



FAI Microlight Commission

Minutes of the Plenary Meeting of the FAI Microlight Commission held at the Olympic Museum, Lausanne on 12th & 13th of November 2004

President:	Tormod Veiby
First Vice President:	Carlos Trigo
Second Vice President:	Tomas Backman
Secretary:	Thomas Gunnarson
Delegates:	See Annex 1

1. Opening

Tormod Veiby opened the meeting and congratulated Richard Meredith-Hardy on his achievement in becoming the first person to fly a microlight over Mount Everest.

2. Apologies

See Annex 1

3. Conflicts of Interest

No conflicts of interest were declared

4. Delegate Reports

See Annex 2

5. Minutes

The minutes of the 2003 CIMA meeting were accepted unamended.

6. Introduction of the FAI President

Pierre Portmann, the newly elected president of the FAI introduced himself to the meeting, welcomed the delegates to Lausanne and congratulated CIMA on being one of the most active of the air sports commissions.

7. Report of the FAI Secretary General

Max Bishop, Secretary General of the FAI, reported that the new President was elected at the recent General Conference in Madrid together with the new executive board members Alvaro de Orleans-Borbon, Robert Clipsham, Bengt-Eric Fonsell, Hideo Hirasawa, Jerzy Makula and B.J. Worth.

The FAI has now adopted its new identity in the form of its logo, flags and commission logos. He also explained that a new scale of subscriptions had been introduced the general effect of which was to redistribute the burden more equitably amongst member countries, whilst maintaining a constant total revenue. The FAI was seeking corporate sponsors to contribute to its running costs.

The FAI 2005 Centenary book would be published next year and special editions could be produced for NACs or sporting bodies incorporating up to four pages of their own content in minimum orders of 100 copies.

8. Environmental Code of Conduct

It was reported that the FAI environmental commission had produced an environmental code of conduct. This would be available on the FAI website and contained a subsection for each sport. Championship organisers would be encouraged to comply with this.

9. Report of the CIMA President

Tormod Veiby, the President of CIMA, gave the PowerPoint presentation that he had given to the FAI General conference in Madrid. [attached]. He noted with disappointment that there are still FAI delegates who see microlighting as a threat rather than an opportunity.

Both he and Tom Gunnarson visited an airshow in Taiwan in August. It was extraordinary in several respects. It was extremely well advertised and supported by large corporations eg Evergreen, there were 650,000 spectators and, due to the total absence of GA in Taiwan, the

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

main attractions were military & microlights. Later in their 2 week visit they went to Kaohsiung which will be the venue for the 2009 World Games. They met the mayor and saw the very fine flight park there. The mayor was not unenthusiastic about hosting one or more microlight disciplines as 'demonstration sports'.

10. FAI Sporting Code Section 10

The following amendments were proposed:

- a. Proposed by France: That emergency parachutes be made compulsory for PPGs.
Vote: For 1, Against 8, Abstain 6: Rejected.
- b. Proposed by Germany: That distances required for Colibri Badges be changed to 500 km for the New Classes Gold Colibri and to $d_M \times 1$, $d_M \times 2$ and $d_M \times 14$ for Bronze, Silver and Gold Colibris respectively where d_M is the distance an aircraft can fly in nil wind in one hour at the manufacturer's published cruise speed.
Vote: For 14, Against 1, Abstain 0: Accepted.
Action: S10 Editor to amend Chapter 2, paragraph 2.3
- c. Proposed by Germany: That the task proportions in PPG competitions be changed to match those of the Classic classes.
Vote: For 2, Against 10, Abstain 3: Rejected.
- d. Proposed by Germany: That PLs have a precision landing deck similar to that of the Classic classes.
Vote: For 3, Against 10, Abstain 2: Rejected.
- e. Proposed by Germany: That PL1s & PL2s no longer fly certain precision tasks.
Withdrawn.
- f. Proposed by Sweden: Add to the responsibilities of the organiser and director "and on demand, make public all the circumstances that have had any bearing on the scoring for the tasks, including the coordinates for turn points, hidden gates, ground markers etc."
Vote: For 14, Against 1, Abstain 0: Accepted.
Action: S10 Editor to amend Chapter 4, paragraph 4.7.1.
- g. Proposed by Japan: That the definition of a 'flat place' for the purposes of record attempts be changed. Withdrawn.
Action: CIMA Bureau to write to the Japan Aero Club explaining acceptable methods of verifying a slope <1%.
- h. Proposed by UK: That the name of PF1 & PF2 aircraft be changed from PPG to Paramotor.
Vote: For 14, Against 1, Abstain 0: Accepted.
Action: CIMA Bureau to clarify legal implications with FAI.
- i. Proposed by UK: Where the candidate Competition Director for a Category 1 Championship has not previously organized a successful FAI Category 1 microlight championship he/she must as a minimum:
 - i. have flown as a competitor in an FAI Category 1 microlight championship, and;
 - ii. have organised national competitions.

