

# **UK Proposals for inclusion in the agenda of the CIMA plenary 2004**

By Richard Meredith-Hardy, Delegate, 14 September 2004 Version 1.4

## **Notes**

This document is permanently available at <http://www.flymicro.com/cima04>

A request for emergency resolution was sent 14 September 2004 to the CIMA Bureau:  
**"FAI must NOT return any of the pre-championship deposit paid by the organizer of EMC2004 until this has been discussed at the CIMA meeting."**

## ***Proposal 1 EMC 2004***

**Proposal 1a: FAI does not return any of the pre-championship deposit paid by the organizers of EMC 2004.**

The organizers of EMC2004 must have signed the FAI organizer agreement that obliges them to pay a deposit by a certain date before the championship starts and the sanction fee no later than 30 days after the start of the championship.

Because some classes were declared invalid, within the terms of the FAI organizer agreement FAI is completely within its rights to refuse to return any of the deposit.

**Proposal 1b: "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."**

As we understand it, whilst CIMA is not very rich, it probably has enough funds to be in the position to refund all of the deposit and sanction fees it received in respect of EMC2004 to competitors who were at EMC2004 in the PPG & PL1 classes (there was not a quorum in PL2). Whilst this could be done immediately, it would be a difficult thing to actually achieve because some people paid their entry fees as individuals whilst others were paid by their National Organization Etc. This proposed method offers tangible support by CIMA to the competitors competing in PF1 & PL1 at EMC2004 whilst at the same time encouraging those same pilots to strive to join their National teams and compete at WMC2005.

**Proposal 1c: "The organizer of EMC 2004 must present a audited set of detailed accounts to FAI ".**

There has been some concern as to what the 30,000 or so Euros received in entry fees from the competitors in the PPG/PL1/PL2 classes was spent on.

## ***Proposal 2 Accountability***

**Proposal 2a: Within 12 months of the completion of an FAI Cat. 1 championship the Organiser must submit to CIMA a set of detailed and audited accounts for the event in a format prescribed by CIMA.**

The purpose of this is two-fold. First, to create a certain transparency in the way championships are run which is rather lacking at the moment, especially as regards competitor's entry fees. Second, to assist future championship organizers with valuable information when setting up their own organizations. 'The proscribed format' is so a set of accounts from one year to the next are reasonably comparable.

**Proposal 2b: That these accounts are made available by the CIMA Bureau to successful bidders for subsequent championships.**

### ***Proposal 3 Representation***

**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 affecting those classes and the selection of championship venues, dates and officials at those championships.**

Note that this is a proposed change in CIMA to something rather like what has existed in CIVL for some years.

### ***Proposal 4 Paramotors***

**That the phrase "Powered Paraglider" in all CIMA & FAI documentation and terminology be changed to "Paramotor", "Paramoteur" in French.**

Besides the fact that these aircraft are usually called Paramotors, it is more and more common to have wings on these aircraft specially designed for the purpose, as time goes by they are less and less "Powered Paragliders" and increasingly something unique in their own right. More than anything though, the reason for this proposed change is symbolic and tries to create tangible evidence that CIMA as a whole is making an effort to create a 'new beginning' in their management of these classes of aircraft.

### ***Proposal 5 Qualifications***

**A new provision regarding the qualification of competition directors similar to that presented below should be added to Section 10, possibly as paragraph 4.4.2 Although it should come into force immediately, it should not apply to bids already accepted (ie WMC 2006)**

Where the candidate competition director for a Cat. 1 championship has not previously organised a successful FAI Cat 1 microlight championship he/she must as a minimum:

- (1) have flown as a competitor in an FAI Cat. 1 championship, and;
- (2) 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.