

BRITISH PARACHUTE ASSOCIATION
SAFETY AND TRAINING COMMITTEE MEETING
BPA OFFICES, 5 WHARF WAY, GLEN PARVA, LEICESTER
THURSDAY 6 OCTOBER 2005

Present:

John Hitchen	-	Chairman STC
Kieran Brady	-	Skydive Strathallan
Pat Walters	-	Tilstock
Jane Buckle	-	Headcorn
Paul Hollow	-	Target Skysports
Stuart Meacock	-	PPC
Mike Rust	-	NLPC
Nigel Allen	-	JSPC (N)
John Page	-	Skydive London
Phil Cavanagh (from item 3)	-	Black Knights
Paul Applegate	-	Chairman Riggers Committee

Apologies: David Hickling, who had hurt himself jumping. The Committee wished David a speed recovery. Nick Johnston has taken over as temporary CCI until David has recovered. Tony Knight, who was representing the BPA at a NATMAC meeting. Also Ian Rosenvinge, Steve Jelf, Mike Bolton, Barrie Buck, Rob Noble-Nesbitt, Dane Kenny.

In Attendance:

Tony Butler	-	Technical Officer
Dr John Carter	-	BPA Medical Advisor
Trudy Kemp	-	Assistant to NCSO/TO

Observers: Mick Nealis, Mark Bayada, Phill Elston, Dave Major, Colin Fitzmaurice, John Harding, Mike Gorman, Rick Boardman, Eddie Jones, Ray Armstrong, Gary Small, Pete Sizer, Jeff Illidge.

ITEM

1. MINUTES OF THE STC MEETING OF THE 11 AUGUST 2005

Circulated to those present was an e-mail from Pete Sizer stating that the Panel's report (Item 5) had been edited for the Minutes and he believed gave an impression Peter Leighton-Woodruff died whilst making a night Tandem descent.

The Chairman stated that the report had not been edited, but the conclusions and recommendations were quoted as written in the report, which is the usual practice. He clarified for the meeting that Peter Leighton-Woodruff had died whilst videoing a night Tandem descent.

Pete Sizer also stated in his e-mail that the report and STC minutes (page 5 – b.i) refer to 'Section 2, Para 8 *NB*', but it should be; Section 2, Para 7 *NB*.

The Chairman stated that Pete was correct in his observation.

Pete had also noted that the first of his observations regarding section 13.4 was discussed, but not the second alternative view. The Chairman stated that it had been mentioned at the previous meeting, but that those CCIs present had no comment to make with regard to Pete's second observation, which Pete accepted.

It was proposed by Paul Hollow and seconded by Stuart Meacock that the Minutes of the STC meeting of the 11 August 2005, with the above 'Para 7' amendment, be accepted as a true record.

Carried Unanimously

2. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE STC MEETING OF THE 11 AUGUST 2005

Page 2, Item 2 – Matters Arising (AFF Instructor ratings). This was a main agenda item.

Page 3, Item 4 – Incident Reports. The Chairman advised those present that the 'grounded' parachutist had been written to, as directed by STC, advising her of the actions taken by her CCI. He stated that no response has been received.

Page 9, Item 6 – Operations Manual Rectifications. The TO had written to all CCIs clarifying the position regarding the use of radio frequencies.

Page 10, Item 9 – AOB. The Chairman advised those present that Tony Knight had written to Clubs requesting a response to the DfT consultation letter regarding the use of foreign registered aircraft. A number of clubs have responded and Tony had now drafted a response to the DfT. Circulated to those present was the draft response and a memo requesting that Clubs read the draft and if they have any comments to contact Tony as soon as possible. The memo also suggests the Clubs write to their MPs regarding the matter. The memo and draft response had also been e-mailed to all Centres the previous day.

3. MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING FROM THE RIGGERS SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE 11 AUGUST 2005

Paul Applegate advised the Committee that he had nothing to report from the previous Minutes. Therefore it was proposed by Paul Applegate and seconded by Pat Walters Applegate that the Minutes of the Riggers Sub-Committee Meeting of the 11 August 2005 be accepted as a true record.

Carried Unanimously

Paul gave STC details of that evenings meeting and stated that the Committee had accepted the use of a Tandem Atom container for Student use. Paul stated that the equipment presented to Riggers that evening was fitted with small rings so in that mode could only be used for AFF. He stated the intention was to get new equipment fitted with large rings, but in the meantime, Riggers had accepted the equipment for throwaway, including ripaway type, ripcord and Static Line use once the large rings were fitted.