Evidence of this experience should be provided to CIMA in the form of a comprehensive CV supported by the National Aero Club presenting the bid and verified by the CIMA Bureau or a nominated CIMA representative. This amendment should apply to bids not already accepted, ie not to WMC2005.

Vote: For 10, Against 6, Abstain 0: Accepted.

Action: S10 Editor to add to Chapter 4 new paragraph 4.4.2.

- j. Proposed by UK: That complaints about the physical mis-positioning of a scoring zone relative to a turnpoint will not be accepted unless it can be shown that the turnpoint is not inside the scoring zone.

Vote: For 15, Against 0, Abstain 1: Accepted.

Action: S10 Editor to add to Annex 6 new paragraph 6.3.5

- k. It was pointed out that the UK proposal agreed at the 2000 CIMA meeting: "That in championships, emergency parachute systems be excluded from the aircraft gross mass requirements" had yet to be included in S10.

Action: S10 Editor

11. EMC2004 - 2004 European Microlight Championships

Carlos Trigo, Competition Organiser, and Tomas Backman, Jury President, presented their reports on EMC2003. Many serious problems were identified, particularly with the PPG competition, which was not validated. In the Classic competition there were 14 protests in all, 6 upheld, 7 denied and 1 withdrawn.

The CIMA president explained that, as a response to the failed competition, the FAI had established a Board of Enquiry (Max Bishop, José Luis Esteban & Richard Meredith-Hardy) which had looked into the circumstances of the failure and made certain recommendations. Its report is attached as Annex 3.

Three UK proposals with regard to EMC2003 were then tabled.

a. Proposal 1

- i. That the FAI does not return any of the pre-championship deposit paid by the organizers of EMC 2004, and;
- ii. That on a one-off basis, and without setting a precedent, the entire deposit and sanction fee received by CIMA in respect of EMC 2004 is transferred to the French organizers of WMC 2005 and it is divided up by them as a pro-rata discount to the entry fee into WMC 2005 for all entrants who were also bona-fide entrants in the PF1 and PL1 classes at EMC 2004.

Vote: For 10, Against 1, Abstain 5: Accepted.

Action: CIMA Bureau to implement, subject to consultation with FAI HQ on the legal and practical aspects. Information to be included in final issue of WMC2005 Local Regulations.

b. Proposal 2

- i. That within 12 months of the completion of an FAI Category 1 championship the Organiser must submit to CIMA a set of detailed and audited accounts for the event in a format prescribed by CIMA, and;
- ii. That these accounts are made available by the CIMA bureau to successful bidders for future championships.

Vote: For 13, Against 0, Abstain 3: Accepted.

Action: by Future Competition Organisers.

c. Proposal 3

That two subcommittees of CIMA are established, one representing the 'classic classes' and one representing classes PF1, PL1, PL2 and the other 'para' and 'foot launched' classes, each to be responsible for all the rules in Section 10.

Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0: Accepted.

Action: Elections held later in the meeting

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

It was agreed that these two sub-committees should meet on the afternoon before CIMA meetings and that their remit also included the selection of championship venues and other items pertinent to their branch of the sport. The CIMA Bureau undertook to write 'terms of reference' for these sub-committees based on similar rules in FAI Section 7 (CIVL) & FAI Section 5 (IPC) to be presented for approval at the next CIMA meeting.

12. EMC2004 Board of Enquiry Recommendations

The recommendations A – H in the board of enquiry's report listed below were then discussed.

- A. CIMA should try to enforce the rule in Sporting Code, Section 10, Article 4.4., that requires preliminary bids for championships to be submitted 3 years in advance. This would allow site visits to take place before a decision on awarding the contest is made 2 years prior to the event.
- B. Two Sub-Committees should be formed within CIMA, one for PPG and one for Classic Classes. These sub-committees should be charged with developing rules and evaluating all bids to host international championships in their respective disciplines. The CIMA plenary should make decisions on the relevant Sporting Code content and on the allocation of championships exclusively on the basis of the sub-committees' recommendations.
- C. In order to ensure proper representation of the PPG community within CIMA, NACs should be asked when nominating CIMA delegates and alternates to specify the main area of expertise of the person(s) nominated. CIMA should urge NACs to nominate more people as delegates who have a PPG background.
- D. Since the operational requirements for each discipline are different, it should not in future be assumed that the Championships for all Classes must be held at the same place at the same time. Such a solution should not be entirely ruled out, but the preference should be retained of holding separate championships, at a different time and/or place.
- E. Whether or not the Classes are co-located, measures should be taken to ensure that the PPG event has equal status with the Classic event. When co-located, this might be achieved by having separate Directors of equal status, with an overall Coordinator, responsible for safe operations.
- F. CIMA should take steps to expand the pool of potential international PPG competition organisers, and to educate the PPG community in matters of Sporting Code.
- G. CIMA should, in future, have in place a timetable with key dates for achievement of essential requirements in competition planning. In the event that these are not fulfilled, an early decision to cancel should be made.
- H. Future International Jury members should be requested to review the content of this report so as to ensure that they fulfil their role as guarantors of the Sporting Code.

