



# Microlight Sub- Committee Minutes

20<sup>th</sup> February – CZ – LAA building 1400 - 1830

## Attendees:

Jiri Krajca CZE alt. delegate, chairman

Yago Osset ESP alt. delegate

Laurent Rapiteau FRA alt. delegate

Owain Johns GBR delegate

Michael Kania GER delegate

Nikolaos Makrasis GRE delegate

Krisztian Dolhai HUN delegate, bureau member

Mate Dobo HUN alt. delegate

Rytis Pauliulis LTU deltegate

Tormod Veiby NOR delegate

Lukasz Halasa POL alt. delegate

Endre Molnar ROU delegate

Hans Palsson SWE delegate

Yuriy Yakovlyev UKR delegate

Tom Gunnarson USA observer, cima treasurer

## Proxies:

From ICE to NOR

From CYP to GRE

From SUI to GER

Chairmans opening address – JK – good to see such a good number, apologies re the smaller venue but pleased to see so many attending.

JK shared and read Rob Hughes email, expressed disappointment on this news and asked OJ to comment

OJ - To clarify not ‘sacked’ not an appropriate phrase and felt this was not the forum to discuss further as a UK team / BMAA matter

<p>Owain Johns – presentation on WMC2024</p>	<p>Talked through the WMC2024 event, explained that a number of the proposal’s picked up learning from the event. JK raised the difference from a successful Grande Open and a number of his pilots felt a difference from the two events, JK event monitor. JK did not attend as family commitments. But feedback based upon what received from other teammates.</p>	
<p>Yago</p>	<p><b>3. ‘Airports challenge’ ASC now published</b></p> <p>Different format to classic classes Landing tasks – inc abnormal landing etc Complimentary landing tasks with dedicated high tech landing scoring Train, train, train to prepare for these – the tech is driving the tasks</p> <p><b>ASC – link to documents – needed - where is this published</b></p> <p><b>4. ‘Super logger’ – Blackbird</b> Data sheet needed shared, dedicated solution Constant transmission – AV/audio</p> <p>Technology – adapted to the technology, rules are adapted to the tech, rather than the current ‘Classic classes’ Totally different to Classic classes in principle</p> <p><b>5. official software for software for microlight competitions</b></p> <p>Chance to have a unique software, live tracking Background - Now it time to support this and get behind it – Yago worked with Frank Olaf who are the creators of airports. Works with superloggers, live trackers, phones,</p> <p>Currently does not work with ‘Classic Classes’ tasks</p> <p>Frank has analysed the classic classes and how it fits in with the airports tasks.</p>	<p>Action to circulate evaluation document, produced by Frank Olaf of classic classes evaluation</p>

	<p>We need it, cost 3 months – 23.000 euros development time to progress. .  Speak to the GAC commission, speak to the Norwegian delegate and the GAC commission, transfer proposal to make a unique software.</p> <p>Wolfgang - thank you – 5k budget allocated, to use and invest in the development of sport. Needs to get accepted by other commissions and FAI.  Kristian - there are other countries, who have systems</p> <p>Yago, need to get out of the mousewheel, if we need to grow the sport.</p> <p>Already used in CAT 1 comps – in ANR, and ASC and has been proved.</p> <p>Laurant - Accurate scoring on time, important that when provisional is accurate, there is a delay function.</p> <p>JK – when will it be ready,  WL – there will be a CAT1 event – which will run the ASC, and give us some live testing.</p> <p>Polish viewpoint – if we select this partnership, then we know that it is sustainable and we can continue to develop it. SLA's needed</p> <p>Jago – we need to think that every time we develop a new task, we need to think about how it is scored</p> <p>WL – we have consistency with tasks – we have one new task in the last 10 years.</p> <p>ASC / ANR</p> <p>Yago to maintain and do we need a unique software, and maintain the system</p> <p>MK – how can it be maintained during the competition because its based upon internet at all times. – dependent upon constant internet, This is a possible issue.</p> <p>POL - We would need to agree a service contract and a SLA – specified on this.</p> <p>Kristian – we need to vote on the budget.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>OJ - managing bigger numbers, scalability - could we use WMC2025 to piggy back off, could this be an opportunity to test, prove further. – when is the next classic Class event?</p> <p>Yago – I would not wait - another year,</p> <p>LR - there is no rush, we have WMC2025 and nothing after</p> <p>WL – there is – scoring is the perennial problem and needs to be resolved</p> <p>There is a need to adapt the new software to the classic classes.</p> <p>Yuri – why not develop the existing systems – we can only test when competing.</p> <p>Yago – only live tracking system, its necessary for the future of airports</p> <p>Potential CAT 2 event to run an ASC to experiment – ESP an ASC event in the future.</p> <p>Pol – making it more appealing to a younger audience.</p> <p>MK – I’d encourage to support this.</p> <p>LR – French system could be shared, free, we have it.</p> <p>JK – we’re in a mouse cage, we have a budget, we should invest it, there is a CIMA budget, we’re growing up our reserve, this is an opportunity to move it to another level.</p> <p>WL – in general, we agree to proceed, based upon CC proposal to invest a sum, we task the next Bureau to get answers for the next, timeline, clarified by end of April, virtual CIMA plenary to make final decision, whole plenary decision, chance to step forward to make a decision.</p> <p>Lukas – create an agreement with Frank to create an SLA - vital</p> <p>WL – clarified we have to April is to raise the Questions</p> <p><b>Now we vote to start this process, Voted 16 for None against Accepted</b></p> <p>Thank you – a milestone !</p> <p>LTU – who will manage the process, - answer the next bureau and a working group.</p>	
--	--	--

