



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*

Minutes

of the Annual Meeting of the

FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)

held in Belgrade, Serbia

on Thursday 13th and Saturday 15th October 2011

20 October 2011

*Maison du Sport International
Av. de Rhodanie 54
CH-1007 Lausanne
(Switzerland)
Tél. +41 (0)21 345 10 70
Fax +41 (0)21 345 10 77
E-mail: sec@fai.org
Web: www.fai.org*

1-3 Welcome, Roll Call of Delegates, Apologies and Proxy votes

The 1st Vice President Graeme Windsor opened the meeting at 0900 and after a roll call welcomed all delegates and observers to the meeting. The attendance list was circulated.

Present: Australia, Canada, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, USA, CIA, CIAM, CIG, CIMA, CIVA, CIVL, GAC, IGC, IPC, ICARE plus a number of non-voting alternate representatives, Technical Commission representatives and observers. Both the FAI President and the Secretary-General attended the meeting on a part-time basis.

Absent: Serbia

An apology for absence was received from Tor Johannessen.

There were no proxy votes.

A total of 19 voting representatives were present which gave 10 votes required to achieve an absolute majority and 13 votes for a 2/3 majority.

Graeme then gave the floor to Dr John Grubbstrom, FAI President, who welcomed everyone.

Dr Grubbstrom indicated that following the Strategic Task Force Report at the last FAI meeting in Dublin; the Executive Board has been tasked to find ways to reform the FAI. Issues to be addressed in the General Conference for consideration, but not determination at this Conference included:

- The future of CASI;
- The future of the Statutes Working Group; and
- Voting powers of Air Sports Commissions at the General Conference.

With regard to CASI, the question raised was its reason for being. Currently the role is to look after the General Section of the Sporting Code, which, if you look at it closely, is mostly about Air Sports. The proposal is to leave the General Section to the ASC Presidents Group as they are the representatives of the Air Sport Commissions and they should know what the General Section should contain. Another important aspect is the forming of the Board of Appeal, however that can be done regardless of CASI, on the few occasions one is necessary. So if the General Conference gives the go-ahead, a proposal to change the statutes accordingly will be made at the next General Conference and there may not be a CASI in 2013.

There is also the question of voting power, for example, the Executive Board does not vote at the General Conference so why should ASC Presidents vote?

Dr. Grubbstrom stated that he had been on the CASI for a number of years and was aware that the work done is overlapping with other work done in the FAI and the smart people in the CASI could be better used for work in the Expert Groups being set up. There is a need to focus on the important things necessary to move the FAI forwards. Although CASI is not an expensive meeting to set up because it is held at the same time as the General Conference, the overall number of meetings adds to the FAI expenses and we need to rationalize the work of the FAI. Although communication on this subject has been made through the minutes of Executive Board meetings, Dr. Grubbstrom apologised for the lack of face-to-face information although there were some discussions at the ASC Presidents meeting in May and again at the NAC Presidents meeting more recently (18 NACs were present). Some of the initial ideas have not been pursued, the number of Vice Presidents question for example. However, the Regional Vice President idea is still being pursued.

The actual voting to implement the changes will be only be made in Antalya, Turkey, next year.

He wished everyone a good meeting and sent his best wishes to Henk Meertens and John Aldridge, both of whom were indisposed and unable to attend the meeting.

4 Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

Declaration of conflict of interest was called for. None were made.

5 Approval of Minutes of the Airsport General Commission meeting held in Dublin, Ireland on 7th October 2010

The following two corrections were noted:

- Item 7 2nd last paragraph (replace anonymously to unanimously)
- Item 8 Heading change 'General' to Sporting Code.

The resolution to approve the minutes of the last meeting was made by the delegate from Canada and seconded by Australia and passed unanimously.

Business arising from the minutes of the last Meeting

Graeme Windsor then went through the actions that resulted from the last CASI meeting

Minute	Item	Status
4	Insurance - Amend GS 3.9.6	Done
5	International record eligibility – National record GS 6.1.2	Done, amended by minute 6
	Claim to state if World or Continental, etc. 6.1.3	Done
	Continental record boundaries 6.1.4	Done
	ASC to decide re having a Continental record. cat. 6.1.5	Done
6	International record eligibility – National record – Working Group established	Done – WG report at Annex 2
7	CIACA to word an ornithopter category	CIACA to report
8	Working Group on SC11	Done - Annex 1
9	Ask each ASC to review distance measurement to ensure compliance with GS	This issue is on-going
12	FAI Casualty Guidelines	Done – Annex 7
13	Guidelines for FAI Appeals Procedures HM/JCW	Work in progress advised by Jean-Claude Weber

6 Report on the Review of General Section 11. (Annex 1 of Agenda)

Buzz Bennett presented and explained the Working Group proposal for a new document. No feedback has been received on the proposal distributed with the Agenda. Australia indicated that the work had been more complex than expected. Germany commented on §3.3.3.4 however, this was not something new and had been in the previous document.