It was proposed by Paul Applegate and seconded by Jane Buckle that the above equipment be accepted.

For: 9 Against: 1 Abstentions: 0

Carried

Paul advised those present that the Committee had also discussed a disciplinary matter. He stated that during a routine re-pack it was discovered that at the previous re-pack the Cypres loop had not been passed through the cutting head. The previous packer is a CSI, AFF and Tandem Instructor. The CCI had 'grounded' the instructor from packing any more rigs, until

this STC. Other rigs packed by the instructor were opened and no other problems were discovered.

Paul stated that the Packer concerned had presented himself to the Committee that evening and admitted to the packing error. He had now changed his packing method and has systems in place to prevent this problem from happening again. Paul stated that after considering this matter, Riggers had agreed to recommend to STC that the Packer concerned be written to by the Chairman of Riggers Committee reminding him of his responsibilities.

Following some discussion, it was proposed by Paul Applegate and seconded by Pat Walters that the above recommendation be accepted.

Carried Unanimously

Paul Applegate then also gave details of the Committee's discussion regarding the Safety Information Bulletin issued concerning the 3-ring failure, which occurred on a NEXT Tandem system on the 18 September. An instructor had experienced a hard opening, during which the right-hand riser released, because the middle ring and the riser locking loop broke. The RSL ring was also torn off. On subsequent inspection, it was noted that the middle ring on the left-hand riser was also slightly distorted.

The manufacturers were been contacted and stated that they have decided to change the supplier and change over to stainless steel rings, made in Europe (the current rings are manufactured in the U.S.A). At the time that the Safety Information Bulletin was issued the manufacturers had yet to examine the equipment, or the video of the descent.

The Committee was advised that it is the manufacturers opinion that 'Collins' lanyards should be fitted to NEXT Tandem rigs.

A statement was subsequently issued by Paratec stating that they believe the problem was caused by the RSL ring being passed through the 3-ring assembly. However, the video had been studied many times, by the NCSO, TO and Chairman of the Riggers Committee, as well as Riggers present at the evenings meeting and they do not believe this to be the case. The Committee had therefore agreed to set up a Panel to investigate this incident further.

Paul also advised those present that Airtec had issued information relating to canopy piloting with rigs fitted with a Cypres, details of which would be circulated with the Minutes.

4. INCIDENT/INJURY REPORTS - RESUME

- i) There had been 13 Student injury reports received since the last meeting. 9 male and 4 female. 1 of the reports was to a Student who dislocated her shoulder, probably at pull time. Another was to a Student who injured his knee exiting the mock-up. The remaining 11 injuries were on landing.
- ii) There had been 13 injury reports received for 'A' Certificate parachutists and above. All male. 2 injuries were to skydivers hitting arms on exit from the aircraft. Another involved a CCI who dislocated his shoulder trying to stop a spinning AFF Student. He could not deploy his main and had to use his reserve. He also injured his ankle when landing. The remaining 10 reports were landing injuries.
- iii) Since the last meeting there had been 7 Student Parachutist Malfunctions/Deployment Problems reported. 4 male and 3 female.
- iv) There had been 44 reports of Malfunction/Deployment Problems to 'A' Certificate parachutists and above since the last meeting. 34 male and 10 female.

- v) There had been 13 Tandem Malfunction/Deployment Problem reports received since the last meeting, including the one discussed earlier involving the 3-ring failure. Another incident involved a Student who became unhooked on one side, possibly just prior to or upon exit. The instructor deployed at approximately 9,500ft and landed the pair without further incident. Some discussion took place regarding this incident. Another involved a Student grabbing the instructor's hand in freefall. The instructor managed to free his hand prior to deployment. There had also been 12 Injury reports received since the last meeting; one involved a Student fainting upon landing, after feeling sick under canopy. Another was to a Student who felt a pain in her shoulder in freefall, the cause was not known. The rest were landing injuries, the majority of which were minor, including one to an instructor.
- vi) One report had been received of an AAD firing. An experience parachutist with 626 jumps was carrying out a 3 way freefly jump, lost sight of the other two and lost altitude awareness whilst looking for them. He deployed at approximately 1,200ft and shortly after his Cypress fired. He landed under two canopies without further incident. Some concern was expressed by those present that the freeflyer had not been wearing an audible altimeter.
- vii) Three reports had been received of display misfires. 2 'off landings' and a fractured leg.
- viii) Five reports had been received of 'off landings' at clubs.
- ix) Four reports had been received of canopy entanglements. All taking part in CF.
- x) One report had been received of a full face helmet coming off in freefall and another where a parachutist had to release a 'tube' after he had deployed and had a rotating malfunction.
- xi) One report had been received where the strong point failed whilst a static line Student was being dispatched from an aircraft. The canopy deployed without incident. The remaining Students were reattached to a secondary strong point and the aircraft was brought down. Another aircraft report received was for a Cessna 206, which experienced an engine problem on 'run in' at 10,000ft, the parachutists, including 2 Tandems exited approximately 1 mile short of the PLA. 1 Tandem and an experienced jumper landed off the DZ.
- xii) A report and letter had been received regarding a packing error, which had previously been dealt with under Item 3 – Riggers.

5. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE AFF INSTRUCTOR QUALIFICATIONS

A paper by Paul Hollow regarding proposed changes to AFF Instructor Qualifications (below) was circulated with the agenda. Paul was in attendance at the meeting to present his proposals. He stated that these proposals had been drafted following a number of meetings with AFF Instructors:

Requirements to attend an AFFBI Course

In addition to the current requirements, candidates wishing to attend an AFFBI course should also hold a Canopy Handling (CH) Coach qualification.

Students and AFFBIs

AFFBIs should be able to dispatch, follow out and coach AFF students during their consolidation jumps (after the student has successfully completed AFF Level 8) once suitably briefed by their CCI.

AFFBIs should teach, brief and debrief AFF students under direct supervision throughout the AFF training syllabus.

Probationary period “proficiency cards”

During the probationary AFFBI period (and before a CSBI or CSI may attend for the AFF examination course), the candidate must complete an “AFF proficiency card” before being accepted for the final examination phase (AFFI course). This “AFF proficiency card” will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Records of ground school lessons taught and to how many students
- b. Records of daily student refresher training
- c. Records of progression briefs (minimum of 1 of each brief)
- d. Records of AFF consolidation students dispatched and coached
- e. Records of experience of student talk down
- f. The recommendation of a current, experienced and CCI nominated AFF Instructor who has evaluated the candidate on a brief, simulated AFF skydive and subsequent debrief on at least 4 jumps simulating AFF Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7. The nominated evaluator must be satisfied that the AFF Instructor candidate (AFFBI, CSBI or CSI preparing to attend for an AFFI course) would, in their opinion, pass those levels during the AFFI examination course.
- g. The recommendation of the candidate’s CCI that the classroom ability of the candidate is satisfactory and that they are fully familiar with the procedures and syllabus for teaching and AFF ground school.

Final phase examination ground school criteria (AFFI Course)

Before any jumping may take place on the final examination phase (AFFI Course), the candidate must satisfactorily complete the following (in order, each with a 70% pass mark):

- a. A BPA closed-book written test on the Operations Manual (and specific AFF questions).
- b. A basic AFF syllabus classroom lesson.
- c. An AFF progression brief.
- d. A “20 minute brief”.

Once the candidate has successfully demonstrated sufficient teaching ability, he/she may be assessed on their (AFF Instructional) skydiving ability.

During the remainder of the course, the candidates must be assessed on (and pass with at least a 70% pass mark) a further AFF syllabus classroom lesson and/or a “Level 1 retrain”, in addition to the required skydiving assessments.

Summary

It is proposed that the current system of 3 courses be shortened to 2 courses, but that an AFF proficiency card is introduced to be completed during the probationary BI period, or be completed by a CSI before attending the AFF examination phase. The various paths are outlined below:

AFFBI route (ie. jumper with no previous ratings)

The candidate must meet the current requirements before attending an AFFBI course. The candidate will be given a recommended minimum probationary period of no less than 6 months during which time the candidate is to work with AFF Instructors and students. He/she must also complete an AFF proficiency card listing a *minimum* amount of work to be completed during the probationary period.

A Canopy Handling (CH) Coach qualification must be held.

After the probationary period, and having completed the requirements listed by the AFF proficiency card, the candidate may apply to attend the second course (AFFI examination course).

CSBI route (ie. jumper already holding a CSBI rating)

If a CSBI rating is already held, the instructor may apply to attend an AFFI examination course if they meet the current AFFI experience (jump number and freefall time etc) requirements, they have completed their minimum CSBI probationary period and they have fulfilled all the requirements of the AFF proficiency card.

A Canopy Handling (CH) Coach qualification must also be held.

