



FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

STRUCTURE AND FINANCING OF FAI MEMBER ORGANISATIONS (NACs)

Replies to the FAI questionnaire were received from the following (36) FAI Members:

ARG, AUS, AUT, BEL, BRA, BUL, CAN, CYP, CRO, CZE, DEN, ESP, EST, FIN, FRA, GBR, GER, GRE, HKG, ITA, JAP, KEN, KOR, LAT, LIT, LUX, NZL, NOR, POL, RUS, SER, SVK, SWE, SUI, TUR, UAE.

A summary of the answers to the main questions is shown below, with commentary in some cases.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Structure of NAC

1.1. *Is your NAC a centralised organisation, or a confederation of single-sport associations?*

Confederation of associations: 13

Centralized entity: 21

Other structures: 2

1.2. *Do you have any kind of regional organisation in your country?*

No: 26

Yes: 10

AUT, BEL and GER have a regionally-based federal structure. POL has 63 regional aero clubs. RUS has branches in 52 regions. SWE and SUI also have several regions. TUR has 495 branch offices.

1.3. *Are any single-airport federations affiliated to the NAC?*

Yes: 20

No: 16

1.5. *Are there any single sport federations in your country that are NOT affiliated to the NAC?*

AUS: Microlight; Power Flying; Exp & Home Built;

BEL: Exp & Home Built

BUL: Aeromodelling

CZE: Aeromodelling, Ballooning, Light Aircraft

DEN: Microlight, Exp & Home Built

GER: Aeromodelling

LIT: Hang Gliding

NZL: Power flying

SVK: Microlight

SUI: HG/PG

1.6. *Please explain the main reasons why these groups are not affiliated to the NAC :*

Most frequently cited reasons: No interest, and lack of funds. Also mentioned: legal reasons; wish for total independence; interpersonal problems; reluctance to accept rules of NAC; and existence of bilateral agreement with NAC, making affiliation unnecessary.

1.7. *Does the NAC have individual members?*

Yes: 16

No: 20

1.9. *Is the NAC a purely sporting organisation, or do you also have industrial or other members?*

Purely Sporting: 27

Also other responsibilities and activities: 9

(Aviation training; corporate/industrial members; fire-fighting; disaster prevention; aid to the civil power; pilot screening; casualty evacuation; air transport; aerial work; organ transport for transplants; environmental surveillance, etc.)

1.11. *Is the NAC government-regulated, or independent of government?*

Wholly independent, no subsidy: 11

Independent, but govt. subsidized: 18

Very close links to government: 7

1.12. *Is the NAC recognised by the National Olympic Committee?*

Yes: 25

No: 11

1.13. *Is the management of your NAC appointed (eg by government), or democratically elected?*

34 NACs stated that their management was entirely democratically elected. One said that some members of the management were elected, others appointed.

1.14. *How often are elections held?*

Annually: 10

Every 2 years: 9

Every 3 years: 6

Every 4 years: 10

Every 5 years: 1

1.15. *Who can vote in elections?*

The answers to this question revealed a wide range of different institutional arrangements. As a general rule, delegates from constituent clubs and other member organizations had the power to vote, sometimes in numbers proportional to the strength of their membership. In one or two cases, notably where government influence remained very strong, electoral colleges were in evidence. Full details of these responses can be provided on request.

1.16. *What percentage of the voting power lies with individual members, institutional members (eg clubs) and affiliated federations?*

Individuals: Six NACs stated that 100% of the voting power lay with individual members, one gave 80% to individuals. Three others had between 30% and 50% of the power with individual members, and a further three gave 1% to 11% to individuals.

Federations: Five NACs (AUS, CAN, LAT, LIT, UK) gave 100% of the voting power to affiliated single-sport federations. One NAC gave 50% of the power to such federations. And three others gave 10% or less of the voting power to affiliated federations.

Clubs and other member institutions: Except for the above, the great bulk of the voting power in FAI Member organizations lies with clubs and other similar bodies that are in membership of NACs.

1.17. *How many air sports persons would you estimate there are in your country who are not directly represented by the NAC or one of its affiliated federations?*

The 36 NACs who responded to this questionnaire declared that they were aware, in total, of some **180 000** air sport persons who were not directly or indirectly affiliated to the FAI Member organization. The majority of these were in AUS, CAN, FRA, GER, POL and SUI.

