

Annex J

CASI THE AIR SPORT GENERAL COMMISSION

PROPOSAL FOR RESTRUCTURING AND TERMS OF REFERENCE

by Sandy Pimenoff President of Honour, CASI
Chairman of the Working Group to restructure CASI

CASI BRIEF HISTORY

Up to 12 years ago, every NAC could nominate a CASI member, additionally the Commission Presidents were ex officio members. According to the original terms of reference, all Sporting Code decisions had to be approved by CASI: both the GS and all codes of the Commissions..

In 1994 CASI was restructured to consist of 10 Commission Presidents and 10 NAC representatives, five elected by the GC each year, to serve for two years.

The reason was simple: The Commissions had in practice taken over most of the development of their Codes, and the "large" CASI had gradually been reduced more or less to rubber stamping these Code amendments. A CASI with 40-45 members had become redundant.

CASI TODAY

For the restructured (present) CASI the terms of reference were in principle defined as:

1. Promote Air Sports including new ones
2. Maintain and update the General Section
3. Propose measures on developing Air Sports outside the mandate of existing FAI Commissions.
4. Organise International Appeals Tribunals

Item 1. Next to nothing has been accomplished by CASI during the past 12 years. Most members have in fact not been concerned about this task

Item 3. Very little positive has been initiated by CASI for years.
On the contrary, opinions in CASI have tried to create difficulties
e.g. for the development of rules for solar powered airplanes.

Item 4 No Appeals have been lodged for three years, since the present sanction fee was introduced.

Item 2 It is an embarrassing fact, that for quite a number of years the
q activities of the 20 members of CASI have been limited to
a maintaining the GS.
And we are referring to a body of 20 people that belong to the
a absolute elite of the FAI, including the Commission Presidents.

In view of the above it is obvious that the present CASI represents a gross waste of time, effort, and money.

And very little can in fact be achieved at one annual meeting, a meeting that many members would like to limit to half a day. And bear in mind that the CASI Bureau has no powers whatsoever to further any items between meetings, except prepare the agenda of the annual meeting.

No wonder that past FAI President Weinreich already at the Dubrovnik GC suggested to abolish CASI entirely..

A further anomaly in the present situation is that the Commission Presidents have a separate meeting during the GC, chaired by the FAI President, and with the participation of members of the Executive Board.

We must realise that Commission Presidents have a heavy workload managing their Commissions, and this workload is bound to escalate if we want FAI to grow and prosper in the future.

Improved cooperation between Commissions will be a necessity, if we want to realise successful FAI Air Games, and possibly FAI WAGs, in addition to other measures intended to improve future FAI prospects

The natural forum for developing such cooperation is the PresCom meetings.

We should avoid duplication of meetings for Prescoms, but rather aim at directing their energy, motivation and commitment toward one meeting concentrating on common interests.

The general disinterest among CASI members for CASI procedures was clearly demonstrated at the Paris GC, where nobody wanted to chair the Working Group created to generate proposals for the future structure of CASI. Neither did membership of the WG bring forth any enthusiasm among the delegates.

This is not intended as criticism, it just goes to show the general lack of interest of the members in the present CIAM procedures. CASI FUTURE

There is little sense in maintaining the CASI in its present form.

It is obvious that the prime task of CASI should be to maintain the GS, as it has been for many years. But to have 20 people including the Prescoms involved in this task is a shocking waste of resources. Eleven years as member of the CASI Bureau has made that painfully clear to me.

The Prescoms should be separated from the CASI, they can then concentrate on the important business of the Prescom meetings, and they can still of course present proposals to the agenda of the CASI meetings..

When defining the composition of a restructured CASI the composition of the present Statutes WG is a good model: it consists of three members. For CASI four to six members, elected by the GC for two or three years, should provide a workable solution.

Six should be seen as a maximum if we want an efficiently operating CASI, A two years tenure, or perhaps even better three years is advisable for continuity.

Finally, CASI should consistently strive to limit the GS to rules and regulations of principle.

The GS should not be cluttered with rules concerning technical details. These vary between different airports, their right place is in the relevant Sporting Code.

Gentlemen, your comments are invited.

Sandy Pimenoff