



Parachute Association of South Africa

Minutes of the ADZO Meeting Wednesday 07 March 2012, 15h30

Location: Grand Central Boardroom, Midrand
Chairperson: Joos Vos

ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES:

Present

Chris de Jager	CdJ	Skydive Central
Donavon Crerar	DC	Skydive Port Elizabeth
Pam Russell	PR	WPSPC (Robertson)
Boss Doug		PISA / ZODIAC
Ralph Ridge	RR	Adventure Skydives Kruger
Vernon Kloppers		Durban Skydive Centre
Erik Vliegenthart		Walker Bay Skydiving
Jason Richardson		Witbank Skydiving Club
Mark Bellingan	MB	Skydive Cape Town
Joos Vos	JV	EP Skydivers, Grahamstown
Graham Field	GF	Aerial FX
Pierre Laubscher	PL	RAASA
Constant Benade	CB	Pretoria Military Parachute Club
Dennis Cohen	DC2	NED

Apologies

Eugene Potgieter	Johannesburg Skydiving Club
Henk van Wyk	Skydive Mossel Bay
Hein Geldenhuys	Skydive Northern Cape
Manuel Cordeiro	Icarus
Anthony Malherbe	ex-Skydive Oudtshoorn
Shaun Smith	Skydive Plett, Skydive Oudtshoorn
Peter Lawson	Pretoria Skydiving Club
Mary Stephens	CAA

Proxies

Mark Bellingan carrying proxies for:

1. Hein Geldenhuys (Skydive Northern Cape)
2. Shaun Smith (Skydive Plett)
3. Shaun Smith (Skydive Oudtshoorn)

Proceedings

JV opened the meeting at 15:40, welcomed all and went through the meeting rules.

Minutes from the previous meeting: There was an objection to the minutes by Graeme Gordon (GG) prior to the meeting regarding MB's statements and JV asked MB to please comment, after which other comments will be taken.

MB noted the request by GG to change the minutes, but confirmed that they reflect what was said so cannot see how they can be changed. The content is accurate.

JV reiterated that an incorrect minute can be changed but these are accurate and thus cannot be.

The minutes were accepted by all present: Proposed by CdJ and seconded by VK.

The following additional agenda items were added under General:

- Application for a Parys drop zone
- How to handle people owning multiple drop zones
- Minimal operational requirements
- SANParks discussion

JV welcomed Dennis Cohen (DC2) (NED) and Pierre Laubscher (PL) (RAASA)

Matters brought forward (JV)

The following matters were brought forward from the previous meeting.

1. Uitenhage approval was pending an acceptable change in name. DC has done that so all is complete and approved.
2. Carlos Cabral (CGC) criminal charges were to be re-raised. This was assigned to NL who said CGC is overseas and therefore NL cannot give any report back on it. This will continue to be followed up.
3. Part 96 concerns. The affected drop zones were to work together with the Angel Trust to resolve and indemnify themselves. CdJ confirmed that Skydive Central did pursue this and is still trying to get a response out of the Angel Trust. No other drop zones reported to have addressed the issue.

JV reported that Part 96 was discussed in a meeting. Letters were sent from ADZO advising the affected drop zones and to RAASA seeking advice.

PL explained that as explained in his response to this communication, the Part 96 concern is actually a misinterpretation of the regulation and its intention. It is aimed at people wanting to use non-type certified (NTC) aircraft for activities such as flips, game farm inspections, etc. It was never intended for competing with full scale operations like a Charter operations. It is a smaller level approval for NTC aircraft.

PL also updated the meeting on Part 105, which has been rewritten, submitted and is with the minister. It was scheduled to be completed by February but now April or May is likely as legally it must be translated into Afrikaans.

This will help us a lot. It states that no NTC aircraft shall be used for parachuting operations UNLESS it has been approved by the NTSO. So Mark becomes responsible for determining if the aircraft are acceptable for skydiving. Mark can delegate this to someone else, e.g. Graham Field or do it himself. If you need to develop a procedure, send it to us (RAASA) and we will be the second approval on the document.

So you may use NTC aircraft but it needs an approval process. Once approved, this will clear out a lot of the doubt around NTCA.

Part 105 is published, approved at Carcom and just waiting for translation and signoff by the minister.

