

To: FAI Secretary General, Jean-Marc Badan
CC: FAI Cima Bureau, FAI Senior Sports Manager, NAC Estonia,
FAI Cima Delegates list, FAI Cima information list, CIMA Wiki

Date: 21 January 2013

Dear Mr Badan.

Thank you for your reply.

We are very pleased to see that you agree with us that signing the Organiser's Agreement can be done as the final step, once the Local Regulations and Task Catalogue have been discussed and approved as acceptable to all parties.

We have been arguing this point with the Bureau since the Plenary, but sadly two whole months have been wasted, when instead, we should have been concentrating on debating the elements of our LR and TC that are perceived to be controversial.

We are also very grateful to see that the FAI is still keen to see Estonia host EPC2013.

However, you did not comment on our suggestion to have the CIMA Delegates resolve the matter and decide themselves on the fate of this event by the way of a postal/email vote.

Unfortunately we cannot agree with all the points in your letter, but **you can be assured that all our decisions and intentions are in accordance with the spirit laid out within the FAI Sporting Code.**

In your letter you are quite rightly spelling out why it is important for FAI and its Commissions to have rules and procedures. The problem is that Cima's internal regulations are very restrictive and not at all conducive to the progress or evolution of paramotoring competitions. Most National Opens do not use Cima rules and have been able to evolve successfully unhindered.

The current format used to submit proposals to amend Section 10 is quite flawed and cumbersome. You only have to look at the archives from the last 10 years to see how most proposals were criticised, rejected outright or not supported by the Section 10 Sub Committee, most of the time for the form or specific words used, rather the content or the spirit behind the proposals.

There are other FAI Commissions such as the CIVL who use much friendlier procedures to make sure they evolve alongside the sport itself.

There is also total inconsistency in the way the Bureau uses its own rules. Rules are quoted when it suits, but ignored when it does not.

For example:

- FR loggers and their approval. The Amod is the logger of choice since 2009 in CIMA events despite a lack of approval, in contradiction with Section 10.
- There was a World League Cup in 2012 with a FAI diploma awarded to the winner. In order to get it started and to promote the concept which was deemed to be good and desirable for the sport, the Bureau decided to break most of its own rules that were put in place.
- Last year the Autogyro class got validated at the WMC2012 just before the event, probably with good intentions in order to promote that new class but nevertheless in contradiction with Section 10. This resulted in the Team prize being won before the event even started, completely devaluing the Gold medal on offer.
- At WPC2009 in Czech Republic, the most of the tasks and the associated procedures were different from the approved Local Regulations. There was a comprehensive summary in the feedback report from one of the Gold medalists at the time: www.tinyurl.com/wpc09feedback

This list can go on.

Our LR and TC are a quite modest attempt to improve the sporting element of paramoring competition and to contribute to the development of our wonderful sport.

Mr Badan, regarding your 3-step "rescue plan", we feel that we have already achieved the first step, the latest draft dated Jan 8th.

Our intentions have been very clear from the start, as described in plain english in our Local Regulations. Some members of the Bureau have complained that we are not using the right ink colour, numbering or format to show the deviation from the model LR template, but this is not very different to the way previous Organisers of CIMA Category 1 events did theirs, with approval by the Bureau and Plenary.

The reason why our Local Regulations may appear to be quite different is because the fuel weighing procedures we are proposing and the bodyweight index are affecting a lot of the standard procedures, including all the economy tasks that have had to be modified.

At the Plenary, exactly half the Delegates voted in favour of our LR and TC (12 out of 24). Only one Delegate voted against. Eleven Delegates abstained, some of them saying that they were unsure about the new rules on offer, or had not enough time to study them in details.

This is the reason why the Bureau was tasked to study the LR and TC to negotiate possible changes with the Organisers and to decide on behalf of the Delegates whether to accept them or not, by 15 December, but sadly for the last two months, the real issues have not been debated, which have nothing to do with formal qualities of the LR or signing the OA.