USA submitted some minor changes.

Chapter 1. For consistency, create a new sub-class for “Human-powered rotorcraft with stored energy (I-H)”.

2.2. Ornithopter. Proposed rewording: “A machine that achieves and sustains flight by the sole means of flapping wings”.

Ornithopter should be included as a definition in the General Section.

2.9. Triangular course. The definition should refer to General Section Annex A 7.3.2.

3.1.7. Delete the word “Triangular”

3.2.3.8. First sentence should be “For a speed record, the course shall have three turn points with a perimeter of 1500m.” The rest of the paragraph remains unchanged.

With the proposed changes, the section 11 is now a usable, workable document. The document together with changes was approved unanimously.

Thanks were expressed to the Working Group.

7 Report on Review of FAI Guidelines – In the event of a Casualty or a Serious Accident at FAI Air Sports

A copy of Annex 7 was distributed to the delegates and Graeme Windsor, as Chair of the Working Group, explained the proposals. After discussion, the following changes were proposed:

Point 2 b) change from “Organisers should be prepared to care for the availability of.....” to “organisers should consider the need to make available.....”

Jurgen Knueppel explained that the changes proposed in point 5 relevant for Parachuting were up-to-date with what is realistic in the current environment.

The proposal was accepted with one vote against and no abstentions.

Thanks were expressed to the working group.

8 Report on Review of FAI Appeal Procedure

Jean-Claude Weber reported on behalf the working group that the subject was a work in progress and not finalised.

9 Proposed changes to General Section 6.1.2. (Annex 2 of Agenda)

Buzz Bennett, presented the conclusions of the Working Group that he chaired. The proposal was to simplify Paragraphs 6.1.2, 6.4.1 and 6.8 of the General Section.

Germany agreed that the changes were appropriate but requested that a NAC not have the responsibility of submitting World Records leaving this to make the claim. However, the subject is not relevant to the mandate of the Working Group and the concern should be addressed separately with a proposal for change.

The subject was however debated and various few points were expressed. The CIG representative indicated that historically, the NACs had wanted this responsibility because they had the responsibility of issuing the FAI Sporting Licence to their members..

The NACs elected to CASI were asked to give their opinion.

Australia – no problem

Canada – no problem

Czech – no problem

France – no problem

Germany – does not wish to handle World/Continental Records

Spain – no comment

Sweden – indicated that record is not a National Record; the NAC should not have to handle it.

Switzerland – no problem

USA – has set its own deadlines to leave enough time to forward the claim to the FAI. It should be noted that Art Greenfield was the only member of the Working Group in favour of retaining the obligation for a National Record prior to a World Record.

The proposal to remove the obligation for a National Record was deemed dangerous for CIMA for various reasons. Different viewpoints were given both for and against the proposal.

Jean-Marc Badan expressed his concern that there was a risk of damaging the spirit of the FAI. He reminded the representatives that the FAI comprises NACs that have been given sporting powers including ratifying Records and issuing Sporting Licences. He suggested looking at how other International Sport Federations handle World Records. He felt that it would be a mistake to disconnect World Records from National Records; this could lead to loss of credibility. The FAI possesses the history of aviation through all the records it has archived. The workload that Record administration generates would be the same regardless of whether it was handled by the FAI directly with the claimant or via the NAC however, the NAC has better control over the pilots and official observers, as they are their members.

Buzz Bennett then indicated his concern that a World Record could be refused just because a NAC has different criteria to the FAI since a NAC is free to determine its own requirements. He reminded everyone that in 2010 it was decided to delink Continental Records from National Records and the majority view of the Working Group was that there was no difference between a World Record and a Continental Record.

The Working Group proposal was put to vote and was lost by seven votes against and five votes in favour.

CIMA proposed to set up a new Working Group chaired by Richard Meredith-Hardy with Buzz Bennett and Art Greenfield as Members. **This proposal was accepted unanimously.**

10 CIMA proposal for changes to the General Section re Microlight Autogyros (Annex 3 of the Agenda)
--

Richard Meredith-Hardy made a presentation explaining the reasons behind the CIMA proposal.

CIG regretted not having received more information prior to meeting but their position is clear. FAI statutes define that all rotorcraft fall under GIC responsibility and any change would need a change to the statutes.

Richard apologised if this was the case but felt there was no need to change the statutes, which already clearly define what is a Microlight aircraft.

Discussion ensued and points were made amongst which:

- there had never been an issue with an overlap between class C and Microlights and should not be with class E.
- there is an advantage to have autogyro Microlights coming under both Section 9 and 10 particularly regarding records.
- Competitors want to participate in Microlight activities

This last point was confirmed by Germany and by the French representative, who indicated that the European Microlight Union had recently voted unanimously to include Microlight Autogyros in Microlight competitions.