Chairman's report (JV)

DISCUSSION		
JV presented the chairman's report.		
We are exploring a tandem passenger insurance policy. MB and JV will meet with Kevin from Aero Club and will have proper feedback after that.		
All drop zones must reapply for drop zone approvals.		
PL explained that there is no risk of non-approval. NASCOM are queried about recreational air space. There is a plan for National airspace development and certain bodies have applied - such as cell phone and radio communications towers. We must apply for airspace because of the height. Some have been approved, only for a complaint to arise after all has gone ahead and investments made and building begun, etc. NASCOM's database of recreational activities is not complete so RAASA is developing such a database.		
The AIC 17.1 (issued in January) has the information. Information will be published as an AIP. No traffic around your drop zone can then claim they did not know of you and complain later. Please complete the circular so we have a paper trail and everything is submitted to NASCOM. I (PL) will stamp and sign the document for you now so you have a copy to show to any complainants. We will update it a little later and print it in certificate format.		
I have statistics of permanent, temporary and display jumps that we have issued from last year January until now.		
DC commented that many drop zones are running on 3 month back-to-back applications and asked if this will be resolved.		
PL confirmed that that is a NOTAM with a 3 month life. An AIC is a slightly higher level document – in operation for a slightly longer duration. The next level up is an AIP which has an even longer duration. NOTAMS operating until now could only be done on a 3 monthly basis. These AICs will be updated annually with no changes to the AIC or AIP. If there are any changes, just notify us (RAASA) and we will issue it for another year. Temporary drop zones will still be applied for on case by case basis.		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION		
All drop zones must re-apply through RAASA for their permanent parachuting operations to secure the paper trail and prevent complaints arising after approval claiming lack of knowledge of drop zone existence.	Responsible All	Deadline Immediately

NSTO Report (MB)

DISCUSSION
MB presented the Safety Report. He thanked contributors for their contributions to the MOP's update and emphasised that we can only move as fast as people respond to updates so it takes time.

<p>We have ARO temporary approval and more changes still to come. The final version will come in when Wing Suiting, Canopy Piloting and Atmonauti are finalised. Then we will print it and make it available to you. Things keep changing so it is a very long process.</p> <p>MB presented the incident statistics.</p> <p>MB explained the new online system for CI incident capture, reminding CI's to let the system generate the person's name so it can complete all the person's details for the user. Don't bypass this and type it in – mouse-over the field and wait for the system suggestion then select the person's name.</p> <p>Each DZO can now track his own incidents captured online. It looks promising and is working but we must use it right to get value out.</p> <p>Renewal notices will be emailed to members for online renewal. Jumpers with rating renewals/applications will be prompted to print the rating section and have it signed by CI but those without ratings or new licence applications can complete everything online. Please educate your members so that Neeve is not inundated with unnecessary queries.</p>		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

ADZO Budget 2012-2013 (JV)

DISCUSSION		
<p>JV presented the budget.</p> <p>JV said that minimum operational issues are related to this but will be discussed later.</p> <p>JV asked if everyone is happy with holding the AGM here or if Rand Air (Aero Club board room), at no cost, is better. This venue is only R 570.00 and the room there is not big enough for the PASA AGM as well so we'd need to then rent something else which is expensive.</p> <p>PL said we might be able to negotiate a good price with the Aero Club for the large conference centre upstairs. It is priced at R 2 500 but they might be willing to discount it rather than have it totally empty.</p> <p>RR proposed ADZO meetings there and AGM here.</p> <p>JV asked PL to please contact the admin office to investigate and we can consider it.</p> <p>All agreed that if a better rate is offered, we will check it out and if it is worthwhile will have both ADZO and AGM there in the future.</p>		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline
PL to investigate rate we can get for the large conference room at the Aero Club for the PASA AGM.	PL	n/a

Drop Zone updates (JV)

DISCUSSION		
<p>Parys Drop Zone (GF)</p> <p>GF presented his application for a drop zone in Parys.</p> <p>GF has been looking at the location for some time and was contacted a few days ago by Steven (introduced to meeting) and Aiden.</p> <p>Aiden owns the land we would operate from. They offered the land (Stonehenge on Vaal) for the operation. It is an extreme sports and fitness centre, the facilities are excellent and the landing area is great.</p>		

It is for non-student and tandem operations only, 8 km from Parys airfield.