All the recommendations were accepted. B was the subject of UK proposal 3, which had been accepted. Richard Meredith-Hardy agreed to run a seminar, probably in the summer of 2005, in pursuance of F. Keith Negal agreed to produce a framework in pursuance of G.

13. WMC2005 - 2005 World Microlight Championships

Joel Amiable and Denise Lacote presented the local regulations for WMC2005, to be held at Levroux, near Chateauroux in France. Key details include:

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

- a. Schedule:
Training, aircraft inspection, registration: Tuesday 16 August 2005
Opening Ceremony: Saturday 20 August 2005
First Competition briefing: Sunday 21 August 2005 Contest
Flying Days: From Sunday 21 August to Saturday 27 August 2005
Closing Ceremony, Prize-giving: Sunday 28 August 2005
- b. Entry fees
Pilots €300
Co-pilot/Navigator €300
Team Leaders €150
Others Free
Entry fee deadline 30 June 2005
- c. Officials
Event Director Denise Lacote
Deputy Directors for Classic Classes Jean Pierre Pouleau
Rob Keene
Deputy Director for New Classes Richard Meredith-Hardy
Mike Campbell-Jones
Coordinator Joel Amiable

Some reservations were expressed about Mike Campbell-Jones following Portugal but it was agreed that he and RMH would make a good team.

The Stewards were then nominated by the organisers:

- Steward Classic Classes Jan Bem (Czech)
Jacek Kibinski (Poland)
Vote: For 14, Against 0, Abstain 2: Accepted.
- Stewards New Classes Roy Beisswenger (USA)
Another to be approved
Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0: Accepted.

The organisers undertook to find a second New Classes Steward subject to approval by the CIMA Bureau.

The jury and monitor election then took place:

- Jury President Tomas Backman (Sweden)
Jury Members Wolfgang Lintl (Germany)
René Verschueren (Belgium)
Monitor Keith Negal (UK)
Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0: Accepted.

- d. Other important information:
- i. Flight recorders will be required and will not be supplied by the organisers
 - ii. Provisional accounts will be submitted to the CIMA Bureau within 30 days of the close
 - iii. Formulas for Classic Classes will be inserted in Local Regulations by 31 December
 - iv. A minimum of 12 tasks will be flown by each class.
 - v. Maps for Classic Classes will be 1:200,000
 - vi. Maps for New Classes will be 1:100,000
 - vii. Maps will be as supplied on the CDs and also the Michelin map.
 - viii. CD including official maps will be provided to each nation and maps will be available on the web site.

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

- ix. Web site for the event will be open by 1 January
- x. The French Nationals will take place in Vichy 4-8 May.

14. Bids for 2006 Continental Championships

The following bids were received for Continental Championships in 2006:

- a. European Microlight Championships EMC 2006 Classic Classes
Host Nation: Germany
Organisers: DAeC & DULV
Venue: Nordlingen airfield 1384 ft, N 48 52.4 E 10 30.3
Entry fee: €350 – 400
Vote: For 14, Against 0, Abstain 2: Accepted.
Action: Keith Negal appointed Championship Monitor.
- b. European Microlight Championships EMC 2006 New Classes
Host Nation: Spain
Venue: Chozas de Abajo airfield near Leon, NW Spain
2723 ft N 42 30.167 W 005 40.500
Vote: For 14, Against 0, Abstain 2: Accepted.
Action: Richard Meredith-Hardy appointed Championship Monitor.
- c. Pan-American Microlight Championships AMC 2006 New Classes
Host Nation: USA
Venue: Greenville, Illinois
Vote: For 15, Against 0, Abstain 1: Accepted.
Action: Richard Meredith-Hardy & Dan Grunloh appointed Championship Monitors.
- d. Open Asian & Pacific Paramotor Championships 2006.
There is the possibility China could be persuaded to do this but it would depend on a very good 'last minute' presentation at the CIMA meeting next year.
In 2003 RMH was granted funding by CIMA to go to China to pursue this matter but it depended on Etushi Matsuo's contacts there. Etushi said he had had no contact with the Chinese in the last year but he would try again. CIMA resolved to continue the option of funding RMH to go to China if the circumstances looked favourable.
Action: Richard Meredith-Hardy & Etushi Matsuo

