

1 From 103rd FAI GC, Incheon, Korea 2009

Report of the FAI President, Pierre Portmann (extract)

WORLD AIR GAMES

The World Air Games took place in Turin from 6-14 June 2009 with excellent weather conditions.

It was a difficult pregnancy, but once the baby was born it went quite well.

We had to face two main problems: lack of cooperation inside the LOC and a severe shortfall of money.

The original budget was reduced by one third, therefore no international media and television coverage was provided.

The World Air Games confirmed that the format we decided on works well. Of course we are still learning, and we will apply the lessons learned in future editions.

The FAI Board and the Airsport Commission Presidents are convinced of the value of such an event, that brings all Air Sports together.

We are actively searching for an organiser for 2011, not an easy task in the current world financial and economical crisis.

Our preparations for the 2009 games have clearly confirmed that close cooperation with a professional organization is necessary and that FAI has to keep more control over the organizers through a revised organizer agreement.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

... /.

That is another reason to continue to develop our WORLD AIR GAMES. They may become another source of income for our Federation and strongly contribute to our image inside and outside the FAI.

We have seen in Turin and at other events how hard it is to navigate between our need to maintain our traditions and to give satisfaction to event organisers, the public and media people.

Our Air Sport Commissions still have much work to do to make our sports more easily understandable for the general public, and more accessible.

Our competitions often last far too long, and are much too repetitive. This is not only boring for the spectators, but in the present working world, it is no longer easy for ordinary people to take two weeks off – in addition to the family commitments they may have.

We need to keep our traditions and standards for Championships. But we also need to be more inventive and innovative.

The World Air Games concept is the vehicle that allows us to do this. We can continue to develop World Air Games, but if possible also other smaller multi Air Sports events, with a more affordable budget. A few local sponsors can then be found to help to finance the events.

Therefore, I strongly urge our Air Sport Commissions to continue to improve their existing WAG events and to develop new public-friendly events.

There is no doubt in my mind that we have to continue with two different types of event:

Classical Championships, mainly for the competitors, and public-friendly single or multi-sports events, with a maximum duration of 3-5 days, training included.

Our success depends also on good cooperation between the NACs and the different FAI Air Sport Commissions.

I appeal to our NACs to give good and strong support to our Airsport Commissions. When an international Championship is held in your country I ask you please to give full support to the organisers. Even though the NAC may not be the organising entity, we expect NACs to feel responsible for international events that take place on their soil.

Only if we all pull together can we be successful in ensuring the future of our Air Sports.

Report of the FAI Secretary General, Max Bishop (extract)

So what of the future? It is clear to me that the FAI competitions of the future – whether we like it or not – will probably have to be:

- Shorter
- More professionally organized
- More interesting for the public
- Partially financed from commercial sources.

As the President has noted, we can still keep our traditional championships if we wish. But we cannot expect others to pay for them, and the costs of running such events are going to continue rising disproportionately because of the increasing scarcity of willing and competent volunteers, and the expectation on the part of competitors of professional standards of organization.

My successor will have to help steer FAI through a clash between the values of commercial companies and those of non-profit associations.

Those of us who are dyed-in-the-wool non-profit association people need to accept that many of our activities are very costly. Unless we are prepared to pay these costs entirely out of our own pockets, we are reliant on others somehow to help us. Those who are best placed to help are commercially motivated companies and individuals. But they also need to learn that sporting associations are not show-business companies, and that democratically decided rules have to be respected.

... /.

2 From 110th FAI GC, Bali, Indonesia 2016

12.1. FAI WAG 2015, Bidding process next WAG (ANNEX 13)

FAI Sports and Event Director Marcus HAGGENEY noted that H.E. Yousif Al HAMMADI was the face of the WAG; he had had confidence in the FAI, the people representing the FAI and the staff, and they had done it together. Without Dubai they would not now be in a position to discuss strategy and look into new opportunities. All the WAGs built on each other and assisted the FAI in getting better and promoting air sports.

Looking at preparations for future WAGs, Mr HAGGENEY thanked the Air Sports Commissions for their work to shape the future of the FAI WAG.

The two bids for the next WAG, from Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA and Malaysia, would be evaluated over the coming year, and he hoped to report back with the positive results at the next GC.

Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS was puzzled, because she thought that Malaysia's membership had been suspended.

Mr HAGGENEY replied that the FAI WAG was not necessarily a NAC-approved activity, since it was not a classical Category 1 sanctioned event. The EB had accepted this intention from an aviation organiser within the country, which was not the NAC. His personal hope was that, with this intention to bid, developments might be encouraged within the NAC.

The President said he was excited to see that they were likely to have the next WAG at one of these two locations, and that things were moving ahead.