Fred Potgieter and Graham will be the tandem masters. Equipment is available. A Cessna will be the aircraft. It is nicer than Pilanesberg with the only obstacle being one low power line is - nothing exceptional for the skydiving we plan.

Mike Rumble (MR) will present on Skydive Pilanesberg. We have not yet paid the R 15 000 for it yet so effectively we do not have it. Currently it is not working so I have pulled away from it and hope it will work for MR.

We are in a flux state at RSC currently. We have no aircraft or equipment with a promise of it coming soon but Parys is a good opportunity for me to use my resulting available time for. JSC is closest at 60 KM (straight line).

Everything is in my presentation, but it was a rushed preparation so I haven't given PL the RAASA paperwork yet. PL has indicated no anticipated problems so it is not through official channels yet but will be in a few days.

JV also looked at it and has advised me on some aspects.

JV added that this will tap into a unique market. People seek the operation out, not the reverse which is our usual approach of marketing to draw crowds.

MB reminded GF that he (GF) will be DZO and sought confirmation that the other people involved in this understand they cannot replace you.

GF confirmed they do.

PL supported the location that has an AMO, breakfast fly-inns and open, flat areas. By supporting the aerobatic training school there we will be strengthening the airfield with other activities which in turn will strengthen the bid against them selling the airfield for development etc. The feeder would be Vereeniging, Vanderbijlpark and Heidelberg. No impact is foreseen on Johannesburg.

GF confirmed they will not land at Parys who do not want them landing on the airfield. GF will take the tandems there and land 7km away. With little sport and no student operations this is no issue.

JV asked for any objections and none were raised.

JV asked GF to please pay and go ahead and wished GF good luck. The application was approved

RR asked why GF and MR never paid for Pilanesberg.

JV said the meeting would be addressing this later as part of the minimum operations.

JV asked GF for an update on Rustenburg (RSC).

GF said he has stepped back a little and RSC didn't operate while he was in Swakopmund. The Angel Trust sent the RSC aircraft to another drop zone and RSC thus had no aircraft. Attempts to use the C206 from Pilanesberg did not work out. One month ago GG decided to recon all Angel drop zones' equipment and he removed all RSC's tandem gear and 6 student rigs.

The Trust can elaborate but the removed gear was supposed to be redistributed across drop zones but so far we have nothing, but I am told they are busy doing it. MB has warned me about this risk in past and I am awaiting GG to tell me what is happening. In the meantime we want to restart static line at RSC, run by Johnny Beukes. They are sourcing a C182 and have arranged 4 static line rigs from the military.

MB reminded GF that if GF is going to Parys, then Johnny must put it in writing and send PASA Office the information. A change of guard at RSC must be formalised with ADZO so we know the way forward. By the time it is reduced to writing, it will be clear.

GF confirmed his wish and wants to put a timeline onto the resolution so he too can move forward.

Skydive Oudtshoorn

JV said that Anthony Malherbe has moved to Namibia and sold his drop zone to Shaun Smith (absent). JV enquired after the feeling from the floor on owning multiple drop zones and the resulting voting rights on ADZO.

MB explained that this is not a multiple licence issue as in KZN as Shaun actually owns and runs two operations so it technically not a problem. The challenge is only being DZO of both drop zones and having the right people in place to operate both.

Is a person with wealth buying many drop zones a problem?

DC2 referred to the Constitution which allows each PASA drop zone operation to appoint one representative to the ADZO board, implying one vote per drop zone.

PL: A critical function we struggle with is the need to grow recreation aviation. There are outside threats and we have seen a big decline with thankfully some increase in certain areas. Any growth should be encouraged. However, someone with a lot of wealth can overrule and overpower the rest of the organisation.

Various options were discussed.

MB proposed that all future buyers of existing drop zones must reapply for the drop zone and be approved by ADZO again as with a new drop zone but excluding the fee. There will be numerous changes in gear, staff, etc., needing approval anyway, but it is rare for a whole committee to change so some continuity is expected.

Proposal was seconded by DC.