15. Bids for 2007 World Championships

Following the agreement to enforce the EMC2004 Board of Enquiry Recommendation A (above) preliminary bids were invited for 2007. Allocation will be made next year but in future allocations should be made 3 years in advance. The following preliminary bids were received for future Championships:

- e. World Microlight Championships WMC 2007 Classic Classes
 - i. Host Nation: Spain
 - Venue: Sotos airfield, Cuenca, between Madrid & Valencia
970 m N 40 12' 07" W 01 32' 53"
- f. World Microlight Championships WMC 2007 New Classes
 - i. Host Nation: Austria
 - ii. Host Nation: Poland
- g. World Microlight Championships WMC 2007 Classic & New Classes
 - i. Host Nation: Czech Republic
- h. European Microlight Championships WMC 2008 Classic & New Classes
 - i. Host Nation: France

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

These preliminary bids were noted
Action: CIMA Secretary – note in 2005 agenda.

16. World Games Kaohsiung Taiwan 2009

The possibility of Paramotors as a demonstration sport in this event was discussed? The contact was named as Roland Hilfiker (qv WAG 2001) who now has an important position in the World Games organization. In August 2005 the World Games will be held in Duisburg, Germany.

Action: Richard Meredith-Hardy

17. Colibri Diploma Award and Diamond Colibri Bids

- a. The Polish delegation submitted a paper [attached] proposing that the Colibri Diploma be awarded to Mr. Miroslaw Rodzewicz (Poland).
Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0: Awarded.

There were 2 late Diamond Colibri submissions. Papers were distributed at the beginning of the meeting describing their achievements and it was pointed out that late items can be included in the agenda following a vote with a 2/3 majority.

Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0.

- b. Zoltan Szabados, (Hungary) for flying 12,000 km through 10 EU Countries in a Virus microlight to mark the accession of Hungary into the EU.
Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0: Awarded.
- c. Matevz Lenarcic (Slovenia) for his epic flight from Slovenia to Canada in a Sinus microlight.
Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0: Awarded.

18. CIMA Budget

Tom Gunnarson, CIMA Secretary reported:

Opening Balance	CH20,461.08
Closing Balance	CH15,983.63
Protest Fees received	€350
Sanction Fee due	€3,000 estimated to be used for 2005 New Classes as agreed in item 11.a.2 above.

It was proposed that the 2004 Budget be adopted for 2005 and that the accounts should be copied & distributed in advance of future meetings.

Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0

Action: CIMA Secretary

19. Any Other Business

The following matters, including some proposals that had been omitted from their proper place in the agenda, were then dealt with:

- a. Web Site
It was agreed that the CIMA Secretary ensure that the web site is maintained.
Action: CIMA Secretary
- b. Ann Welch CIMA Award
The Working Group set up last year will continue and make a proposal to the next meeting as it now seems no other FAI commission with which she was associated will be preparing an award.
Action: Tormod Veiby, Carlos Trigo & Keith Negal

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

- c. International Database
No progress has been made on this project.
Action: CIMA Bureau
- d. Ranking system
Richard Meredith-Hardy said that he had done little on this since his proposals last year, mainly because the immediate need for it had gone away with the cancellation of the 2005 WAG. However, since the 'division' of 'para' classes & classics is now more visible he would consider splitting the COMPS ranking into two halves.
Action: Richard Meredith-Hardy, José Luis Esteban
- e. SIM Cards
Proposed by USA: That SIM cards rather than phones be sealed prior to flying a task.
Vote: For 1, Against 10, Abstain 5: Rejected.
- f. PDAs
The issue of small concealed GPS's talking to PDA's with moving maps via wireless technology was raised.
Action: CIMA Secretary – table for next year
- g. FAI Centennial
RMH gave a brief description of his and Brian Milton's efforts to get some 760 microlights into the Bagatelle in Paris for the centenary. Besides funding and so on, FFPIUM seemed to be rather unenthusiastic, the project had stalled and time was now so short there was little chance of reactivating it. It was proposed that Carlos Trigo continues coordinate microlighting's role in the FAI Centennial.
Vote: For 16, Against 0, Abstain 0
Action: Carlos Trigo to liaise with FAI Secretariat and Commissions
- h. Letter to New Classes Competitors in EMC2004
It was proposed a letter to all the pilots in the (invalid) PF1 & PL1 classes at EMC 2004 should be sent a letter to explain what had been done to reduce the possibility of a repeat of situation at EMC2004.
Vote: For 14, Against 0, Abstain 2: Accepted.
Action: CIMA Bureau

20. Election of Officers

CIMA President (Tormod Veiby – retiring)
Nominated and elected: Thomas Backman
No other nominations.

