

HELICOPTER CLUB OF GREAT BRITAIN



Ryelands House
Aynho
Banbury
OX17 3AT.

3rd March 2016

Markus Haggene
Sports and Marketing Director
FAI - Fédération Aéronautique Internationale
Maison du Sport International
Av. de Rhodanie 54
1007 Lausanne
Switzerland

Dear Markus

I am preparing for the next meeting of CIG and am quite surprised to see there has been a response to my letter from the Commission published on the FAI website within the Rotorcraft Meetings Document Section "Annex C". I don't see the response addresses my concerns.

I believe my letter has been completely misinterpreted by those who have read it, which was expected considering the numbers of different nationalities involved, and reading the President's response clearly confirms my cause for such concern. In the absence of notification of a response from the Commission within 90 days of the competition, I have forwarded a copy of my original letter to the UK Delegate to CASI, Alan Cassidy MBE.

I must thank Jacques Berlo, CIG 3rd Vice President, for his efforts to try to bring the Bureau together (at his own expense) to encourage discussion of the contents of my letter which was exactly my intention. And the willingness of Irina Grushina, CIG 2nd Vice President, to travel to Belgium for a meeting prior to the WAG 2015. It was unfortunate The President was unable to attend and I understand the CIG 1st Vice President, Konrad Geissler, didn't think it was appropriate without the President.

Firstly, I would like to clarify my original letter was not a complaint, protest or an attempt to make derogatory comments about the Polish Aero Club, the event organisers or competitors. All of the Polish team involved with the administration of the event gave their all. The organiser provided a more than adequate infrastructure to hold the event and organised the logistics diligently. The concerns I aired were with the competition management and had nothing to do with the Polish organisers, they are entirely the responsibility of the Commission. My letter has become a public forum, it should have stayed within the Commission until any decisions had been made. So much for confidentiality! I now find myself in the uncomfortable position of having to defend myself publicly. This is not a position I should be in. Had the President taken the time to investigate this fully, none of this would have arisen and this time could have been spent more constructively.

In addressing the response to Plenary Agenda document Annex C, I raise the following points.

1. General Rules and Regulations.

'All crews must hold Sporting Licences. There must be no changes of crews/countries within three years (CIG Rules Chapter 2.1.7). This was included to ensure that there was no change between CIG 3 year World Championship Cycles. CASI changed the General Section to 2 years. This was not picked up by the CIG – CASI Delegate. A request has been made to CASI for dispensation to accept the CIG 3 year rule'.

Section 9 Chapter 2.1.7

Each crew member must be in possession of a valid FAI Sporting Licence, issued by the National Aero Club in which they are registered as a member and are citizens or residents of NAC's country. A crew whose members represent different NAC's may be accepted by CIG as an International crew. There must be no changes of crews/countries within 3 years.

At the time of writing my letter the President confined a different position completely (See Annex A). It is quite clear the Commission President has already addressed this with a different response prior to the competition. He states quite clearly and with authority that **Section 9 Chapter 2.1.7** was in place when the organiser agreement was signed and is not constrained by the revised General Section as amended 1st May 2015. Could the President advise which version is his official response?

2. Sporting Licences

“The issue of Sporting Licences is set out in Chapter 3 of the General Section effective 1.1.2016. Change of Representation is not permitted within 24 months.

Error in Sporting Licences

4 cases are listed, Austria, Belarus, Russia and Macao. I have checked with the relevant NAC representatives from which the following information was provided.

a. Sergie Tupikov (Russia) Incorrect. Attached is a copy of his Sporting Licence issued by his NAC (30.7.2015)

b. Aleksei Mochanski (Belarus) Incorrect. Attached is a photocopy of his Sporting Licence issued by his NAC. The name stated by Mr Monks is wrongly spelt. This Sporting Licence is on the FAI Data Base with the correct spelling.

c. Anita Parr (Austria). The reply from the Austrian Aero Club states that Mrs Parr replaced the crew member Mr Kurt Schoosleitner just before the Championship due to personal reasons. Mrs Parr was crew member for her husband. She has lived in Austria for 15 years. She overlooked sending her Registration Document to the Austria Aeroclub hence the failure to provide her with her Sporting Licence before the start of the WHC.

d. Chu Kin Hang (Macao). FAI say no Sporting Licence exists. No further information is available. He flew with a British team Member who would have known a Sporting Licence was essential but as an International Team.

