

Annex 8 – Prepared by Mike Close

Proposal that CASI review if the General Section of the FAI Sporting Code is sufficiently flexible or quickly adaptable to allow new event concepts to be implemented without the FAI ignoring its own Rules.

Discussion Points

- Are there circumstances where the FAI can ignore its own Statutes and Codes?
- If the FAI ignores its own rules is it morally, or legally, well placed to insist others within the organisation do?
- Are events that are organised and marketed as FAI events, but created in partnership with a commercial company, subject to the FAI General Section?
- If not subject to the General Section, then how does the FAI administer them and who determines the processes?
- If an FAI Sanctioned Event does not conform in all respects to the FAI Sporting Code, and an individual complained to the Court of Arbitration in Sport, although unlikely, could this result in the event be declared void, with subsequent distress to other competitors?

Possible Examples.

These are provided for discussion only on the adequacy of, and compliance with, the Sporting Code and not to imply automatically that what was/is being done is not in the best interests of the FAI.

- The FAI Swoop Freestyle World Championships had 18 invited athletes, but the 4.1.4 of General Section defines a World Championship as an International Sporting Event open to participants from all NACs.
- It has been alleged that bids for FAI Swoop Freestyle World Championships were not called for in accordance with IPC requirements and the matter did not appear on the agenda of the last IPC Plenary Meeting.
- Similar concerns have been expressed on the envisaged FAI Drone World Championship.
- Has the fast tracking of drones and their events, and the thinking outside the box, gone beyond the scope of the FAI Statutes and the delegations and authority given by the FAI General Conference?