



To: Paap KOLAR
Cc: Kokk URMAS, President NAC Estonia
Cc: CIMA Bureau
Cc: FAI Secretariat

30 January 2013

Dear Paap

The current position with the bid from Estonia for the FAI European Paramotor Championships in 2013 is that the final presentation you were required to make to the 2012 CIMA Plenary as per Sporting Code Section 10 Annex 2.3 is still not complete. This is despite several extensions to the deadline set by the plenary, and then the Bureau on behalf of the plenary, and then the FAI Secretary General.

I am sorry to say that the time has now come where the CIMA Bureau has made its decision on behalf of the CIMA Plenary. It is now of the view that the nature of these delays constitute sufficient evidence to suggest the championships will not be a success and therefore **withdraws its sanction for the FAI European Paramotor Championships 2013 with immediate effect.**

The primary reason is because you have consistently failed to comply with the FAI Sporting code, or have even made much constructive effort to. FAI Secretariat has received no signed Organiser Agreement, no deposit has been paid, there are no valid local regulations or task catalogue, all the various deadlines have been ignored.

For CIMA to give its sanction the organizer agreement must be signed and rules must conform to the agreed model. You and your NAC have been told this many times by the Bureau and other CIMA delegates and FAI Secretariat, yet there has been no significant change in your position since the plenary voted not to authorize the draft it was given more than two months ago. With less than four months to go, prospective competitors must have firm understanding of the rules of the competition in time to prepare for the event, but despite extensive correspondence there is no evidence that you will ever agree to use the rules which are required for CIMA to give its sanction.

In your letter of 21 January 2013 to the FAI Secretary General you make the point that your approach may be considered '*too innovative and ahead of its time*'. In reply I say the Plenary is not adverse to innovation, you only have to look at the other two FAI Category 1 paramotor events sanctioned at the 2012 plenary to see quite radical innovation in action, but with many hundreds of years of combined experience the Plenary is also very wise and prefers to be consulted rather than insulted which is mostly a simple matter of presenting your proposals in time for delegates to study and discuss them.

In essence, a successful championships all comes down to its preparation. You have failed to deliver your organizer agreement or your draft LR or TC in time for any of the multiple deadlines you have been given, and furthermore, we have seen no evidence that you or your NAC have been making any other significant

Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale

preparations for the event. The website seems to contain none of the usual (and necessary) information which would be expected this close to the event - in fact, there appears to be very little evidence at all of the *'months and years of work'* that has been claimed.

CIMA has now withdrawn its sanction from this event but it welcomes innovative proposals in future and I dare say delegates will study them with interest when they arrive. All you have to do is prepare them in good time.

For the record, this is the CIMA Bureau's account of events leading up to this decision:

Organizer agreement

- Sporting Code Section 10 Annex 2 para 3.3.3.1 states that the Organiser Agreement must be returned to the FAI Secretariat by the time of the CIMA Plenary immediately before the Championship.
- The CIMA President did advise you a year or more ago of this requirement, but did say that a new OA was being prepared by FAI Secretariat which would almost certainly be easier to understand, and recommended to wait for it.
- ASC presidents were advised at their May 2012 meeting that it was intended for the new OA to be ready for General Conference approval in October 2012.
- However, by July 2012 it became apparent that the job was more complex than expected and this would not happen. You were therefore informed that the only available OA text would be the standard one you were originally sent on 13 April 2012.
- In September 2012 various details of that OA were discussed in a long Skype meeting between you, the CIMA President and the FAI Senior Sports Manager. Included was your agreement that it would be done in time for the Plenary in November.
- Contrary to CIMA rules and expectation, and despite reminders, no OA was forthcoming either before or at the Plenary 9-10 November 2012.
- It was explained to you at the plenary, again, that this same agreement has been signed hundreds of times by every FAI championship organizer for years; it may be difficult to understand, hence the on-going initiative to re-do it, but there are no secret tricks hidden within it, and this was confirmed by several delegates who had personally signed it in previous events.
- The Plenary gave you a deadline extension until 15 December 2012 to provide it.
- There followed a protracted series of correspondence with FAI Secretariat about the content of the OA. This was characterized by your repeated misrepresentations of what had been agreed, and at least one attempt to alter the standard text without agreement.
- In any case no signed OA was received by the deadline of 15 Dec 2012 as you had agreed in the Plenary to do.
- You tried to excuse this deficiency by trying to make the OA dependent on a LR and TC. Sporting Code Section 10 Annex 2 para 3.3.1 makes it perfectly clear that the OA is completely independent of the competition rules which will be used in the event, and this has been confirmed by FAI Secretariat on multiple occasions.
- It eventually ended with FAI Secretariat sending you an amended 'agreed' version on 18 Dec 2012 with only one rather small agreed change from the standard text. FAI Secretariat also advised you of a new deadline of 15 January 2013 for it to be signed by your NAC and returned to Lausanne.
- You made claims that the Agreement was signed. But none was received by FAI Secretariat.
- FAI Secretary General sent you a letter on 16 January 2013 reminding you and your NAC of this third failure to meet a deadline.
- FAI Secretary General again sent you and your NAC a letter dated 23 January 2013 noting that still no signed OA had been received.
- As of the date of this letter no signed OA had been received by FAI Secretariat.