The result as to who might have issued it only affects Austria but they were not at the level of Individual Medal Awards. International Teams do not qualify for inclusion.

It is unfortunate that the allegation against 2 competitors was unfounded.

Championship Rules Chapter 2 -10.3 forbids a complaint or protest of one team against another. The allegation regarding the Macao/British fails because not only was it a non-counting International Team but was considered as an element of the British Group”.

The President has completely missed my point! The inclusion of sporting licences in my letter was to highlight how a relatively inconsequential requirement of the rules can have a very large impact on some competitors whilst initially appearing to have no great impact.

As an example, I quoted Anita Parr, Austria. No valid sporting licence means there were not enough Austrian crews to qualify for entry to the team event! I don't believe she should be penalised but it is clear the impact on the competitor that a non compliance has.

Chu Kin Hang did compete with a British crewman. Kin was unable to hold a sporting licence as there is currently no provision within FAI that recognises Macau. He was not part of the

British delegation but the British delegation did everything to assist promoting Rotorcraft in Macau and supporting the Polish event by embracing his entry and contacting FAI office on his behalf to assist his plight. In answer to the President quoting **Chapter 2-10,3**, no complaint or allegation has been made by the British delegation about him or others without sporting licences. The information regarding the validity of sporting licences came directly from the FAI office. (See Annex B).

According to their records as of 10th October 2015, seven competitors did not have valid registered sporting licence on the Sporting Licence Database. For the record only one of the four listed in my original letter did have a valid registered sporting licence. The reason why this record could not be found was due to a typing error of the surname on the WHC scoring sheet as FAI confirmed.

According to FAI, one competitor listed in my letter did not have a valid sporting licence registered on the database on 10th October 2015 but did by 12th October 2015 (See ANNEX B) and another did have a valid sporting licence but under a different spelling. The spelling of his name was Mochanskiy on the score sheet which was incorrect and the name as spelt was not on the FAI sporting licence database. For the purpose of good order, the correct spelling is Machansky who does have a registered sporting licence and not Mochanski as the President has referred to in his rendition.

Is the President questioning the reliability of the FAI staff or the Sporting Licence Database?

I personally believe a sporting licence has no relevance as to how a competitor performs, however, there are reasons why FAI has implemented the requirement and if a competitor does not have a valid registered sporting licence then they have no place in the competition. Their scores would not count. This can have a massive impact on the competitor and any team score.

Setting out the Fender Course

“This was late. The Organiser had been advised that it should be set out in time to allow crew inspection. The Jury, being informed of Mr Monk’s dispute checked the course. It was found that one container (Barrel) was displaced by 9cm. It was corrected.

A Protest was submitted by Mr Monks which was read by the Jury. The subsequent evidence proved that the ‘offending container’ was not on Mr Monks’ side of the course. Before a Hearing could be called Mr Monks withdrew his Protest. No other team has made a complaint”.

Chapter 2 General Rules and Regulation 13.0 Competition Rules Sub Sec 13.15

The required equipment for all events, specially described in the event rules and their annexes, will be provided by the Organiser. No other equipment should be used by the competitors. All equipment which will be used by crews during the respective events must be available for inspection at the event briefings. Any lines or markings for all events, fixed equipment such as the slalom course, the fender rigging course or the dog house, must be in place and available for inspection by competitors and officials at least one hour prior to the departure of the first competitor. A plan of how the course is to be laid out (including freestyle box) should be given to the Jury President at least 24 hours prior to the first departure.

