

Speech at the Plenary Meeting in Lausanne March 2002.

Mr President, I must address Agenda Item 13, in the Minutes from the 2001 CIAM November Bureau Meeting, Revision of the Agenda and Bureau Proposals. In the Minutes it says "The Bureau checked the proposals for inclusion in the Agenda of the 2002 Plenary Meeting. As electronic form is required, those not meeting that requirement will not be accepted."

It should have been obvious to the Bureau and its members that those proposals that just were sent in in hard copy were meant to be treated seriously by the Bureau. The Sporting Code rule A.7.1 stating that all proposals must be received by the FAI Office in electronic form and hard copy to be included in the agenda was introduced 1st of January 2001. Thus it should easily have been understood that the lack of electronic form was a mistake that easily could have been rectified by a simple email to the respective NAC's. Furthermore, the Bureau did not have to consider each proposal, as this is the duty of this Plenary Meeting.

When I learnt that the Swedish proposals were rejected I emailed to the FAI Office with a copy to Sandy Pimenoff on 20th of December with a question of what was faulty and that we were willing to overcome the problem. On this email I received no answer from the CIAM Bureau. A second email was sent 12th of February to Luca Gialanella, with copy to Sandy Pimenoff asking to know which nations and the number of proposals that were rejected on this ground. The reply I got a few days later said **"...Sweden is not alone, I can assure you, but I consider what you asked me for reserved to the consideration of Bureau members only."** I can't understand this answer as I do believe that the task of the CIAM Bureau is to work for the CIAM member NAC's to develop and improve aeromodelling. The Swedish Model Flyers Federation have been insulted by the obvious nonchalance from the Bureau, both in the treatment of the proposals and the lack of willingness to communicate.

What I have said so far indicates that, with some willingness from the CIAM Bureau, all proposals that were rejected could easily have been included in the agenda as there were more than two months between the Bureau Meeting and the publication of the Agenda.

Finally, on behalf of the Swedish Model Flyers Federation, I demand that the following text shall be incorporated in the Minutes from this Plenary Meeting: "The decision by the CIAM Bureau to reject those proposals not submitted in electronic form was not in the best interest of CIAM. It could easily have been taken care of with a simple email to the NAC's."

Bengt-Olof Samuelsson

Bengt-Olof Samuelsson

Swedish delegate

Swedish Model Flyers Federation