1st Vice President (Carlos Trigo)
Nominated: Richard Meredith-Hardy, Carlos Trigo
Elected: Richard Meredith-Hardy

2nd Vice President (Tomas Backman)
Nominated and elected: Carlos Trigo
No other nominations.

Secretary (Tom Gunnarson)
Nominated: Tom Gunnarson, Keith Negal
Elected: Keith Negal

President of Honour
After an enthusiastic vote of thanks from the meeting for his good work over many years Tormod Veiby was proposed as President of Honour.
Vote: Unanimous

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

New Classes Sub committee

Richard Meredith-Hardy (UK, President), Roy Beisswenger (USA), Helmut Stern (AUT), Johan Bossyut (BEL), Rene Verschuren (BEL), Joel Amiable (FRA), Etushi Matsuo (JPN), Jiri Koudela (CZE).

Vote: Unanimous

Classics classes Sub committee

Keith Negal (UK), Antonio Marchesi (ESP), José Luis Esteban (ESP), Jacek Kibinski (POL), Carlos Trigo (PRT), David Hempy (USA), Marton Ordody (HUN), Jan Bem (CZE).

Vote: Unanimous

S10 Sub committee

Richard Meredith-Hardy (UK, Editor), Tomas Backman (SWE), Carlos Trigo (PRT), José Luis Esteban (ESP)

Vote: Unanimous

CIMA delegate to FAI Aero-medical commission

Jan van der Helden (NED), Joel Amiable (FR)

Vote: Unanimous

CIMA delegate to FAI Amateur built aircraft commission

Carlos Trigo

Vote: Unanimous

CIMA delegate to FAI Aerospace education commission

No candidate. Post remains unfilled.

CIMA delegate to FAI Environmental commission

Marton Ordody (HUN), Jacek Kibinski (POL)

Vote: Unanimous

Flight Recorder Approval Committee (FRAC)

RMH (UK, President), José Luis Esteban (ESP), Joel Amiable (FRA), David Hempy (USA)

Vote: Unanimous

21. Next Meeting

10 - 12 Nov 2005 , Start time 9:00 am

Tomas Backman (President)

Keith Negal (Secretary)

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

Delegates

Annex 1

FAI Member Country	Delegate	Alternate Delegate	In Attendance	Notes
Present:				
Austria	Helmut Stern			
Belgium		Rene Verschueren	Johan Bossyut	
Czech Republic	Jan Bém		Jiri Koudela	
France		Joel Amiable	Denise Lacote	
Germany	Wolfgang Lintl			
Italy		Giulo Ottoviani		
Japan	Etushi Matsuo			
Netherlands	Jan van der Helden			
Poland	Jacek Kibinski			<i>Late arrival</i>
Portugal	Carlos Trigo			
Spain	Antonio Marchesi	José Luis Esteban		<i>Proxy from Venezuela</i>
Sweden	Tomas Backman			
Switzerland	Patrick Watermann		Hans Fritsche	
United Kingdom	Richard Meredith-Hardy	Keith Negal		
USA	David Hempy	Roy Beisswenger		
				Voting delegate =
Apologies:				
France	Jean-Paul Ruff			
Hungary	Marton Ordody			
Kenya	Alexis Peltier			
Venezuela	Pedro Gonzalez			<i>Proxy to Spain</i>

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

Delegate Reports

Annex 2

FAI Member Country	Numbers	Accidents	Notes
Austria	Paratrike pilots 60		PPL is required to fly 3-axis microlights. PPGs are now legal. Paratrikes fly mainly in neighbouring countries.
Belgium	<u>Members</u> Classic BMF 700 PPG FBPM 280 FBPM Pilots 90	Fatalities	1 One third of microlights are Weightshift. New medical introduced. 3 day national PPG championship in 2004. No regulations exist for PPGs.
Czech Republic	<u>Members</u> Total 5000 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 1700 Weightshift 560 PPG 280 Others 3000	Fatalities Investigated	3 27 The Czech Republic expressed in interest in organising WMC 2007
France	<u>Members</u> Total 10000 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 4000 Weightshift 3000 PPG 2000 Gyro 500 Balloon 2	Fatalities	28 25 fatalities since January 2004. Mostly human error, including many experienced pilots.
Germany	<u>Members</u> Total 5200 Instructors 1200 Schools 260 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 2600 Weightshift 1600 PPG 500 PHG 202 Gyros 10	Fatalities	10 All fatalities were 3-axis including experienced pilots.