Commentary:

- *The structure of FAI Member organizations is very varied. The majority are centralized structures that have clubs or individuals as members, rather than confederations of single-sport federations. However, a majority have single-sport federations affiliated to the NAC.*
- *Ten responding NACs have renegade federations operating outside their control.*

- *A large majority of responding NACs are still dependent on government subsidy to some extent.*
- *Most NACs are democratically structured, but there is no common pattern as regards electorate or terms of office for board members. These vary between 1 and 5 years.*
- *A very large number of APs remain outside the organizational structure of FAI member organizations.*

2. Financing of NACs:

NACs were asked to list their sources of funding in approximate % terms. Two of the 36 countries that responded declined to give precise financial information. The numbers of NACs reporting income from each possible source, in terms of the % share of their total income, are shown below. In brackets after each source of income is the total number of NACs that reported obtaining money from that source. Conclusions and commentary on these figures are shown further below.

Subscriptions from clubs (24):

100 > 75%: 6

50 > 26 %: 5

25 – 1 %: 13

Fees for Sporting Licences (24):

75 > 51%: 1

50 > 26 %: 1

25 – 1 %: 22

Government subsidy (20):

100 > 76%: 4

75 > 51%: 3

50 > 26 %: 4

25 – 1 %: 9

Subscriptions from individual members (16):

100 > 76%: 1

75 > 51%: 2

50 > 26 %: 4

25 – 1 %: 9

Sponsorship (16):

100 > 76%: 1

50 > 26 %: 3

25 – 1 %: 12

Sales, merchandising (11):

75 > 51%: 1

50 > 26 %: 4

25 – 1 %: 6

Sanction fees for competitions (7):

50 > 26 %: 1

25 – 1 %: 6

National Olympic Committee subsidy(5):

75 > 51%: 1

50 > 26 %: 1

25 – 1 %: 3

Interest (4):

25 – 1 %: 4

Record fees (5):

25 – 1 %: 5

Rental of real estate (2):

% 14, 97

100 > 76%: 1

25 – 1 %: 1

Equipment rental (1):

25 – 1 %: 1

Magazine (1):

25 – 1 %: 9

Donations (2):

75 > 51%: 1

25 – 1 %: 1

Government mandate (1):

25 – 1 %: 1

Others (unspecified) (6):

25 – 1 %: 6

Commentary:

1. *Income from subscriptions from clubs, federations and individuals constitutes 50% or more of the NAC's total income in only 9 countries. Astonishingly, in over half the responding countries, such income amounts to less than 25% of the NAC's total income.*
2. *Two thirds of respondents charge for Sporting Licenses, but in only a couple of cases does this bring in a significant proportion of their income.*
3. *A surprisingly high percentage of respondents (well over half) continue to benefit from substantial government generosity. In four cases, NACs receive over 80% of their income in the form of government subsidy. Very few however, (5) receive any money from their National Olympic Committee, although 23 out of 31 are recognized by their NOC.*
4. *Sponsorship and sales of merchandise seems to be good sources of income for a small minority of NACs. But in the majority of countries they are totally absent, and in most of those countries that do have some income in these categories, it represents generally a small percentage of their total income .*

What percentage (%) of your total annual income is the FAI annual subscription ?

The NACs' answers to this question revealed the following percentages %:

100 > 76%: 4

75 > 51%: 1

50 > 26 %: 5

25 – 1 %: 24 (of which 12 <5%)

Commentary

These figures were very surprising for us in FAI. We had expected the FAI subscription to be a greater burden for far more NACs. As it turns out, the FAI subscription represents more than 50% of a NAC's turnover in only 5 cases. In over two-thirds of the NACs responding, the FAI subscription constitutes less than 10% of income, and in one third less than 5%

3. Other Organisations Separate from the NAC

3.1. *Are there any groups in your country that challenge the authority of the NAC?*

Yes: 6

No: 30

Commentary:

The extent of this problem may have been exaggerated. Most NACs seem to enjoy relative tranquillity and harmony.

4. Associate Members

4.1. *Would the NAC agree to having FAI Associate Members from your country in FAI for specific disciplines (not covered by the NAC), whilst still itself retaining FAI Active Membership?*

Yes: 5

Clear No: 22

Non-committal (negative) answers : 9

4.2. *If not, why not, and what have you done, or what do you suggest should be done so that the members of these organisations can be represented in the FAI ?*

A wide range of narrative answers, available on request. The overall tone of the responses was : "The one member per country principle must be upheld at all costs; no need for FAI to become involved – problems to be settled at national level; NACs are open to anyone who wishes to participate; we need unity; there is strength in numbers; fragmentation would weaken influence and effectiveness.

Commentary:

It was clear from these responses that there was no enthusiasm amongst responding NACs for any significant reform of FAI's Associate Membership rules.

**Fédération Aéronautique Internationale
Avenue Mon-Repos 24
CH – 1005 Lausanne, Switzerland**