CSI route (ie. jumper already holding a CSI rating)

If a CSI rating is already held, the instructor may apply to attend an AFFI examination course if they meet the current AFFI experience (jump numbers and freefall time etc) requirements and as soon as they have completed all the requirements of the AFF proficiency card.

A Canopy Handling (CH) Coach qualification must also be held.

Once accepted for the final AFFI examination course, the candidate is not permitted to undertake any skydiving evaluation on the course until they have satisfactorily completed a written exam and a set amount of classroom examination (at least a basic syllabus lesson, progression brief and a “20 minute brief”), as outlined above. In short, the candidate must satisfy the examiners of their instructional ability before they may demonstrate their skydiving ability.

Note: TBIs and TIs, as per the current system, should attend either an AFFBI or CSBI course before applying to attend an AFFI examination course.

A considerable amount of discussion took place concerning this proposal. Although the majority of members present felt that a lot of thought had gone into these proposals, some CCIs felt that some of the proposals were a bit too radical at this stage and perhaps needed further consideration.

Following further discussion, it was proposed by Paul Hollow and seconded by Ian Rosenvinge (proxy) that the above proposals be accepted.

For: 5 (incl. 1 by proxy), Against 3, Abstentions: 2

Carried

The Chairman stated that as the above proposal had been accepted, STC would need to give a ‘permission’ that it does not apply to the AFF Instructor Course at Chatteris, which takes place from the 17 October 2005.

It was proposed by Mike Rust and seconded by Paul Hollow that the above be accepted.

Carried Unanimously

6. PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BPA OPERATIONS MANUAL

- a. A letter from Jane Buckle had been circulated with the agenda, requesting a number of changes to the Operations Manual regarding Tandem parachuting. Jane was present at the meeting and gave details of her request.

Jane had proposed that:

Section 2, Paragraph 7, of the Operations Manual, be changed to read:

7. STUDENT TANDEM PARACHUTISTS

A Student Tandem Parachutist is defined as anyone making a descent attached to a Tandem instructor.

N.B. FAI 'C' Certificate (Red) parachutists participating in Tandem Instructor Evaluation Courses are not classified as Student Tandem Parachutists (Section 4, Para 5).

It was stated that the reason for the proposed change, was that the NB referred to 'B' Certificate parachutists and made no provision for 'A' Certificate parachutists.

Following some discussion, it was proposed by Jane Buckle and seconded by Kieran Brady that the above proposed change to the BPA Operations Manual be accepted.

For: 7 Against: 0 Abstentions: 2

Carried

Jane Buckle had also proposed that:

Section 10, Paragraph 5, sub-para 5.5 of the Operations Manual, be changed to read:

5.5. Tandem Parachutists are not permitted to take part in Canopy Formation (CF) or night descents.

Following some discussion, this proposal failed to find a seconder.

Note: The Above does not mean that Tandem Parachutists are permitted to take part in CF or night descents. It was felt by those present that the rules were already clear and did not need changing.

- b. A letter from Nigel Allen had also been circulated with the agenda requesting a change to the AFF section of the Operations Manual. Nigel was present at the meeting and gave details of his request.

Nigel had proposed that:

Section 2, Paragraph 5, sub-para 6.6, italics, of the Operations Manual, be changed to read:

a. Front loop(s). b. Unstable exit. c. Track Turns.

Nigel Allen stated that he wished that AFF Instructors were given the opportunity to teach track turns on Level 6. Some members present felt although Nigel's proposal was optional, there was a danger of overloading AFF Students on Level 6.

Following some discussion, it was proposed by Nigel Allen and seconded by Steve Jelf (proxy) that the above proposed change to the BPA Operations Manual be accepted.

For: 6 (incl. 1 by proxy)

Against: 1

Abstentions: 3

Carried

7. INSTRUCTOR COURSE 03/2005

The Chairman advised those present that Instructor Course 3/2005 was held at Target Skysports, from the 15 –25 August. He stated that the Association would like to thank the Centre for hosting the course. It was noted in the course report that ‘in spite of being informed on the Joining Instructions, many candidates are still attending the courses without the correct documentation. This especially applies to the Aeronautical Radio Licence. In the future candidates will not be permitted to continue on the course without physically having all the correct documentation with them. CCIs should note that when considering potential candidates for a course, they should not leave it until the last moment to apply for various licences or certificates’.

There was one recommendation from the course that required STC ratification:

‘That Gervais Henderson be given a six-month extension to his Category System Basic Instructor rating’.