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

FAI Member Country	Numbers	Accidents	Notes
Italy	Microlights 8000		Aeroclub d'Italia has a new constitution which should make it more active in international air sports. Only 7 FAI Sporting Licenses renewed in 2004. 11 Competitions in Nationals including 3 PPG in 2003. No National Championships in 2004.
Japan	<u>Pilots</u> Classic 962 PPG & PHG 1238 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 372 Weightshift 279 Paratrikes 107 PPG 1850 PHG 850		A difficult year with many typhoons. Microlights may now fly in a 9 km radius of origin airfield, a constraint that does not apply to the PPGs and PHGs.
Netherlands		Current rate PA	2-4 Microlight federation has joined with GA to form the "department of motorised flying" in the national aero club. Flying is now possible from green fields where previously only from 4 licensed airfields.
Norway	<u>Members</u> Total 800 Licences 450 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 285 Weightshift 95		No fatal accidents in 2003
Portugal	<u>Members</u> Licenses 886 Instructors 65 Schools 10 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 292 Weightshift 53	Fatal 2003 Fatal 2004 Reported 2004 Serious injury	5 0 4 1 11000 hours flown, 9 new clubs, trying to bring PPGs into national federation. EMC2004 held at Castello Branco
Spain	<u>Members</u> Pilots 5000 PPG licenses 600	Fatal 2003 Fatal 2004	8 3 Increasing number of fast 3-axis, reducing number of Weightshift. Many unlicensed PPGs. New PPG commission in the Aero Club. 2 National championships, all using flight recorders. The microFLAP software is working well.

FAI Microlight Commission Meeting 12th-13th November 2004

FAI Member Country	Numbers	Accidents	Notes
Sweden	<u>Members</u> Licences 610 Licenses GA 600 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 215 Weightshift 250 PPG Of which: Polaris 70 Amphibian 10	Reported	8 No injuries reported – mainly landing accidents
Switzerland	<u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 2	Reported	1 The project to introduce three axis microlight's on a similar basis to that of Germany has been shelved following a crash of one of the two microlights involved in the trial. Most Swiss microlight pilots fly outside the country.
UK	<u>Members</u> Total 4196 <u>Aircraft</u> 3-axis 3461 Weightshift 60% PPG 40% PHG <u>Licenses</u> New issues 478	Fatal accidents 4 Fatalities 7 Serious injuries 4	4 7 4 A very bad year, one mid-air between a flexwing and a helicopter, one a wing separation following a faulty modification, one crash in Pyrenees
USA			Introduction of Sport Pilot and Light Sport Aircraft standards are now being introduced but the requirements are quite onerous which means that FAR Part 103 will certainly continue and may increase. With so many organisations and a deregulated environment it is difficult to produce any meaningful statistics. 8 th Biannual National Championships held.

SYNOPSIS ON INVESTIGATION INTO THE EUROPEAN
MICROLIGHT CHAMPIONSHIP (NEW CLASSES) –
CASTELO BRANCO, PORTUGAL – 31 JULY – 7 AUGUST 2004

Investigating Panel:

Max Bishop, FAI Secretary General
José Luis-Esteban (Spain)
Richard Meredith-Hardy (UK)

Introduction

The 2004 European Microlight Championship (New Classes) at Castelo Branco, Portugal, ended with no valid results and no medal-winners. Entrants had paid 400 Euros each in entry fees, and teams had travelled great distances to participate. The International Jury's decision to invalidate the competition may mean that some national teams will lose sponsors and subsidies.

The purpose of this investigation was to identify what went wrong and why, and to recommend measures to ensure that such a failure cannot be repeated. The intention is not to apportion blame or identify culprits.

Aim

The aim of this report is to identify what measures need to be taken to ensure well-organised and successful international championships in the "Paraglider" microlight classes in future.

Analysis

Review of the evidence has revealed the following facts:

1. *A preliminary bid from Portugal to host the European Championship was presented to CIMA in November 2002. As there were no other bids, it was unanimously approved that the Portuguese organizers continue with a test competition in 2003.*

The test competition that took place in 2003 was not registered on the FAI International Sporting Calendar. It had 6 classic classes competitors and a small number of PF1's.

2. The Minutes of the CIMA meeting in 2003 record that the CIMA Bureau was unanimously given authority to approve the Local Regulations for the European Championship in Portugal, by 1 January 2004. Revised local regulations were approved on 22.01.04.

The CIMA meeting in 2003 appointed a 2004 European Championships Monitor, in fulfilment of Sporting Code Section 10, 4.4.1, which reads: *"At the time a bid is accepted CIMA shall nominate a monitor to ensure preparations are*

complete and on time. The monitor shall be a Jury member, Steward, or person with specialised knowledge of championships. The monitor shall be invited to visit the championship site approximately 6 weeks before the start of the event and any prior rehearsal competition held prior to the event." The members of the International Jury and Stewards were also chosen and approved unanimously at this CIMA meeting.