I never submitted a protest, I did not dispute the accuracy to the setting out of the course. I brought the non compliance of **Chapter 2 General Rules and Regulation, 13.0 Competition Rules Sub Sec 13.15**, to the attention of the Technical Delegate and explained how it affected me. Anyone with experience of competing at world level in Rotorcraft sports as a pilot/crew will be able to tell you not only does a crew look at the siting of the equipment according to plan but also the relief of the course, wind direction and any markers available on the horizon. Something I was unable to do. This situation was foreseeable, the published time of the briefing and the start of the event did not allow for the compliance of **Chapter 2 General Rules and Regulation 13.0 Competition Rules Sub Sec 13.15**. (See ANNEX C). In keeping with the rules a written complaint was forwarded and as at the time of writing this letter a response has still not been received. (See ANNEX D).

This is not the first time the inspecting of the course has lead to problems with an event. During the WHC 2005 a situation was commented on by the Chief Judge in his report. He made recommendation that more time was given to “inspecting of the course”. (See ANNEX E).

Conflict of Interest

a. Equipment (extension lap belts)

This discussion between Mr Monks and the Chief Judge was not brought to the attention of the Jury. Reference was made to a Protest but none was issued.

A protest was issued. Please find attached a copy of the protest, complete with supporting documents, showing the Chief Judges' first decision on the use of standard equipment signed by the Event Director, including acknowledgement of receipt of monies equivalent to CHF 600. (See ANNEX F).

Is the Jury President suggesting the Protest was withheld from him? If so, then by whom? If not, why did he not process the protest before any other discussion could ensue? I made every attempt officially to bring it to the attention of the Jury. I believe I did everything required according to the rules and believe I was failed.

b. Experienced Officials

“CIG Rules say that ‘There should be at least 4 experienced officials’. The word is ‘should’ not ‘must’. CIG were aware of the lack of experience. Taking into account that Russia had been working closely with the Organiser for a year, CIG appointed a Technical Delegate to advise it was considered reasonable to proceed with the Championship. Mr Monks did not object. A response was expected from the CIG Technical Advisor but none was forthcoming. Moreover when the matter of her activities was put to the Team Managers it was approved 10 – 2 after a secret vote”.

I am more than aware that a Technical Delegate was approved by CIG, in fact it was my suggestion to Irina Grushina that she should be appointed prior to the competition, this conversation took place during May of 2014 in Jurata Poland during a training camp. It was agreed by the Commission during the 2015 Plenary. The Technical Delegate position is only referred to in the organiser agreement 3.2.

“The commission may, should it elect to do so, appoint an individual or body to advise the Organiser on behalf of the Commission, (“the Technical Delegate”) on all technical and administrative aspects of the Sporting Event on behalf of the commission at any stage in the organisation of the event. The organiser agrees to accept the reasonable recommendations of the Technical Delegate”.

Can I ask why and when was there a secret vote of the Team Managers? The five I have asked were unaware of such vote. Why should there have been a vote if the CIG had already appointed the position of Technical Delegate prior the competition ?

Is the President confused? The only vote asked of the team managers was to ask whether they were happy for the crews from Belarus to be allowed to fly the navigation course the following day, outside of the published event times, citing fuel problems preventing them for starting. I understand the Jury handed over its decision making to the Team Managers. Can I ask the President, when did a majority vote overrule the rules in a competition when rules have been created in a structured and democratic process at least 1 year prior to the event by CIG? If this is the adopted process then what is the requirement for a Jury? (See ANNEX G). Provision is quite clearly made within the rules for this exact situation.

Sec 9 Chap 2. 13.4

Late arrival at Line P will normally be penalised by 5 points for each minute of delay or part thereof to a maximum of 25 points. After 5 minutes delay the competitor will be required to fly last. In the event of a proven technical problem, the Championship Director may authorise a change in departure time.

Future Actions

“Mr Monks has made a number of requests. Whether or not the Commission would want an Independent Adjudicator is debatable. It would need changes to the By-Laws and the General Section”.