PROPOSALS		
1- Abnormal Landings for Microlights	<p>Does not have to be used on every task – it needs to be added to fit in with ASC, mainly for ASC. Annex 4 – <b>surely for ASC</b> not CC (classic comps) In section 10 not task catalogue What is horizontal Not doing a crazy landing Doing a nice clean landing What is abnormal? The configuration Delete the line?? ASC – annex 9 It needs to be specified – e.g backtrack, abnormal is to vague and subjective It needs to be specified for ASC How do you check, you need to specify to be able to measure it – this would be open to interpretation. WG – is there any chance to change the proposal, changes made if not we vote on it</p> <p><b>Proposal 1 amendments</b> <b>New text to add</b></p> <p><b>Section 10 – 4.24.10 ABNORMAL LANDINGS</b></p> <p><b>Abnormal landings in all four types of landing are defined for ASC thus:</b> - <b>Nose wheel not off the ground / touching the ground before the main wheel.</b> - <b>Any part of the aircraft other than the wheels or skid touching the ground.</b> - <b>Touchdown with locked or braked wheels.</b> - <b>One or both main wheels leave the ground, while nose wheel remains on it.</b></p> <p>Vote for 16 – for None against – accepted</p>	
2 - Start of a task for Microlights	16 for None against – accepted	
3 – Location of Photos in Microlight tasks	<p>For change – 1000m too much = 4mm Laurant – 1250m proposed Polish - 500m 4mm – 1000m</p> <p>Voted 9 for – accepted</p>	
4 – Use of scoring and results publishing software	<p>LTU – justify related to items earlier in the meeting – items 4,5 LR (french ) the next morning when we wake up,</p>	

	<p>This aspirational view is that this could be possible with the best scoring Yago – provisional scoring is an option LR - upon provisional and 6 hours counting</p> <p>WL – could this be withdrawn and taken back to next meeting, taken into account the earlier decisions on scoring led by Yago.</p> <p>WITHDRAWN</p>	
5	Paramotor	
6 – Review on Complaint Scope	<p>Changed the wording – any matter – may – it covers of everything, Lucas – spot landing – staying silent, and leave the score LR - official camera</p> <p>WITHDRAWN</p>	
7 – Complaints	Voted 16 for – accepted	
8	Paramotor	
9 – Complaint change	<p>Proposal 9 amendments</p> <p><b>New text</b> <b>Section 10, 4.35.4</b></p> <p><b>The director cannot change his response after he has already issued a response to the complaint published on the official notice board.</b></p> <p>1 abstain 15 for - accepted</p>	
10 – Maximum amount of fuel for limited fuel tasks	<p>Changed wording challenge – full capability – UKR agreed</p> <p>Proposal 10 amendments</p> <p><b>New text</b> <b>Section 10, 5.4.1</b></p> <p><b>The maximum amount of fuel, which may be carried for records, is stated in S10 Chapter 3. Fuel shall be measured by mass, or volume. For Championships, the maximum amount of fuel permitted for limited fuel consumption tasks is 15 kg for aircraft flown solo and 22 kg for aircraft flown with two people, or the equivalent in litres, although lesser amounts may be stated at briefing. When designing the task, the competition director must ensure that the task is large enough to challenge all the aircraft and all the competitors' capabilities.</b></p>	