3. In March 2004, he and the person appointed as the Director of the "New" (Paraglider) Classes in Portugal conducted an on-site visit to Castelo Branco lasting, in total, 4 days. The Director submitted a report to CIMA that identified several problems, namely: excessive heat; strong winds every day; wild surrounding country with difficult out-landings, inadequate shade; slope and surrounds of proposed PPG strip unacceptable. He drew up a plan for an acceptable PPG take-off and landing area, and compiled detailed lists of the equipment required, and who should provide it. The Director claims he never received any reaction from the Portuguese organizers or from CIMA to his report.

4. The Monitor made a second visit to the site about a month before the event. At this stage, he found that no preparations had been made, neither in area for Classis classes nor in the New Classes area. He expressed his concerns to the Portuguese organizers, but was satisfied with their reassurances that work was about to start and would be completed in time.

5. On 14 July 2004, only 2 weeks before the contest was due to begin, the Portuguese organizers informed the PPG Competition Director that the take-off and landing area had been changed. The PPG Director reacted on 18 July, copying his response to CIMA officials. In this response to the Portuguese organizers, he stated that it was absolutely vital that PPGs be based on their flying field; and that the change of plan would cause a logistical nightmare and serious unrest amongst pilots (predictions which in the event proved justified). He also warned that there could be flight safety implications, for which he was reluctant to accept responsibility. There was no CIMA reaction to this message.

6. When the PPG Competition Director arrived, some 6 days before the start of the Championship, little had been prepared for the PPG classes, not even the takeoff and landing decks. All the preparations had to be completed, under difficult circumstances, at the last minute, despite the fact that the dimensions of the required space for PPG competition operations were clearly laid down in Sporting Code Section 10 Annex 3.

For the number of competitors, there should have been four, if not five decks, 2 x PF1, 1 x PL1, 1 x PL2 and preferably one exclusively for landing. In fact, there was barely even one deck.

7. It appeared to those involved in the PPG event that, although they were in a substantial majority, they were treated as "second-class citizens". The infrastructure, facilities and organization provided for the Classic Classes were of a significantly higher standard (although not free of problems). Many gained

the impression that PPG entry fees were being used to cross-subsidize the Classic Classes event.

8. A particular problem was the inadequate number of marshals for the PPG event. The classic classes had 17 full-time marshals and the new classes only 6.

9. Tasks were not adequately prepared before the competition. This added unnecessary extra stress to the director, marshals and competitors. There were many changes to tasks during the briefings.

10. The overall Competition Director was rarely present in the PPG operations area.

11. A decision, taken by the overall Competition Director and supported by the International Jury, was taken in mid-contest to replace the PPG Competition Director, on the grounds of his exhaustion. The competitors and PPG marshals did not support this decision.

12. Despite numerous oral complaints, none of which seems to have been made in a formal way, no written protests were made in the PPG classes in accordance with Sporting Code, General Section, Chapter 5. Therefore, the International Jury was never called upon to adjudicate formally on the state of affairs in the PPG Championship.

13. Several PPG pilots decided on one day to manifest their discontent by blocking the runway and airspace for the Classic Classes, thus delaying their task.

14. No official results were produced by the PPG classes at the end of the competition.

The International Jury did not verify and approve the Championship results and declare the event valid as required by G.S. 4.3.2.7.2.

15. No mention was made of the PPGs at the Closing Ceremony.

Comments

Analysis of the factual evidence described above reveals a series of factors that contributed to the failure of the competition – errors of omission and commission, inexperience or lack of competence (both on the part of officials and competitors), undelivered promises, inadequate monitoring and control, failure to implement the requirements of the Sporting Code and Organiser Agreement, and blurred lines of decision-making, amongst others.

However, everyone seems to have tried to act in good faith and it would serve no useful purpose to identify precisely who is responsible for which failing, since it is clear that we are dealing here with major institutional problems. The following **conclusions** can be drawn:

- The site at Castelo Branco was unsuitable for PPG operations, for reasons of weather and site facilities, amongst others. This fact was not apparent from the bid documents presented by the Portuguese delegation to CIMA, whose members were inexperienced in this form of microlight flying.
- The CIMA decision to go ahead with the Championship was taken in an unclear fashion, in three stages, without a formal evaluation of the site's suitability for all classes of microlight. The approval of Local Regulations was not handled in accordance with Sporting Code Section 10 , 4.6.1.
- The on-site visit by CIMA officials that took place in March 2004 correctly identified and predicted most of the major problems that subsequently arose. But the action taken to try and correct these problems was limited solely to messages sent by the PPG Competition Director to the Portuguese organisers, who failed to act on them.
- The PPG Director gave clear instructions as to how the PPG site was to be laid out. Two weeks before the planned start of the contest, he discovered that the organisers had decided to adopt another, unacceptable, lay-out. He informed CIMA of this. Other than a further, strongly-worded message from the PPG Director, no corrective action was taken at this stage, the last opportunity to cancel and prevent competitors from travelling to the contest.
- Once on site, the work-load imposed on a small number of organisers by the lack of preparedness of the site was unacceptably high.
- The contest was allowed to proceed by all involved despite the obvious unsuitability of the conditions. The operational requirements for Classic Class microlight championships and PPG championships are quite different, and in some respect incompatible. Few sites are sufficiently large and have adequate infrastructure and resources (including airspace) to enable both types of Championship to happen simultaneously.
- The number of PPG competitors in Portugal was for the first time considerably higher than the number of Classic Classes competitors. However, the Portuguese Competition Director, the Stewards and the International Jury members were all "Classic" pilots with very limited experience of PPG operations (although all had attended previous championships as officials and had the opportunity to observe what went on.) They did not enjoy the full confidence of the PPG competitors, as was shown by their reaction to the replacement of the PPG Competition Director.

- The PPG competitors were fully justified in feeling treated as “second-class citizens”.
However, they behaved inappropriately and demonstrated lack of familiarity with the Sporting Code by resorting to acts of “civil disobedience” (blocking of Classic classes runway), rather than making formal protests to the International Jury (none were received from the PPG classes).
The International Jury appeared to believe it had no options in its armoury other than to approve replacement of the Director, a move that proved counter-productive.
- Significant breaches of common courtesy occurred at the end of the competition, when no reference at all was made to the PPG competition by the Championship organizer. When the International Jury President attempted to remedy this by making a statement to the PPG community, he was whistled and booed off the stage.

Summary

The European Microlight Championship in the “New” Classes should not have been awarded to Castelo Branco in the first place (even though it was the only available bid). Once awarded, action should have been taken (either cancellation or fundamental remedial action) when the site’s shortcomings were revealed, even though this might have been very late. Unacceptable differences were evident between the treatment of Classic and New Classes. Some sites (and surrounding airspace) are not suitable for simultaneous championships in both Classic and PPG classes. Measures are needed to ensure the proper future international representation of the PPG community. Mature and experienced PPG competition organisers are in short supply, and action is needed to train more. All PPG competitors, and particularly Team Leaders, need to familiarise themselves with the contents of the Sporting Code, especially as regards the making of complaints and formal protests. Without appropriate complaints and protests, the International Jury as final quality assurance element of CIMA is not brought into action.

Recommendations

- A. CIMA should try to enforce the rule in Sporting Code, Section 10, Article 4.4., that requires preliminary bids for championships to be submitted 3 years in advance. This would allow site visits to take place before a decision on awarding the contest is made 2 years prior to the event.
- B. Two Sub-Committees should be formed within CIMA, one for PPG and one for Classic Classes. These sub-committees should be charged with developing rules and evaluating all bids to host international championships in their respective disciplines. The CIMA plenary should make decisions on the relevant Sporting Code content and on the allocation of championships exclusively on the basis of the sub-committees’ recommendations.

C. In order to ensure proper representation of the PPG community within CIMA, NACs should be asked when nominating CIMA delegates and alternates to specify the main area of expertise of the person(s) nominated. CIMA should urge NACs to nominate more people as delegates who have a PPG background.

D. Since the operational requirements for each discipline are different, it should not in future be assumed that the Championships for all Classes must be held at the same place at the same time. Such a solution should not be entirely ruled out, but the preference should be retained of holding separate championships, at a different time and/or place.

E. Whether or not the Classes are co-located, measures should be taken to ensure that the PPG event has equal status with the Classic event. When co-located, this might be achieved by having separate Directors of equal status, with an overall Coordinator, responsible for safe operations.

F. CIMA should take steps to expand the pool of potential international PPG competition organisers, and to educate the PPG community in matters of Sporting Code.

G. CIMA should, in future, have in place a timetable with key dates for achievement of essential requirements in competition planning. In the event that these are not fulfilled, an early decision to cancel should be made.

H. Future International Jury members should be requested to review the content of this report so as to ensure that they fulfil their role as guarantors of the Sporting Code.

The Investigating panel concluded their work by end of September 2004 as briefed.

The publication of the Synopsis has been delayed awaiting supplementary data and reports from the Organizer, some of which is still pending.

28.10.2004
Tormod Veiby
CIMA President