That person must come to this meeting. All yes. JV said we do this every 6 months

PL asserted that PASA is approved as the ARO so any licence for a drop zone belongs to PASA. An individual owning or operating does not own the licence so they cannot sell the licence. They must return the licence and PASA must reissue it to the new owner.

It was agreed that SS bought Oudtshoorn prior to this decision so this will not apply to him.

Skydive Northern Cape

Hein has indicated that no more operations will take place at Skydive Northern Cape in the foreseeable future so it will remain dormant.

MB said that this was specified for just the next 5-6 months.

CdJ said that they (SC) are in discussion with Skydive Northern Cape to help them get up and running again, aircraft being the biggest challenge, but that he believes there is a market there. Discussions are still in early stages.

JV asked if CdJ would then be acting for them, to which CdJ responded that this is not the case and they are just helping to get the drop zone back on its feet.

Skydive Pilanesberg Clarification

MR: Operated over Christmas and new year – RSC is not operating so RSC's licence was used for Pilanesberg as a trial. Sun City objected at the last minute, removed the welcome centre and our synergies with them we lost, but we proceeded anyway with the support of most others there.

A tender has gone out to the airport as an international airport. The operation needs a lot of time and energy and MR is unsure how it will work with the airport management changed. MR said that maybe in a year or two he could revive it but it currently requires energy which MR does not have.

MB noted that since nothing has been paid or finalised and since MR is not going there to run it and put the necessary pieces in place there is nothing to discuss. It is not viable, so we are cancelling it.

PL suggested that for Northern Cape, Pilanesberg and RSC, PASA holds the licence. If it is approved and we have the airspace, don't take it off the system. That way, if someone wishes to revive any of them, the licence can just be reissued.

MB confirmed that none have been taken off the system and all will remain from that perspective.

PL says that according to the AIC, Klerksdorp is not there anymore, but he (PL) has kept Potchefstroom there as inactive.

MB said he understood to only give RAASA the active drop zones.

MB was tasked with correcting this list with PL and RAASA and re-adding the inactive drop zones.

CONCLUSION

GF's application for a Parys drop zone was approved.

All future sales of existing drop zones will require the purchaser to reapply to ADZO for the drop zone and be approved by ADZO as with a new drop zone but excluding the R 15 000 fee.

Shaun Smith will not be required to comply with the above drop zone purchase decision as the purchase was concluded before this decision was made.

ACTION	Responsible	Deadline
GF to deposit payment for Parys drop zone application	GF	Immediately
MB to correct the drop zone list with PL and RAASA	MB	n/a

Increased ATC holds caused by CT-Lanseria traffic (RR for JSC)

DISCUSSION

RR said that because of increasing holds from this traffic, despite approaching ATC, JSC is looking at other drop zone sites in the area, left and right of the corridor. One weekend saw over three hours of holds, which is unacceptable so JSC is actively searching to move out of the corridor

RR welcomed any suggestions.

MB raised that a few years ago we put cones over three drop zones and they required feedback to retain those. JSC - due to not coming to these ADZO meetings did not comply with the feedback requirement so their cone was not upheld. This would otherwise have been a permanent fixture and [MB] does not know if it can be revised, but the reason JSC lost it was because nobody attended this meeting.

If the cone was in place they would have included that in their plans, but they won't change their plans to accommodate it now.

JV asked PL if he can help, since they own the land.

PL said that AIPs are published but this does not overrule airspace. MB's point is valid. Nobody will reroute passenger aircraft for a recreational activity. The cone agreement is temporary. No permanent approval is given, but the existing cones are agreed with Johnny Smith who issues a written agreement for up to one year. JSC must go to the Pool Manager for THAT area. There is a lot of traffic there. Each drop zone must look at their airspace and ensure they have a written agreement and they renew it each year otherwise this will continue.

PL said new drop zone proposals should also take note – the first thing you do should be ATC talks on what is available. You can't change published air routes for recreational activities. RAASA will facilitate the meeting but can't make the decision or demand.

PL said JSC can approach RAASA and RAASA will try to facilitate.

CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

Elect ADZO executive committee (All)

DISCUSSION		
<p>CdJ, JV and GF are available. MB proposed that JV stays as chairman of ADZO because the pipeline needs a ready person. CdJ seconded. None against.</p> <p>The ADZO exec was elected: JR proposed GF, MB and CdJ. None against.</p> <p>Aero Club representative was elected: MB proposed GF. None against.</p>		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

Elect 2 (two) PASA Management Council representatives (All)

DISCUSSION		
<p>2 members for the Management Council (MC) were elected: JV and CdJ. None against.</p>		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

G Gordon request relating to previous ADZO minutes (JV)

DISCUSSION		
<p>This was dealt with in matters brought forward.</p>		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

SANParks (RR)

DISCUSSION		
<p>RR: said the Adventure Skydives Kruger (ASK) had crossed over areas with Skydive Central (SC). SC didn't understand what had gone on from our side or the tandem contract we have put in place with SANParks. RR Introduced David Maina (DM) to the meeting.</p>		

RR said it was not SC's fault and they were just pulled in but said he (RR) feels that it is essential that as we had discussed in previous ADZO meetings that if I plan 150 tandems in another drop zone's area, I contact that local drop zone. For the odd demo it is not necessary but certainly with big stuff and when you will affect them if something goes wrong.

DM gave some background, saying he (DM) proposed the idea to Ralph in 2010. DM was talking to SANParks for a few jumps near Kruger. In Feb 2011, DM spoke to SANParks further and spoke to a Kruger Park contact who was doing trails.

DM circulated a timeline of events. He included what SANParks required, what Ralph could provide and what deal we could give them. DM Introduced Ralph to Derrick and met with SANParks, who agreed on the IP of this idea and said it could go ahead.

Last week on Thursday, DM found out that jumps had already taken place there.

RR said that a year of work went into this project. We need to discuss it with each other when we go into different areas. I have done jumps with the actual lodge they are going to. Now it puts a risk on our 18 month infrastructure development. It isn't ethical.

MB confirmed that ADZO did discuss that if an operator goes into another's airspace they must contact the operator beforehand.

RR emphasised that DM had invested a lot of money.

MB said SC approached him for a temporary drop zone to operate with SANParks, but MB had no prior knowledge of other operations. MB recalled that he did mention to SC that they should contact RR as the temporary drop zone was for tandems for SANParks, right next to RR's drop zone.

JV recalled an email from SC saying they were planning this, but didn't know RR was doing anything there.

RR said ASK didn't think it was big so were holding back and last week when finalising and getting deposits in it emerged that this was happening.

CdJ said that SC was supposed to contact RR and apologised for not doing so which was an oversight. Marco, who did organisation, should have and he slipped up on that. SC read the letter from the event organisers (received this week) and that was the first we had heard of RR's involvement - last week. Kruger Park Trails put this out to tender and SC responded in time and qualified. No malice was intended and the event was a pilot for National benefit to multiple drop zones.

CJ said that when SANParks approached SC, SC asked why they didn't go to a provider in the area and they said they liked SC's marketing style. Malelane airfield said there was no chance of using them. SC scouted and found another airfield (and on 13 February submitted a temporary drop zone application) not knowing anyone else had submitted applications. We planned the event went out on 1 March to advertise with tandems and put together videos. This is potentially very big and would eventually involve all drop zones, looking at annual and National events in 6 different locations so we saw it as National, not as Kruger. The pilot event was to be at Kruger but the next one in the Northern Cape.

MB confirmed that CdJ did say when applying that it was a pilot event for National event.

CdJ emphasised that SC are not making money out of this and are assisting a SANParks and Wild Card venture. SC didn't intend to step on toes went into it for skydiving nationally. SC has just now got a contract with Medical Association country-wide for similar venture; CdJ asked the room if anyone else has been contacted. Nobody responded as being contacted.

CdJ said they plan to go ahead but if anyone is unhappy SC will pull out and let them take over.

MB confirmed this was acceptable asked SC to just email ADZO and inform them on what you're doing.

PL asked if environmental affairs had been approached. The act prohibits flights over protected areas and parks so make sure it is covered with the Department of Environmental Affairs. PL advised to be careful of the politics as there is currently a lot of litigation around this issue.

DM confirmed they had covered this issue. SANParks did have vulture concerns and thus ASK proposed a boogie as a trial run.

JV asked if RR tendered.

