expressed his view that the APPI qualification is too easy to obtain, and that 'licence tourists' travel to where they can get an APPI licence, when they fail their national association's own licence system, noting Romania as an example of where he has known this to take place. KS considers that the APPI training systems are not too bad, but the ESTC needs to build an opinion of APPI. Germany receives about 10 – 12 membership applications from holders of APPI ratings per year, and it is not clear how to adopt these into the national rating system. KS stated that if an FAI IPPI tandem rating is produced, it could be accepted in Germany if issued from a European association. It was generally accepted that an FAI tandem IPPI rating is an issue that the ESTC needs to have a position on. The group discussed a possible EHPU IPPI certification, under European control and issued within European countries only. JV proposed that each nation within EHPU should consider the safety issues. RS proposed a working group to look at an EHPU solution for amateur tandem pilots only. This was generally accepted and members where identified as RS, KS, LS and AB. This working group will plan a questionnaire for ESTC members to complete with their associations' tandem training programme, how it is revalidated, the period before expiry, etc. The intention will be to prepare a proposal to take to EHPU at the scheduled 2019 meeting in Spain. DT introduced the digital membership card system that is being trialled by the BHPA, managed by a Swedish company "Cardskipper". Hungary already has a digital membership system.	RS, KS, AB, LS
(Agenda items 2 and 3 dealt with together.)		
4.0	**Working Group 6 (WG6) update.**	
4.1	MS gave a general update on the work of WG6, and the status of the emergency parachute standard EN 12491 and the revised harness standard EN 1651.	
4.2	MS presented slides about the function of WG6 on behalf of EHPU's Airworthiness Officer Angus Pinkerton. He outlined the experts that contribute to the working group, and the process for writing and revising standards - bound up in the formal processes within national standards organisations, and the overseeing standards body CEN. MS presented slides on the forthcoming systematic review of the flight safety characteristics standard EN 926-2. He put forward a request from Angus Pinkerton as EHPU's Airworthiness Officer: that ESTC contributes by collecting opinions on the current standard's class system. This would be limited to those (within each ESTC member's home organisation) that have a professional interest in the standard (i.e. test pilots, SIV course providers). This would be done via a questionnaire to be sent out to ESTC members.	
4.3	There followed a discussion on the standard and the proposed request. The following points were generally agreed by ESTC members: - Pilots generally do not understand the certification system and there	

	needs to be better education to address this. - EN-B class is too wide, in that it encompasses basic to high performance wings. RS stated that the lack of published video of the test manoeuvres is an issue, and that in his view it is impossible to accurately determine pitch angle from a ground mounted camera. He stated that he had communicated this to WG6 on a previous occasion. KS briefed the group on the data loggers used by DHV in its Safety Class tests, and many members of the ESTC agreed that an electronic device for verifying pitch angle and g force would make the analysis of EN test manoeuvres less subjective. BS (as test pilot) supported this idea.	
4.4	The following points were agreed amongst the ESTC members, and will be communicated to WG6: - Despite some concerns raised by KS and DT, ESTC members generally agreed to take part in distributing a questionnaire to their associations' pilots of their choice, who have a professional interest in EN 926-2. They will gather responses and return them with a version translated into English. - ESTC will recommend to the EHPU Airworthiness Officer that WG6 incorporates into the revised EN 926-2 the requirement that test houses implement technology to ensure better measurements of glider behaviour during certification testing (e.g. data logger for pitch angle verification). - ESTC will recommend that there is a system put in place for independent verification of test houses – this might be in the form of a periodic inspection of video test files, etc.	All ESTC, upon receipt of ques-tionnaire.
5.0	**EHPU's European Accident / Incident database.**	
5.1	KS presented slides on the database, and took questions from ESTC members. The process for completing a form entry was discussed, and KS illustrated the database information on each incident that is published in an anonymous way on the BHPA's website, and is accessible in the public domain. Various points were discussed, including the 'letter' icon that records when incident details have been sent to a manufacturer (names, etc, are not included).	
5.2	KS requested that French submissions are processed with more detailed information. MV to discuss with the relevant staff at FFVL.	MV
5.3	AH will send the username and password to the Norwegian federation so that the database can be used.	AH
6.0	**DHV Flying Rules (illustrations)**	
6.1	KS presented the revised illustrations following comments from BHPA at a previous meeting.	
6.2	DT requested that KS revisit the English version on the DHV website (for foreign pilots), as the English text is currently not the full equivalent of the original in German.	KS & DT
6.3	ESTC members gave the following points on specific drawings:	

	• Converging rule drawing – requires explicit text as the drawing alone is not immediately clear that it refers to the regulation in SERA for pilots on converging courses. • On the ridge soaring convention drawing, it was recommended to remove the rocks at the far end of the beach, for clarity. • On the 'give way to thermalling pilots' drawing, it is essential that the full text accompanies the drawing, otherwise it could be read as giving priority to thermalling pilots. The full text needs to state that slope soaring conventions have priority, because it is not the intention to state that thermalling gliders have priority over those slope soaring. • Landing field drawing – swap the paraglider and the hang glider, so the hang glider is in the final stage of flight (is lower). ESTC members gave the following general points on the drawings: • The drawings should not show that one type of aircraft (e.g. a hang glider) has priority over another type (e.g. a paraglider). • The text should point out that the drawings are not to scale – if you are starting to manoeuvre as illustrated in the pictures, you will be just about to have a mid-air collision.	KS & DT to amend drawings and text as discussed.
6.4	KS stated that EHPU should reach a decision at the next EHPU meeting that it will adopt the European flying rules as illustrated (with complete text). The topic has already been discussed in the European Gliding Union and Europe Airsports.	
7.0	**Medical issues.**	
7.1	LS raised the topic of diabetes and various pilot licences and requirements.	
7.2	LS proposed the following points: • EHPU adopts the standpoint that pilots who have a medical condition that can onset at any time (e.g. diabetes) must not fly commercially. • EHPU adopts the following policy for non-commercial flight: an "I am fit to fly" declaration will suffice.	
7.3	The group discussed self-declaration and it was noted that Switzerland, UK and Germany all work on the basis of self-declaration of health and medical issues. France requires a simple medical at the time the first licence is applied for, and no further medicals for all subsequent licences. In Slovenia and Czech Republic, an medical is required for tandem pilots and instructors.	
7.4	LS will distribute amongst ESTC members a short questionnaire to collect medical requirement information for each member's home country / association. Based on statistics from the returned questionnaires, he would like to generate a short statement along the lines of "in these countries there are no medical requirements, and no accidents attributed to diabetes, etc."	LS
8.0	**A.O.B**	
8.1	Next ESTC meeting to take place on 1st June 2019 in Slovenia.	