

MEETING OF F.A.I. MICROLIGHT WORKING GROUP

6 RUE GALILEE, PARIS, ON TUESDAY 17th OF FEBRUARY 1981

M I N U T E S

=====

Present :

Mrs. Ann WELCH (UNITED KINGDOM), Chairman

BELGIUM	Mr. Pierrangelo MEZZAPESA Mr. Hugo PARIDAENS
CANADA	Captain Ron DENNIS
FRANCE	Mr. R. MAGALLON
NORWAY	Mr. Odd JOHNSEN
SWEDEN	Colonel Wilhelm WAGNER Mr. Carl G. SUNDSTEDT
UNITED KINGDOM	Mr. Paul BAKER Mr. Stephen A. HUNT
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	Mr. Everett LANGWORTHY General Clifton von KANN

F.A.I. : Mr. Patrick WELSH, Technical Counsellor

The Chairman welcomed the National Aero Club microlight representatives to F.A.I., and read out contributions to the meeting from those unable to attend.

Apologies for absence received from : IRAK - no activities
JAPAN
DENMARK
IRELAND
AUSTRIA

* * *

I. REPORTS OF ACTIVITIES IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES

See attached table.

II. DEFINITION

The Chairman pointed out that this was a very critical problem, and it was essential to have a clear definition to separate microlights from other aircraft in order to obtain exemption from regulations. After a discussion in which the criteria in various countries were mentioned, the definition which appears on the attached report was agreed upon (and was subsequently approved by C.A.S.I. with a wording modification).

III. F.A.I. INVOLVEMENT

The Chairman pointed out that in view of the desire of the Governments of many member countries to have guidance from F.A.I. on the question of microlights, it is urgently desirable to set up a new F.A.I. Committee.

The Swedish delegate agreed saying that if F.A.I. lost the initiative, I.C.A.O. would perhaps take over and institute a 2 to 3 year project by people who are not at all familiar with the problem.

The Chairman said that as many countries as possible should be involved in order to obtain the desired standards and maximise the exchange of information. She added that she was willing to carry on as Chairman to coordinate this exchange until a formal Technical Committee had been set up. When this was approved elections would be held to decide the President and other officers. The Chairman said she would not stand for election as the officers should be those who were actively engaged in the development and flying of microlight aircraft.

It was unanimously agreed that until C.A.S.I. approved the formation of this new Committee that Mrs. A. Welch should carry on as Chairman.

It was unanimously decided to recommend to C.A.S.I. that a new Committee should be formed. The name suggested was C.I.M.A. (Commission Internationale de Micro-Aviation)

IV. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- Pilot proficiency standards similar to those submitted by the Canadian delegate would be helpful to other countries.
The Canadian delegate announced that a new syllabus would be shortly available as there is a great need for standardisation and the establishment of instructor ratings.
The Chairman said there was not much we could do at present on pilot proficiency. The papers handed out should be studied and delegates should correspond until the Committee came into being.
- In reply to a question from the delegate of the U.S.A., the Chairman did not think that a new Section of the Sporting Code would be required. The present Section 2 covering Aerodynes would be adequate, providing the word "microlight" was inserted where necessary. A new chapter 8 could also eventually be added.
- The delegate from the U.S.A. said that in his country there was an administrative problem between ultra and micro-lights but he believed this could be solved.
- Finally the Chairman said that when considering requirements for licences, it is important that there should be for example freedoms to instruct from unlicensed airfields, a declaration of fitness instead of a full medical examination, the use of a discrete radio frequency, etc.

.../...

V. DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

February 1982 in Paris or possibly late 1981 after approval of the new Committee by the General Conference in Tokyo..

=====

REPORT ON MICROLIGHT ACTIVITIES

1) Approximate world activity in Microlights as reported at the Working Group meeting :

COUNTRY	APPROX. N° AIRCRAFT	REMARKS
AUSTRALIA	700	Unregulated, except for some area restrictions
BELGIUM	100	No special regulations yet. Microlight flying permitted on some airfields.
UNITED KINGDOM	300	Negotiations with CAA now in progress. Restricted licence probable.
CANADA	400	National association has control over pilot competency. Government supports.
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	4 +	Some aircraft have been ordered officially.
F.R. GERMANY		Currently restricted to trials.
ITALY	300 ?	Some 6 years experience of microlight flying.
NORWAY	?	Hang gliders (1400) not allowed to add power, microlights can fly as aeroplanes.
FRANCE	300	Fly on temporary (6 months) C of A and glider pilot theoretical exam.
NEW ZEALAND	not available	Thought to fly unregulated but limited to max. 500 ft.
NETHERLANDS	20	Illegal. Flying carried out in Belgium.
JAPAN	50-100	Waiting for FAI guidance on definition etc.
FINLAND	-	Forbidden.
AUSTRIA	-	Forbidden. National noise problems.
SPAIN	15	No rules known.
SWITZERLAND	?	Special exemptions, but limited to 500 ft.
U. S. A.	4000	No special regulations required at present
SOUTH AFRICA	50	Control handed over to South African Aero Club
IRELAND	17	Negotiations with CAA in progress. Aircraft registered with national association.
CHILE	2-3	Same regulations as hang gliders ?

AW/AV
20.2.1981

Countries which had not forbidden motorised hang gliding (and as a result microlight flying) reported rapidly increasing activity. Those involved in negotiations with national aviation authorities reported various relaxations or freedoms from "aeroplane" regulations. In some countries regulation had been handed over completely or in part to the National Aero Club or Association.

2) Definition

The proposed definition of a microlight was accepted by C.A.S.I. with minor alteration of wording. It is now as follows :

A microlight is :

A single or two-seat aeroplane having a dry (empty) weight not exceeding 150 kg and a wing area in square metres not less than $W/10$ (weight divided by 10) and in no case less than 10 square metres.

N.B. Wing area is the area of the horizontal lifting surfaces and there is no upper limit to wing area.

3) Request to C.A.S.I. for the formation of an F.A.I. Technical Committee on Microlights (C.I.M.A.).

This was accepted in principle by C.A.S.I., but with the final decision to be taken at the June meeting. This would not cause delay as the new Committee could not formally exist until approved at the F.A.I. General Conference in Japan in October. The reason for postponement of the decision until June would allow more information to be available to F.A.I. Council Members. In the meantime the Working Group under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Ann Welch should continue to be active, particularly with the exchange of information by correspondence.

4) Actions to be taken

The most important need is to obtain sufficient freedom from restrictive regulations so that simple, slow speed, and inexpensive flying is readily available and can develop in a sound and safe direction.

It will be useful to microlight associations engaged in negotiations with Governments to have information on rules and regulations - or freedom from regulations - which have been obtained in other countries. Please send summaries of negotiation results, rules or standards to be imposed, or exemptions granted to Ann Welch for circulation, to those on the attached address list in news letter form.

News of technical progress and other activities should be included.