The CIG indicated that if the CIMA made a formal request to allow autogyros to participate in the 2012 World Championships, this would be accepted and the CIG would then, during the course of the coming year review the CIMA proposal and rediscuss next year.

It was highlighted by the USA that the overlap between classes was not an issue except for Records and the statutes are ambiguous on this point.

A counter proposal from Australia was to allow the CIMA proposal to be adopted now but subject for a complete review at the next CASI meeting.

A motion was put forward to accept the proposal now but to place the subject on the agenda next year and to invite the USA to propose changes to avoid the overlap problem for records.

The motion was adopted by 16 votes in favour and one vote against.

11 CIMA proposal for changes to the General Section re Paramotors (Annex 4 of the Agenda)

Richard Meredith-Hardy explained the reasons for the proposal, which would include the word “paramotor” in the title of the Commission. Paramotors now have more participants than Microlights and they need to be treated as equal partners in all affairs of CIMA.

The proposal was approved unanimously.

12 Approval of FAI Sporting Code – Section 14 Electrically - Powered Aeroplanes (Annex 5 of the Agenda)

It was not sure who was the author of the proposed text. It probably came from CIACA but in the absence of the representative it was impossible to discuss the content, which contained information that was both out of date as well as mistakes. It would appear that the Solar Impulse project was the motivation for this document. The question of the necessity to create a whole new section for this subject when Electric power propulsion already exists in other Sections was raised. The USA indicated that GAC could include this into Section 2 at next GAC meeting, which is in 5 weeks time. One small issue was the delay for including a subject on the Agenda.

A motion to request GAC to adopt this into section 2 as soon as possible was passed unanimously.

13 Proposed update to CASI Election process (Annex 6 of the Agenda)

Buzz Bennett, as author, explained the proposal that requires a change to the FAI By-Laws to reflect that CASI consists of representatives, rather than delegates.

The Proposal was adopted unanimously.

14 The future of the Air Sports General Commission

Graeme Windsor opened discussion by referring to the introductory address by President John Grubbstrom. He pointed out that the Sporting Code General Section not only covered sporting matters handled by ASCs, but also more political and administrative issues that ASCs would not normally be involved in. For these matters the input of NAC representatives is not only valuable but also probably essential to achieve the best solutions. He also asked whether the ASC Presidents alone had the expertise that the broader coverage NAC representatives in CASI currently provide. He also asked the question of how the “orphan” sections of the Sporting Code would be catered for as ASC representatives tended to be focussed primarily on their own sporting activities.

He proposed that CASI should provide a resolution to the General Conference on its view of how present CASI activities should be handled in view of the EB proposal.

In order to achieve this, the representatives each provided the following viewpoints:

CIVA: during the current meeting there have been numerous occasions where the input from the other representatives has been useful. The blend of Commissions and NACs is valuable.

Germany: no additional comment, favours a status quo.

Sweden: It all depends on how things are handled. For example, the Appeal Court could be removed from CASI. More importantly, there is a serious need is to look at the whole FAI and to clean up the whole organisation. CASI should stay as it is but we should look at the tasks and probably have a separate Court of Appeal. The NACs pay for the FAI and should have their say.

USA: FAI should be inclusive not exclusive and to exclude the NACs is not beneficial. The Sporting Code is administered by the Air Sport Commissions for Competitions but by NACs for Records.

GAC: in favour of the Swedish position

CIMA: Agrees with what has been said before. The advantage of CASI is that it is chaired by a President elect and has an independent voice rather than suffering from a top-down autocracy. CASI should stay.

CIA: concurs with what has been said so far. But would like to point out that the idea has not been very well thought out. There is perhaps a hidden agenda? The ASC Presidents group is not the right group to maintain the General Section, because it contains administrative issues that are not their responsibility. It is a consulting group, not a decision-making body. How would be able to handle the changes? CIA is opposed to doing away with CASI.

IPC/Canada: Has not yet heard a single reason that justifies doing away with CASI. 'if it ain't broke don't fix it'. CASI has shown itself to be an excellent debating group, which gives both the ASC viewpoint and the NAC viewpoint. There is no reason to change the current organisation and it is better for the FAI to maintain a status quo.

CIVL: support maintaining CASI as it is now.

France: is also in favour of maintaining the current status although the question should be asked of how we can make our work more efficient and quicker. It is not costly to run so don't disband CASI, improve it.

Spain: agrees with France and is in favour of maintaining CASI as it is now.

Switzerland: FAI President of Honour, Dr. Hirzel, spoke on behalf of Switzerland. He supported all that has been said so far and was in favour of maintaining CASI. He indicated that CASI comprised two aspects: Sporting and Political.