	Voted 15 for – 1 abstain, accepted	
11 – Start, finishing and Turning Points	Gates / turn points discussion 16 for – TO gates  <b>New text</b>  <b>[additional text]: 5.6.8 Gates shall be perpendicular to the inbound track.</b>  Voted 16 for – accepted	
12 – Maximum amount of fuel for limited fuel tasks	Voted 16 for – accepted	
13 – Ground feature description	Administrative - ok  Voted 16 for – accepted	
14 – Photos	Photos – WL - 10 + 10  Proposal 14 amendments  <b>New text</b> <b>[additional text]:</b> <b>The maximum number of photos to identify during one task must not exceed 10 per A4 page and one page should only cover a defined part of the task. This limit does not include features SP, TP, FP.</b> <b>The maximum number of photos to identify during one task must not exceed 20.</b>  Voted 16 for - accepted	
15 – Circle task for microlights	Circle - altitude - increase tolerance  Voted 9 in favour – 6 against – 1 abs - accepted	
16 – Circle task for microlights	Circle - null and void because of decision on 15  WITHDRAWN	
17 – Removal of Split Square task for microlights	Administrative - please remove	
18 – Engine stop or idle procedure	Voted 16 for – accepted	
19 – Spot landing task for Microlights C1	Braking – challenge proving to 125 Why should we call it a deck Organiser can decide to stop or decide in the deck – NO Fuel task – free landing Stall speed – is defined - they are microlights Deck stays in  3 in favour	

	11 not in favour – not accepted	
20 - Spot landing task for Microlights C2	WITHDRAWN	
21 - Powered Precision Landing task for Microlights C3	WITHDRAWN	
22 - Powered Precision Landing – timed - task for Microlights C4	WITHDRAWN	
23 - Removal of Deck Landing task for Microlights C6	No score – no deck free landing Voted 16 in favour - accepted	
24	Bowling paramotor	
25	Paramotor	
26	Paramotor	
27	Paramotor	

French – presentation WMC2025 - Laurant - needs to share slides on WIKI

Location same as slides from last year – easy to reach, nice place to be.  
main buildings

Chief Marshall to be decided

20 marshals is target

Event director – logistics – manager

Location talk through, Separate quarantine and parking – only move to quarantine for the task – avoid confusion

Rigging area, trailer area – parking area

Check point for phone Quarantine

Don't cross the tarmac – to the south,

Late take off – quarantine – moving to the aircraft, possible to keep the aircraft in quarantine, two sets of screws etc

Parking area, safety of machine – will need two sets of tie downs

Red area to the North of the airfield – all movements to the North – all commercial to south – similar leave and arrival routes to deenethorpe for separation

External visitors should land on the hard,

ACOL software to be used – possible demonstration

Flymasters to be used – primary included in the fee – and provided, if secondary flymaster, if AMOD – declare can be secondary, if issue with primary you must provide the secondary logger,



give secondary. All loggers that are categorised. Must be approved in any other commission – same problem on loggers.

Have modelled based upon the deenethorpe tasks and the results – and proved it to work, no excel files, all live.

Scores will be only available for each team

600 euro entry fee

1.250 scale map

Open in May – from 5- 11<sup>th</sup> May

3 machines per country allowed – max 20 registered – you can then pick more as back up

Emails –

### **AOB**

CIMA bureau – has questions about WMC2025

Entry fees have increased - when we started to look at fees, based upon fees – flymaster

Vote proposal on bid

Vote on final documents - only received Monday

Is everyone able to read them and understand them, and decision to adapt WMC2025,

Cannot have a vote – issues are not solved – what are the issues, need to be resolved,

Vote tomorrow – small items that need to change, naming policy etc