Local Regulations and Task Catalogue

- Section 10 para 4.8.1 states very clearly the form in which the Local Regulations must be submitted to CIMA for approval. This is very easy to do because CIMA provides a model text in S10 Annexes 3 & 4 which only need the addition of key details like name, location, date, officials Etc. for it to become a fully functioning set of championship rules.
- On a number of occasions very far in advance of the 2012 Plenary you were also advised that if you wanted to include something different to the model in your Local Regulations or Task Catalogue then the plenary must authorize it, and, being complex documents considered in a multi-lingual forum of representatives, they would need good advance warning so they could understand it and consult their constituents as necessary.
- You chose instead to publish your local Regulations very early in the morning immediately before the first plenary meetings, at a time when delegates were either sleeping or travelling and had little or no opportunity to study it, and certainly had no possible opportunity to consult the pilots they represent.
- And it wasn't exactly as if the document you presented was even 'similar' to the model. It was completely different, in content, layout and numbering, and no clue to differences from the model was provided.
- In the short time available, some differences were identified and discussed at the paramotor sub-committee meeting and these were voted upon at the subsequent main plenary meeting:
 - 6.2*Pilots and machines are weighed before and after economy flights in order to measure the weight of fuel used....* An alternative procedure was proposed and accepted which did NOT include weighing the pilot.
 - 6.3 Bodyweight index; This handicapping scheme was NOT accepted.
- The nature of the changes you were appearing to propose in the Local regulations suggested there might be significant changes to the task catalogue too, but you were unable to present anything to the Paramotor sub-committee, or to the plenary at the appointed time. The plenary had to give you an extension until the following day to produce it, which you did only a handful of minutes before the delayed agenda item was called.
- Some content of the Task Catalogue was nevertheless discussed by the Plenary, and the plenary gave the instruction that the Fastest Take Off task should be deleted.
- The plenary had therefore given three specific instructions, but when it came to a vote to approve the rest of the LR and TC, the vote failed.
- Despite your subsequent remarks, there is no substance to your claim that this vote was not conducted in an entirely democratic and proper constitutional manner. It seems far more likely the result of this vote was primarily caused by your totally inadequate preparation which gave delegates the choice of approving documents they hadn't read, or deferring the decision to a later date for the Bureau to make on their behalf.
- The plenary agreed the LR and TC should be re-presented to the CIMA Bureau, obviously incorporating all the amendments it had agreed, and others as directed by the CIMA Bureau, with a view to a final version being agreed by 15 Dec 2012.
- You were aware that the Bureau took the view that since there cannot possibly be a championship without an OA, there was no point in discussing LR without a signed OA being in place first.
- On 16 Dec 2012 you posted a draft 2 on the wiki. These appear to be essentially the same documents as the draft 1. They did not incorporate the changes instructed by the plenary and did not include any indication of differences to the agreed model.
- On 17 Dec 2012 a Bureau member wrote to you: *"A few years back it was decided that only the additions or deletions had to be sent to CIMA for approval. This would take one or two pages of text. Alternatively, you could do as it's been done in 2012 and 2011: the whole text was presented with additions highlighted. Could you please proceed one of those ways?"*
- Whilst I can find no particular reply to this reasonable request, on 8 Jan 2013 you posted a version 3 of the LR on the wiki which claimed to have 'changes highlighted'.

- It still did not incorporate those changes instructed by the Plenary, and did not include a revised Task Catalogue. On closer scrutiny, what the so-called 'highlighted changes' in the proposed LR are changes from was impossible to understand because the entire document is nothing like the agreed model and the alleged changes appeared to be rather random; some are not changes from model text at all, some non-highlighted text is completely new, and there are many deletions which are not shown. This was explained in detail in the CIMA President's email of 15 Jan 2013, but no attempt by you or your advisor to explain or make a remedy has been seen.
- The action plan proposed by the FAI Secretary general in his letter of 16 January 2013, item 1, stated: "1. *The Organiser provides the CIMA Bureau with a draft version of the Local Regulations and Task Catalogue, based on the model document and with a separate document listing any changes from the model – as per Section 10 para 4.8. Deadline: 23:59 CET 21 January.*"
- Your only response, on 21 January 2013, seems to be to say: "we feel that we have already achieved the first step, the latest draft dated Jan 8th." But it is absolutely clear that it does not achieve the first step, the many reasons why were already explained in CIMA President's email of 15 Jan 2013.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard Meredith-Hardy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Richard Meredith-Hardy
President
FAI Microlight & Paramotor Commission