CIG: Can see no reason for change. The ASC Presidents have enough to do already and can contribute to CASI either directly or delegate someone else from their Commission.

Australia: Believe that CASI should continue but should look to improve the way it is organised. There are three main reasons:

- 1) ASC Presidents are here to support their own organisations and may not be sufficiently interested in all the matters
- 2) the ASC Presidents are selected by their Commission and may not cover all regions, so it is important that NACs participate too.
- 3) NACs are impacted by decisions made by CASI and should be able to have their say.

IGC: the ASC Presidents would not have time, energy or sufficient interest to deal with General matters and we could end up with a General Section that is not properly updated.

CIAM: maintain a status quo

The CASI representatives were unanimous in their position for the future of CASI but questioned how to make CASI more efficient. Criticism included overlapping of duties and inefficiencies. No overlapping is obvious and no examples have been given. The main inefficiency is the time it takes to get results from a Working Group. Perhaps a database for shared information would help.

There are more and more technical opportunities to improve efficiency. Examples given were the CIVL monthly Skype meetings in place of two face-to-face meetings a year, the CIMA WIKI tool. The new FAI website will hopefully make things more open and accessible.

Australia expressed being impressed by the collective view of both the Air Sport Commissions and the NACs. It was suggested that as the Executive Board is proposing to pass a motion to remove voting rights from the ASC Presidents it wants to compensate this by giving more control to ASC by handing them the General Section.

A motion was approved to present to the General Conference the rejection of the proposal to disband CASI but to agree to have the Court of Appeal moved elsewhere.

15 Any Other Business

The IPC asked to put the subject of FAI Medals on the Agenda. This was unanimously accepted.

Buzz Bennett explained that the cost of the medals has increased considerably due to the increased value of the Swiss Franc. When questioned, the FAI indicated that the medals were of good quality and their cost was realistic. Not all Commissions handle the Medals question in the same fashion and also the quantity of medals required varies considerably. It was commented that there should be more harmonisation but that the cost of FAI medals impacted negatively on the cost of organisation of a competition and was one of the factors that make it difficult to find organisers. It is the duty of the FAI to help reduce costs and to provide real value for money.

He expressed surprise that a financial question was raised in CASI as FAI funding comes from the NACs. He suggested that the NACs should select how their money should be spent. There are problems with medal prices and services, all of which have to be paid for but the highest cost for an organisation is staff salaries, not the cost of medals.

A motion was put forward by CIVA and seconded by CIMA to task the FAI with investigating a source of medals at a lesser cost. The motion was adopted unanimously.

The 1st Vice President thanked all the representatives for their participation at this meeting. He declared the meeting closed at 1500 hrs.

16 Bureau Election

Graeme Windsor, 1st Vice President opened the elective meeting on October 15th, immediately following the General Conference. He indicated that the whole Bureau was stepping down to allow new elections to be held. He handed the Chair to Jean-Marc Badan, Secretary General of the FAI.

President

Were nominated for President of CASI

Buzz Bennett - declined

Gunter Bertram - declined

Jean-Pierre Delmas - declined

Art Greenfield - declined

Bob Henderson - declined

Graeme Windsor accepted and was duly elected by acclamation.

1st Vice President

Were nominated for 1st Vice President

John Aldridge – Jean-Marc Badan indicated that John has declared that he will not stand again as President of the CIVL

Buzz Bennett – accepted and obtained 9 votes

Gunter Bertram – accepted and obtained 6 votes

Mike Close - declined

Art Greenfield - declined

Tor Johannessen – accepted and obtained 1 vote

Bob Skinner - declined

Buzz Bennett was duly elected as 1st Vice President.

Vice Presidents

Were nominated for the three Vice President positions:

Gunter Bertram – accepted and obtained 12 votes

Alan Cassidy - not eligible

Mike Close accepted and obtained 9 votes

Jean-Pierre Delmas – accepted and obtained 10 votes

Freddy Herbert accepted and obtained 2 votes

Alicia Hirzel accepted and obtained 12 votes

Tor Johannessen accepted and obtained 1 vote

Richard Meredith-Hardy - declined

Bob Skinner - declined

Jean-Claude Weber - declined

Thierry Villey - not eligible

Gunter Bertram, Jean-Pierre Delmas and Alicia Hirzel were duly elected.

Secretary

Gillian Rayner was nominated and accepted the nomination, which was approved by France, and was duly elected by acclamation.

Following the elections, the President resumed the Chair. He proposed Henk Meertens, out-going President, be nominated President of Honour. This was approved by acclamation.

He thanked everyone for being present and closed the meeting at 19h00.

Date and Place of next CASI Meeting

Thursday, 18th October, 2012, Antalya, Turkey