“To summarise I would like to see the following actions considered:

- 1. The introduction and implementation of an FAI Standards of performance manual with full checklist system for competitions.*
- 2. The status of the sporting licence database checked for entry and correct issue by NACs, and all scores affected in this competition revising and publishing.*
- 3. The appointment of an independent adjudicator actively overseeing the competition.*
- 4. Minimum qualifications for Jury members, with interview for suitability.*
- 5. Regular rule awareness examinations with qualification status and ranking.*
- 6. A qualified Jury pool capable of sitting on Jurys across all air sports.*
- 7. At least one member of the Jury should be from another Air Sport Commission.*
- 8. Active implementation by FAI Secretariat of FAI Code of Ethics via questionnaire (Annual disclosure) available for public inspection.*
- 9. Common registration process to all ASCs for competitors for competition entry.*
- 10. Revision of the Jury Hand book, with more extensive check lists.”*

The actions I have asked to be “considered” are all debatable, that is why I have asked them to be “considered”. I believe there should be a democratic process which allows change if required. If By-laws and the General Section require alteration to improve our sport then why should they not be changed. Surely this is our function and responsibility, we owe this to the competitors.

“Mr Monks is not careful with his choice of words. He refers to the same people having roles in the World Championship being the same in WAG. This is not correct”.

- 1. The Jury President is different.*
- 2. The WAG Event Director is CIG Rules Chairman.*

3. *The Chief Judge is different.*

In my attempt not to over use the names of individuals, I was referring to people and not positions. This was correct at the time of writing. The President is quite correct, the Jury President during WAG 2015 was, indeed, different to that published at the time of writing my letter namely David Hamilton, WHC 2015 (Jury President). The first I became aware of the change of the WAG Jury President was on the 25th November 2015 when the President announced he was unable to attend. (See ANNEX H).

The WAG Rotorcraft Event Director was Wolfgang Perplies, the CIG Rules Chairman and WHC 2015 Chief Judge. The WAG Chief Judge was Irina Grushina. All very capable people!

I see the President states steps are being taken to ensure no repeat of errors. I hope more is being done than after the WHC 2005. I quote from the plenary minutes 2006.

The President proposed that the Commission adopt the following resolution to which he thought nobody can object.

“CIG reaffirms that all International Rotorcraft Competitions must be conducted strictly in accordance with the provisions of the FAI Sporting Code (General Section – Section 9) and Regulations approved by CIG. It is the responsibility of FAI Officials (Judges and Jury Members) to ensure that these Rules are strictly applied”.

The UK Delegate seconded the motion which was carried unanimously. The President then ruled that the matter was closed.

Unfortunately, it does not appear to have been actioned.

In summing up.

- This is not a complaint about the Polish organisers.
- This is not a complaint about competitors.
- My letter contained examples of how rules affect competitors not that competitors broke rules and should be penalised.
- Due to a general lack of understanding of the rules the management of the competition, as listed within the Section 9 Chapter 1. 7.1, failed the Polish organisers.
- A system of handing over responsibility in the form of emotional blackmail has been adopted taking over from leadership and decision making by the management.
- There is no confidentiality to protect competitors .

- Management have not learned anything from the past and the same mistakes keep repeating.
- There is a distinct lack of knowledge of the rules or they are being ignored.
- I am disappointed the President has focused his efforts on attempting to discredit me in his response when he could have used this time constructively as a leader in this regard.

In my previous letter I raised some points for consideration. In the light of this response I think we need to go much further as a Commission in order for this very unfortunate situation to be resolved and the Commission brought back on track.

Yours sincerely,



David Monks

Chairman of the Helicopter Club of Great Britain.

FAI delegate for Great Britain

Secretary to CIG

Council Member and MDirector of the Royal Aero Club of the United Kingdom

Direct contact information: +441926 857265 (office)

+447966 259454 (mobile)

david@djme.co.uk