It was proposed by John Page and seconded by Mike Rust that the above recommendation be accepted.

Carried Unanimously

8. PERMISSIONS

- a). A letter from Nigel Allen was circulated with the agenda requesting an exemption from the requirements Section 10 (Safety), Para 2, sub-par 2.4, of the Operations Manual, which states:

‘If, after dispatching static line parachutists, the instructor does not intend to land with the aircraft, all static lines and bags will be unhooked and stowed away securely. In the case of aircraft with high strong points where provision is made for stowing static lines and bags, unhooking may not be necessary.’

Nigel’s letter stated that the Club’s primary aircraft is a Cessna 208 Caravan and the club had produced a static line stowage bag, which he believed eliminates the need to unhook the static lines. Nigel gave the meeting details of request and also presented a number of photographs of the static line stowage bag for STC to consider.

Following some discussion, it was proposed by Nigel Allen and seconded by Steve Jelf (proxy) that the above permission be accepted with the proviso that it does not contravene the requirements of the aircraft approval notice.

For: 8 (incl. 1 by proxy)

Against: 1

Abstentions: 1

Carried

- b). Nigel Allen had also requested another exemption from the requirements of the Operations Manual: Section 1, Paragraph 4, sub-para 4.3.3.d, which states:

‘To ensure that the appropriate ground to air signals are displayed when necessary.’

Nigel’s letter stated that Netheravon’s SOPs do not permit parachuting to take place if radio communication is lost. Nigel was able to provide details of his request.

Kieran Brady asked if they had a system in place for communicating with the plane if they did not wish the plane to land. Nigel stated that although they did not have a system in place to keep the aircraft airborne if required, but stated that he would include some sort of system within the Centre’s SOPs to cover this aspect.

Following further discussion, it was proposed by Nigel Allen and seconded by Steve Jelf (proxy) that the above permission be accepted.

Carried Unanimously

- c). Another letter from Nigel Allen had also been circulated with the agenda, requesting that Kevin Trevett be permitted to make a Tandem descent using a modified harness. Kevin has the condition Arthropoises (congenital disability of arms and legs).

The Chairman advised those present that the harness had been approved in the past for another Student with a similar condition. It is available at the meeting and was examined and accepted by the Riggers Committee that afternoon.

It was proposed by Nigel Allen and seconded by Steve Jelf (proxy) that the above permission be accepted.

Carried Unanimously

- d). An e-mail from Jane Buckle had been circulated with the agenda requesting that Chris Lynch be permitted to attend the November CSBI Course and dependent on the recommendations of the Course Examiners, be awarded CSI status. Chris was originally given permission for this by STC in August 2003.

It was proposed by Jane Buckle and seconded by Ian Rosenvige (proxy) that the above permission be accepted.

Carried Unanimously

- e). Circulated to those present was a letter from Dave Emerson requesting that a Mr Walker be permitted to carry out AFF training and if successful be permitted to make an AFF Level 1 jump. Mr Walker was 56 years of age and had previously made a Tandem jump. Dave Emerson stated that he had interviewed Mr Walker and he was very fit for his age and he was happy to teach him.

The Technical Officer advised those present that Dave Emerson had spoken to him on this matter and had stated that he would train the Student, but if he was not suitable, he would not permit him to jump.

Some concern was expressed by those present with regard to the training of Students over the age of 55.

The Committee asked Dr Carter, the Medical Advisor for his advice on this matter. John stated that the older the person gets the less fit they are and more likely to be injured on a heavy landing. He stated that the problem is that people get older at different

rates. He stated that he felt that STC had the right to give permissions, however he was concerned as to how STC make a judgement without seeing a person.

Kieran Brady tabled a proposal for consideration that no one over age of 55 is accepted on a parachute training course unless they present themselves to STC and carries a unanimous vote

The Chairman stated that this proposal would need to go out with the agenda for consideration by the Committee.

Following further discussion, it was proposed by Dave Emerson (proxy) and seconded by Nigel Allen that the above permission be accepted.

For: 3 (incl. 1 by proxy) Against: 7 Abstentions: 0

Not Carried

9. A.O.B

There were no items for discussion under Any Other Business.

Date of next Meeting; Thursday 1 December 2005
At 7 p.m.
At the BPA offices.

7 October 2005

Distribution

C. Allen - Chairman BPA
CCI's
Council
Advanced Riggers
CAA
Lesley Gale (Editor – Skydive)