RR confirmed he did. This is for bulk tandems. When Norman Langeveldt wanted to do tandems in Middelburg it was prevented. RR said he is not stopping the venture by SC but they must understand that any issues affect ASK's operation and reputation (incidents etc. can ruin ASK's business with the lodge). Bulk tandems in foreign venue carry higher risk for outsiders than for me as I know the area but it also affects my own operation.

CdJ said they never expected 150 tandems on a weekend. They expected 20-30 for the pilot and then more around country and each area was to get involved with each event.

MB reminded all that the purpose of a temporary drop zone is usually for a club go-away, not for a business venture.

CdJ said they arranged it as a club go-away to do fun jumps and whatever tandems come along. SANParks say they have 20 odd. It is structured so that SC won't lose money and didn't lower prices or undercut others.

MB reminded all that in temporary drop one applications they should include in the comments what it is for. Communicating with others in the area will also alleviate this.

MR said he had a related project on the card, "Skydive for Rhinos", wanting 448 tandems around the country – one for each poached rhino in the area – and if the two can be tied together it could be a good prospect. MR has selected 5 drop zones he would like to involve.

CONCLUSION

ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

Minimum Operational Requirements for Drop Zones (JV)

JV explained that there are quite a few dormant drop zones that cost ADZO money to get the DZOs to the ADZO meeting yet they aren't operational and it is very expensive for ADZO.

The Management Council (MC) feels some minimum operating requirement should be made for operations.

MB said this was highlighted recently when a pilot phoned wanting to drop people at Potchefstroom which hasn't operated in ages. There was no reply from the last CI. MB knows the DZO but after no operations for so long, they suddenly want to start operating. They replied saying they have paid up - but they had no people or procedures in place and MB questions why the pilot is phoning and not the DZO?

This in turn highlighted some other issues.

There are a few licences e.g. Walker Bay, Oudtshoorn, Nylstroom. We can't be ad hoc – something must be in place to say it is operational. MB needs to know what is happening.

We should put something in place for drop zones not operational.		
MB suggested that if a drop zone hasn't operated in 6 months they should go dormant and must meet some requirement to fire up again.		
EV said he spent a lot of money to get here and does not want to lose that. EV is looking for other opportunities but it is currently dormant. EV understood from NSTO that we need to still have all our operational requirements in place if we want to operate again.		
MB suggested they go dormant then email NSTO to inform of start-up, which EV agreed was fair and added that they should resend their submissions plus information of who is on the staff and the aircraft details.		
EV said a dormant licence is fine if it won't cost R 15 000 to restart.		
DC2 asked if flying DZOs in for meeting was a documented requirement. If not operating during the AGM, they can pay for themselves. If not active are they entitled to attend ADZO meeting, but is ADZO responsible for the ticket? In addition, if a drop zone is dormant for x period, the licence should lapse		
MB explained that ticket payment by ADZO was historical, not required but people are distributed.		
DC said it is the same as currency. If a drop zone doesn't operate for 6 months, shut it down – it isn't current. Certain parameters should be set for them to reopen.		
PL used a CAA and training schools example for best practice. If you stop operating for any reason, you notify CAA you are dormant. There is withdrawal or cancellation of licence but you don't need to renew and you won't be audited. When you are ready to restart, you inform them. If nothing has changed and CAA is happy, they reissue your certificate and you continue.		
Just notify PASA/ ADZO. The drop zone retains the licence and airspace remains, etc. When they are ready, reapprove any changes and continue.		
A proposal was put forward by MB and with discussion and various suggestion from others, finalised to the following: <i>By notification or 6 months – whichever comes first - you go dormant and when you're ready, approach the ADZO Exec (not ADZO, so you need not wait months). Only new applications should need ADZO which meets only every 6 months</i> <i>If no operations happen for a year, and a new person wants to use airfield, then the original person has the right of first refusal, after which it can be issued to newcomer. If the holder says they want to start again, but has no actual plans, there should be requirement that if he takes it up must operate within 3 months.</i> <i>The ADZO exec will decide if you meet the requirements adequately (currency, intention, time periods, etc.).</i>		
Proposal was seconded by EV.		
None against.		
CONCLUSION		
ACTION	Responsible	Deadline

Closing

The Meeting was closed at 17h35.

Minutes recorded by: Claire King (CK)