

# Multi Sport Event Working Group

## Post Wroclaw Report

4 September 2017

## 1. Introduction

The CASI Mid Year Meeting in Wroclaw reviewed the Report of the Multi Sport Working Group dated 24<sup>th</sup> May 2017, and Amendment 1 dated 15<sup>th</sup> June 2017.

Generally the Reports were favourably received but detail comments were made, and it was noted that, at that stage, specific words for participant selection had not been drafted.

The Working Group has not had access to either the formal Minutes of the Meeting or the notes on which these will be based. This revision is therefore based on the Working Group Chairman's notes and the recollection of the members. Nevertheless it is believed that it reflects the discussion at the Meeting. The major revisions are to the new paragraph 4.1.6. These are to make it clear that a Multi Sport Competition is one that involves other Sports in addition to Air Sports, recognises that if the organiser is other than the FAI then the FAI may not have total control of the Events, and clarify that the Event Rules have to be approved by the relevant ASC. In addition some improves to the flow of the English were suggested.

The original report was comprehensive and it is not considered that it is necessary to repeat the information. This Report is therefore limited to revising Section 6 which covered the specific Recommendations for the Sporting Code. This is now Section 2 of this Report. Should further clarification/justification be needed then of course the original reports should be referred to.

## 2. Recommendations for Sporting Code

There are four changes recommended to Chapter 4 of the Sporting Code. These are listed individually. The suggestion from the Statutes Working Group (SGW) was simple and these recommendations are also relatively simple. However these have been refined out of a more complex discussion as the Working Group carried out its task. In many cases this was caused by either inconsistencies or ambiguity in the current Sporting Code. Whilst an option was to try to identify and remove these, this was well outside the Term of Reference of the Working Group. In addition the FAI has been using the current version for many years, including going back before the 2015 reordering, without any apparent difficulty.

### FIRST CHANGE

Paragraph 4.1

Reason: This is a change just due to the extra paragraph in the Classification of Events and is depend on that being accepted.

***Change to extend to applying to 4.1.1 to 4.1.56***

### SECOND CHANGE

New Paragraph 4.1.6

Reason: to define a Multi Sport Competition.

This is the term used by the SWG, although generally up to the issue for the first Working Group Report they have been referred to as Multi Sport Events. In the FAI Sporting Code a Sporting Event is defined as an event organised by or on behalf of the FAI. As these Competitions involve Sports other than Air Sports they will probably not be organised overall by the FAI and so the term Multi Sport Event is not possible. To get around this by any other way than adopting the term 'Multi Sport Competition' would mean considerable change to the

structure of this part of the Sporting Code. This would be possible but it would not be straightforward and the end result overall is likely not to be any better, and could well be worse. Unintended consequences are also possible.

It is agreed a special event may be required to fit the concept of the Competition and/or to achieve the objectives of the FAI and the competition organiser. As an MSC can involve very different and new events, only say that as far as possible they will be based on First Category events, as per the SWG draft, is too narrow.

New paragraph suggested by SWG as modified by the Working Group

***4.1.6 Multi-Sport Competitions. A Competition where Sporting Events for one or more Air Sports are included, but which also include Sports other than Air Sports. To the extent that the Events are under FAI control, the FAI Sporting Code and, as far as possible, the Competition Rules for First Category Events will be used. To fit the concept of the Competition these Rules may be adapted by the ASC(s) concerned or an ASC(s) and the FAI Executive Board/Head Office may agree to propose a special event. The final Event Rules shall be approved by both the ASC(s) and the FAI as 4.4.3.***

### THIRD CHANGE

New Paragraph 4.4.3

Reason: to add a Multi Sport Competition to the Sporting Calendar list and define how it is approved.

To be consistent with the inclusion of acceptance criteria for other events, this has to be defined in the Sporting Code. There is no history of what type of Multi Sport Competitions will evolve and obviously a World Games should require a higher FAI approval level than say a small event involving only one ASC. It does not seem appropriate to have only a single level of approval. To get round this it was agreed that Head Office should advise who the approval authority would be in each case. By saying that the advice of the FAI Head Office should be obtained, the Office can of course consult with the FAI President/EB or use their own judgment and precedents to advise the appropriate approval level on a case by case basis. With more experience, and as these events become more common, precedents will start to give the answer. When that happens, it may be possible to make the Sporting Code more specific, but at this stage we believe we cannot be too definitive. When the approval is given, this has to define whether the participants are individuals representing a NAC or are independent individuals so it is clear to everyone.

***4.4.3(note all subsequent paragraph numbers will need to be raised by .1)  
Multi Sport Competitions. As approved by the FAI. A proposal for Air Sport involvement in a Competition has to be put up for approval. The FAI Head Office will advise the FAI approval level required on a case by case basis. The approval shall include whether the participants are individuals representing a NAC (becoming a National Delegation) or are independent individuals, as agreed with the Competition organiser***

### FOURTH CHANGE

New Paragraph 4.4.3.3 (4.4.4.3 after renumbering)

Reason: to define how entries are obtained.

There are several elements to what the Working Group considers should be in the paragraph.

