



FAI Airspace Expert Group
Report to the 108th FAI General Conference
Pattaya, 17-18 October 2014

Reported by : *Günter Bertram, Point of Contact (PoC)*

The following points were issued as a Task List by the FAI Executive Board:

1. **To build a working relation with ICAO**, through the Regional Office in Paris, to be informed on developments in regards to :
 - a. Possible alterations Airspace classification
 - b. Definition of technologies required for access to air space

I started the task by approaching Sven Halle a member of the Technical Team of the ICAO Regional Office in Paris. I meet him regularly at Eurocontrol. When describing the intention of FAI we very soon had to discover that the only way for a NGO is through the ICAO head office in Montreal.

In regards to subtask a. it is quite easy to say that there are no short or medium term (10years+) alterations planned to Airspace classification. Europe through EASA is getting closer to the ICAO requirements by implementing SERA (Standardized European Rules of the AIR) at the end of this year. The nations are still the ones to decide which of the airspace classifications they use in their state.

Subtask b. is probably Carl's (NEG) field, but again it is not ICAO but the regions and even states that alter, require more or less new technologies. The airports community has to be vigilant, but at present there is no new requirement that has been defined.

2. **Challenge the FAI members to cooperate with AEG to get an information exchange on best practices** in regards to air sport use of air space going

As said many times before the NACs seem to be very happy with what they have got. Lars Holmström (ex.POC-NEG) and I offered to all the delegates at Kuala Lumpur the chance for individual meetings. Not a single question was asked.

3. **Start a written survey by NAC's and ASC's about their main problems in Airspace and analyse the results** for next priority works in AEG for optimal support of FAI-members
1. establish a list of main criteria on airspace from the air sports / recreational viewpoint, as tool for further discussions with respective authorities

see above

Quote from my last report: It is extremely difficult to make general statements in regards to air sports main criteria in regards to air space. Looking at the diversity within FAI members (airsports), we have quite a challenging situation. On the one hand we have the old founding members of FAI in central Europe whose main concern might be air space availability in a very populated area and on the other hand the evolving air sports communities in for example eastern Europe who only lately can enjoy the freedom to exercise air sports in a manner which is not bound to the military community.

Our dogma has to be:

“Air sports needs free access to air space” and we need it where the air sports people are and not in some distant reservation.

AEG: My attempts to challenge the members of the AEG failed. That might be due to my limited time in asking them over and over again to participate, but I still hold a full time job and cannot ask each member individually. If I sign up for a working group I have to stick to it. A very good example is the SWG where the dedicated people make their inputs.

I have had a lengthy phone conversation with Carl from the NEG. We agreed to have a skype-meeting soon to establish a common base for the work of the two Expert Groups.