

Dear Graeme and Gill,

Just to check CASI agenda this year includes something about microlight autogyros. Minutes from last year, item 10:

...A counter proposal from Australia was to allow the CIMA proposal to be adopted now but subject for a complete review at the next CASI meeting.

A motion was put forward to accept the proposal now but to place the subject on the agenda next year and to invite the USA to propose changes to avoid the overlap problem for records.

The motion was adopted by 16 votes in favour and one vote against.

In the first instance there should be a review this year. Of course this is to be debated, but in my opinion the conclusion must be positive: Microlight autogyros did get their first ever opportunity to compete for FAI medals this year at the World Microlight Championships in Spain which just ended. More info will be included in my CIMA report to the general conference but in the meantime:

<http://marugan2012.es/microlight/summary> shows the gyros flew all the same tasks as the rest of competitors

<http://www.youtube.com/user/ultraligeroparamotor/videos> shows some videos where gyros look perfectly integrated among the rest of microlights.

In terms of the 'overlap', in the context of what happens for microlight autogyros after last year's decision, all I can do is repeat what I said in my paper to CASI last year:*created a new 'partial-overlap' with FAI class E-3-a but this was no different to the uncontroversial overlaps which have existed for many years between class R and other FAI classes including C-x-a, C-x-ao, DM, and aircraft covered by FAI Section 13.*

To expand on this, it is important to understand FAI defines a microlight in class R as a function of weight -and- minimum speed -and- number of persons on board. Other FAI classes (Classes C and E for example) define aircraft by weight only, so class overlaps often occur which are dependant on operational state, like number of people or quantity of fuel on board, rather than any physical change to the aircraft. We contend there is no contradiction in FAI offering the possibility of being able to compete in a FAI sanctioned competition or making a record claim in as many of these different operational states as possible.

Furthermore, the microlight weight limitations are sometimes slightly different to other FAI classes, 450 Kg MTOW when flown with two persons, for example, which is different to C-1a which is 500 Kg (and might be solo). There are some aircraft which can only legally meet one or other of these definitions, but plenty which can legally meet either definition, the only difference being what is on board at the time.

We don't have a problem with the idea that an aircraft might sometimes be a microlight and sometimes not. Whether it is a competition or a record, all we are interested in is the performance when an aircraft is demonstrated to be a microlight so it can be compared against other performances of aircraft which were similarly demonstrated to be microlights.

The fact that at another time the same aircraft might not be a microlight is not relevant to CIMA, but we are pleased FAI offers alternative routes for records to be claimed in that case, shame there are rarely other ways they can compete for FAI medals, but those are issues for the commissions which sanction those events.

In conclusion. it would be very difficult, and is entirely unnecessary, to attempt to legislate some sort of mutual exclusivity when the basis is almost always an operational rather than a physical one. And there is no need for it.

Regards

Richard Meredith-Hardy

CIMA President