We are therefore very puzzled as to why the Bureau is now saying that they cannot support anything the Plenary did not agree on in the first place!!

At the heart of the matter, what really has to be discussed is TASK PHILOSOPHY, as this is what appears to be dividing opinions, even when within the full spirit of the FAI Sporting Code:

- We are proposing a better, safer, quicker and legal fuelling method, that has been well proven for 7 years.
- We are proposing a fairer approach to economy tasks by leveling the playing field, by scoring the pilots' performance in proportion to their bodyweight, again well proven for 7 years and in several countries. (Fairness as defined in FAI Sporting Code: Introduction, Chapter 1.1 Principles).
- We are proposing to have the option of setting some Team-only slalom tasks, a concept that has already been accepted by Cima for the 2013 World Paramotor Slalom Championships.

Those are the 3 main items that appear to be a problem for some of the Bureau members. We feel very strongly about the first two, which do come together, and this is the only way we are able and willing to run the economy tasks in our event. We are very keen with the third one which we know will be popular with pilots and Teams but we are prepared to drop it if it makes a difference, despite the fact that this concept is already approved by the Plenary for WPSC 2013.

Mr Badan, regarding your second step, we suggest that the Bureau either accept our task philosophy or reject it. If they accept it then we will endeavour to redraft the LR into any acceptable format to them by return and proceed to step 3.

If either the Bureau or the Delegates find that they cannot accept our task philosophy, then we shall all know where we stand, there will be no step 3 and we will reluctantly but gracefully respect the Cima Bureau's decision to cancel EPC2013 as a FAI Cat 1 event.

In case our approach is considered too innovative and ahead of its time, we are prepared to be patient and remain on hold for the further developments in CIMA and possibly to return in the future with another bid, maybe even a World Championships.

We have done a huge job in preparation for this event and we have invested a lot of time and money in the past few years which will not be put to waste. We are ready to reconsider our plans and switch to a category 2 event this year if need be, which would become our 3rd test event but also a leg of the World Paramotor League Cup, as well as the Baltic Sea Open Paramotor Championships 2013 and the 2013 Estonian Open Paramotor Championships.

We are satisfied that Estonia has embarked on this journey in a responsible and constructive manner, despite the tedious negotiating, the uncertainty, the criticism and the lack of respect from some CIMA officials.

- Our staff have necessary qualifications, most of them are active competing pilots and experienced Organisers.
- The Competition Director has competed in the last three FAI Category 1 events.
- We have organised successful EPC test events for the last two years.
- We have sent a 6-man delegation to WPC2012 to learn from the Spanish organisers, to listen to the feedback from the pilots and thus increase our experience.
- Since our initial bid, we have organised open meetings for pilots, teamleaders and anyone else involved in 2009 and 2012, and we have studied the ways several European countries are running their National Opens.
- All the content of our Local Regulations and Task Catalogue have been used successfully in many National Opens and other FAI events.

We would still urge the Delegates, or the Bureau on their behalf, to give Estonia a chance to deliver a great championships of the highest sporting quality to the European pilots and nations, who we know are supporting us in great numbers.

Attachments:

Proposal to the FAI Secretary General, 8 Jan 2013:

<http://wiki.fai.org/download/attachments/15434427/Proposal+from+EPC2013+Organisers.pdf>

Answer from the FAI Secretary General, 16 Jan 2013:

http://epc2013.eppa.ee/letter_to_paap_kolar_epc2013_16.1.13.pdf

EPC2013 Local Regulations, Draft 3:

http://wiki.fai.org/download/attachments/15434427/EPC2013_LOCAL_REGULATIONS_draft3%20colored.pdf

EPC Task Catalogue, Draft 2:

http://wiki.fai.org/download/attachments/12386360/EPC2013_Task_Catalogue_draft2.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1352535132003

With best regards,

Paap Kolar
EPC 2013 Head of the Organising Committee
EPC 2013 Competition Director
FAI CIMA Delegate for Estonia
EPPA Member of the board

Skype: p4kop4ko

+372 5051015

paap@paap.ee