The original suggestion from the SWG was:

#### *4.4.3 Event Criteria*

*New*

*4.4.3.3. Multi-Sport Competitions. Entry is open by invitation from the Organiser to national delegations or individual participants under the control of the FAI. A selection process may be put in place by the ASC(s) concerned.*

The Working Group recommends the first sentence is changed to

*Entry is open by invitation from the Organiser to individuals representing a NAC (becoming a National Delegation) or individual participants both as nominated by the FAI*

The reason for the change from 'under the control of the FAI' to 'as nominated by the FAI' is so that the Organiser has to accept the FAI nominations. The Sporting Code ensures that nominations will be members of the FAI and so are under the control of the FAI.

The last sentence of the SWG suggestion was the subject of very considerable debate. It was agreed that saying a selection process may be put in place by the ASC was not only optional, but also provided no definition at all about how this might be accomplished. Many alternatives are possible so firstly there would be no constancy and there would inevitably be controversy in many cases, as evidenced by the discussion within the Working Group.

Two basic options seem to be available, the NAC's or the ASC's. There is no reason for the selected option to be the same for the two classes of participants. Also to be considered is whether if, for example, that the NAC's puts forward the names, should the relevant ASC have the right to put forward selection criteria and/or the right of veto and vice versa?

In the case of independent individuals, there was fairly quick agreement within the Working Group that this should be the responsibility of the relevant ASC. From Cat 1 and Cat 2 events held under the auspices of a NAC they will have the information, formally or informally, on the abilities of individual athletes who have participated. They can select, whether the total number required is large or small, those most appropriate for the Competition, and the Competition Rules. This will provide the concept of the competition required by the organiser and the FAI, even though the competition itself may not use Cat 1 or Cat 2 Rules. There was some initial discussion as to whether a NAC could have a veto, or could suggest an alternate for the names of those put forward, as long as they issued the Sporting Licence for that individual. An argument was that this input could be based on politics within the NAC, but it was also pointed out that there are politics within ASC's. It was eventually considered in these circumstances that the NAC could put forward an alternative, but that acceptance would be subject to the relevant ASC agreement.

For individuals representing a NAC the arguments in favour of the selection being the responsibility of the relevant ASC are basically the same as those for an independent individual.

The argument for the responsibility being the NAC concerned is, what some consider a fundamental point, that only the organisation that is be represented can select those representing it. Their representatives cannot be selected by what could be small group from within an ASC, and also being from random countries whose own NAC's are likely to be in competition with that NAC. This assertion is consistent with both the selection process for the individuals representing a NAC in a Cat 1 event, and also with Byelaw 2.1 to Rule 27 and 28

of the Olympic Charter. The Working Group is unaware to what extent the FAI, in view of its association with the IOC, has to follow the IOC Charter. The NAC will have the same information as the ASC with regard to performance in Class 1 events, and additional information from non FAI and other special events within the country. This is invaluable in the situation where excellent competitors are not able to take part in as many international Cat 1 events as they would like, because of cost or time constraints. In order to maintain the required standard of the Competition it is acceptable that the relevant ASC can specify the standards of performance required by the individuals or alternatively the number that a particular NAC can put forward based on history. This would inevitably mean that different NAC's will be allowed different numbers across the various Air Sports and that in many competitions that number may be zero.

The Working Group agreed that if this method is used then the equivalent veto/alternative process should be in place, with of course the role of the NAC and the ASC reversed.

There were further detail arguments considered by the Working Group. As the CASI Plenary Meeting in Wroclaw made no decision, this now has to go to the CASI Plenary in Lausanne. These additional arguments can be put during the discussion.

With the principle of the selection of participants not having been agreed two detail options are provided in this Report.

For National Delegations being selected by the NAC and individuals selected by the ASC(s) the following is offered:

***4.4.4.3 (renumbered after new 4.4.3) Multi-Sport Competitions. Entry is open by invitation from the Organiser to individuals representing a NAC (becoming a National Delegation) or individual participants both as nominated to them by the FAI with the following processes.***

***4.4.4.3.1 The selection process for individuals representing a NAC is that the relevant ASC(s) may set the minimum performance standard required for participation, and/or limit the Delegation numbers. After the NAC has nominated their National Delegation then the ASC(s) has the right to veto any nominee provided that the justification is given.***

***4.4.4.3.2 The selection process for individual participants is that these are nominated by the relevant ASC(s). After the NACs who issue their FA Licence have been advised of the nominations then the NAC has the right to veto any nominee and suggest an alternate provided that the justification is given.***

If CASI decide that National Delegations should also be selected by the ASC(s), rather than the country they represent, the following is offered:

***4.4.4.3 (renumbered after new 4.4.3) Multi-Sport Competitions. Entry is open by invitation from the Organiser to individuals representing a NAC (becoming a National Delegation) or individual participants both as nominated to them by the FAI with the following process. Irrespective of the basis of participation, participants are nominated by the relevant ASC(s). After the NACs who issue their FAI Licence have been advised of the nominations then the NAC has the right to veto any nominee and suggest an alternate provided that the justification is given.***