

For (Arguments by Luc & Proponents)	Against (Counterarguments)	Rebuttal (Proponent Response)
Performance Equalizers		
Leveling the Playing Field & Fair Merit		
Equalizers reduce an advantage that was never earned.	Equalisers punish heavier pilots, who "earned" their weight, for the benefit of those who lack competitive equipment for their size.	Equalisers do not punish ; they simply equalise performance.
The goal is to make size performance more equalized and establish an equilibrium where winning is not anymore a race for who's ballasting the most .	The idea of deliberately degrading the performance of larger wings is inappropriate.	Winning is about relative performance , not absolute performance. Pilots will still be motivated to optimize everything, but competing under the same rules.
The sport should prioritize putting the merit on decision making , regardless of body weight.	If manufacturers improve smaller gliders, equalizers would constantly need adjustment.	The current proposed equalizer lengths are already calculated for the theoretical next generation of wings with optimized line thicknesses and load tests for every size.
Safety and Ballast Reduction		
Equalizers address the ballast issue. If implemented, there would be no point in flying with ballast , allowing pilots to use normal or lightweight kit.	Equalisers are viewed as paradoxical/absurd at the top level of competition—optimizing for low drag (small helmets, trim, sleek harnesses) only to add drag-inducing "noodles" to the lines.	This perceived paradox arises from mixing up separate subjects. Even if using "school wings," the ballast issue would still exist.
Inclusivity and Market Incentive		
The system promotes inclusivity by giving smaller pilots (women, small men, etc.) a way to actually compete , ensuring the sport as a whole does not lose.	Equalizers will not change anything for "really light pilots" (below 70kg) who will still need to ballast up to fly an S or M wing. They believe no one will buy an XS Enzo just because of noodles.	The introduction of equalizers is required to create a market for smaller wings. This market demand will incentivize manufacturers to put R&D into making better S and XS wings .
The current market for smaller wings is hidden under the ballast practice , leading manufacturers to neglect R&D in smaller sizes.		If Equalizers are done correctly, a light pilot who ballasts to an M size may choose to fly their natural size, provided the S wing becomes competitive due to increased R&D focus.
Superiority Over Other Solutions (e.g., MRT)		
Size Equalizers do not interfere with the performance related to gaggle flying .		MRT compensation can become random and unfair because the extra performance given by the group effect

		can be much higher than the size performance difference, potentially leaving compensated pilots behind. For Cat1, equalizers offer a high level of fairness with the lowest level of randomness .
	Equalizers cannot compensate for handling disadvantages ; a larger glider with equalizers might fly slower but retain the handling characteristics of the larger size, which struggles in tight or broken thermals. Smaller wings also have less inertia, making them more difficult/nervous to handle.	The glider's glide is still designed to be slightly better for the larger size to account for inherent handling issues and find an equilibrium.
	Equalizers cannot account for all physical differences , such as the reduced drag of smaller pilots (e.g., smaller forearms) who carry ballast to fly larger wings.	Luc states that he is already taking average pilot physique, including arms and harness, into account in the equalizer calculations. Forearms and physical size differences are a separate subject that does not need to be addressed by equalizers, as the goal is only to address the ballast issue.
Safety and Logistics of Implementation		
Equalizers are separate from the harness safety issue. Changing safety norms for harnesses will take years , whereas equalizers already exist and can be tested.	Pilots question the legality and safety of equalizers as an uncertified modification.	The safety risk is manageable. The Head of the German League flew a full SIV program on a wing with XL Equalizers. Furthermore, flying with them is argued to be safer than flying harnesses (like Submarines) that lack in-flight SIV certification and negatively affect safety in abnormal flight.
	The primary danger is not flying with them, but the logistical difficulty of installation : requiring pilots to detach and reattach their rear lines at registration.	The issue of remounting lines might be solved by slotting the tubes and finding a way to secure them to the riser without opening the maillon. Currently, equalizers are only discussed for high-level events (Cat1 and PWC).
	Pilots who carry ballast can choose to release it according to conditions, while those with noodles must fly with them the whole flight.	Few pilots are actually set up to release ballast, because it's another distraction at a time when full concentration is needed.

For (Arguments)	Against (Counterarguments)	Rebuttal (Proponent Response)
Multiple Radius Turn Points (MRT)		

MRT provides a size compensation system that is applied across all glider classes (CCC through EN-A).	Luc fears that MRT interferes too much into the gaggle flying aspect of performance.	The interference of MRT with group dynamics is precisely why equalizers are preferred by Luc: Size Equalizers do not interfere with gaggle performance.
	The MRT compensation becomes very random . The extra performance given by the group is much higher than the size performance difference, potentially leaving compensated pilots behind.	While MRT might be acceptable for low-level competitions, Cat1 events require a high level of fairness with the lowest level of randomness, which MRT does not provide.
	MRT adjustments are viewed as complex, opaque, and leave too many variables unresolved .	(None found in sources specifically defending MRT against these claims; proponents generally focus on Equalizers or Weight Classes as superior alternatives.)
Weight Classes (WC)		
WC are considered the proper solution for the future and make competitions fairer, safer, and more inclusive .	Setting up Weight Classes in a FAI-1 Worlds environment would be a mess logistically.	Weight classes are already implemented in many FAI-2 comps , showing it is not as complicated as some think.
WC address the core problem by giving pilots a real motivation to fly on their proper weight class , competing with their equals.	The structure of multiple categories means the overall winner will disappear .	The loss of an overall winner is just different to what we are used to ; it is standard practice in many other sports.
This approach preserves the freedom of choice for pilots regarding their glider, ballast setup, and flying style.	WC would put smaller pilots in a position where they have to accept not being competitive at the same level as larger people in an open class format.	If a pilot could win their own weight category , they would be motivated to fly their natural weight rather than ballasting into a larger class.
WC can be implemented simply by checking the Wing Max Load Homologated label on the glider, avoiding controversial pilot weigh-ins.		
The Status Quo (Current System)		
The current system maintains a single, highly valued overall winner .	The status quo is fundamentally and unavoidably unfair to smaller pilots.	(No direct rebuttal; the general sentiment is that change is necessary due to the existing unfairness and safety risk).
There are no forced limitations on glider size or ballast amount, preserving maximum pilot choice.	It creates unsafe conditions by forcing pilots to carry large amounts of excessive ballast to remain competitive.	
	Many pilots have stopped competing because they cannot or do not want to carry large amounts of ballast.	

	The current situation hides the market for small wings, discouraging manufacturers from investing R&D into them.	
Enforcing a 33kg Ballast Limit (or any similar weight limit)		
Limiting the total weight in flight is critical for safety, reducing the severity of incidents related to inertia, takeoff, and landing.	Previous attempts at weight limits were seen as hated restrictions by pilots.	New CIVL harness specs already include a maximum weight (10kg max harness weight and maximum dimensions), which shows progress is possible.
Ballast limits must be reinstated to avoid incentives to ballast up, even if equalizers or weight categories are implemented.	Ballast limits are difficult to enforce because pilots found ways to cheat (e.g., drinking water before weigh-in, wearing lead knickers).	Rules must be easily enforceable . One idea is "surprise" weight controls at takeoff or goal, with disqualification for significant weight difference from registration.
	If limits are set too low, small pilots (below 70 kg) will still need to ballast up until suitable CCC gliders exist in their "natural" PTV (all up weight).	
	Any rule that limits weight without addressing the size disadvantage will mean smaller people have to accept not being competitive .	