--

Returning the discussion, the President noted that, according to the FAI Statutes, the appointment of the WAG should be made by the General Conference. The next World Air Games were in the pipeline, and next year might be an appropriate time to sign a contract with the next organiser. He hoped the GC would consider adding this item to the agenda, in order to give the EB and presidents greater liberty going forward, rather than waiting for the next conference before the contract could be signed.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) noted that Mr Art GREENFIELD had pointed out the discrepancy in the protocol from the previous GC the day before. He asked if they could act on this now.

The President replied that they would act on this during the day. It was being refined so that they could see what was in the minutes and what the proposed change would be. It was rather complex, however. When he had the material it would go on the agenda.

Mrs Mary-Anne STEVENS pointed out that they had run into the same issue they had encountered already. Because of the provisions of the Statutes, they could vote to add this item to the agenda, but the Statutes did not allow them to vote on the item without 50% of active members present.

The President noted that they were not changing the Statutes, they were merely delegating an issue from the GC to the EB.

Mrs STEVENS said that a vote on any matter not appearing on the agenda was valid only if at least half of active members were present, and unfortunately they did not meet that criterion.

The President asked if the wording was "present" or "represented"? Mrs STEVENS replied that it was present only.

Mr Bruno DELOR understand the statutory issues, but he felt that on such an important subject they had to be efficient. He therefore supported the idea that they find a way to delegate the decision to the EB. This was better than deciding too late.

Mrs STEVENS noted that there was another section of the Statutes that said that the GC could decide that voting by mail was appropriate to settle a specific matter. They could put it on the agenda and have the discussion, then have a vote afterwards in which all active members could participate.

Mr Sanjay THAPAR thought they should not get bogged down in bureaucracy. The way the Statutes were written, the General Conference was supreme. If some decision needed to be taken that was not on the agenda, or notice was not given, they should nevertheless be able to make a decision, perhaps by a 2/3 majority.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN thought they could open point 12.2 and discuss the matter, and give approval for the EB to make the decision; the agenda item already covered the bidding process for the next WAG. They could debate this point and make a decision without violating the Statutes.

The President asked if the Statutes Working Group wished to comment on putting this question into item 12.2.

Mrs STEVENS felt that strictly speaking there would still be a problem, but she understood the dilemma they were placed in by the way the Statutes were currently written.

The President asked if anyone knew the exact reference in the Statutes that stipulated the GC had to decide on the location of the WAG.

Mrs STEVENS replied that this was not in Statutes, it was in the General Section.

The Secretary General asked for a proposal to be put up on the screen. The first question they had to clarify was whether this was covered by the agenda or not. Mr Lindgren had said it was covered, because the bidding process was an item on the agenda.

This was agreed.

Next, the General Section of the Sporting Code 4.4.1.1 defined that events on the FAI sporting calendar (which included the WAG) were approved by the General Conference. As far as the timing was concerned, the EB was currently negotiating with two bidders, and they needed to conclude an agreement with one of these bidders by spring 2017. If they waited until the autumn, it would be too late to ensure thorough preparation. The EB therefore asked that the GC task the EB with continuing the negotiations and concluding the agreement, and that they then put the ratification of this on the agenda of the next GC.

Mr Bruno DELOR agreed with the proposal, which he felt was very important.

Mr Robert HENDERSON noted that Statute 3.6.1.1.5 stated: "During its proceedings, the General Conference may decide by a two-thirds majority vote of the active members in good standing and Air Sport Commissions present or represented to discuss action items not appearing on the agenda or to alter the order of the items." The provision for voting the location of the WAG was in the Sporting Code, which was subservient to the Statutes. He believed they could vote to put this issue on the table, and then those delegates present, because they were only voting on a provision in the Sporting Code, could agree to delegate the power to decide on the location to the EB.

A delegate asked what then was the point of the last sentence, "The decision is to be ratified", if the contract was signed in the spring of 2017.

The President agreed that the final sentence of the proposal should be deleted. He read out the final proposal.

First, he opened the discussion on the procedure.

Mrs STEVENS pointed out to Mr Henderson that, looking at 3.6.1.3.2, they were stuck in the same conundrum as yesterday. This highlighted the need for the important work on completely realigning and revising the Statutes, By-Laws and General Section. She thought the matter was clear, but she left it to the wisdom of the General Conference.

Mr Pierre PORTMANN, President of Honour, noted that this was the 110th General Conference of the FAI. One of the reasons their organisation still existed was that they had always stuck to the rules and the Statutes. In

every company of the world, the moment they started to interpret their Statutes in whatever way suited them, it was dangerous. Although he was unclear about Mrs Stevens' arguments, he thought she was probably right. He also had respect for Mr Henderson, who had found a way through. But finding loopholes was dangerous in itself. It was up to the General Conference to decide, but he felt they should beware.

Mr Bruno DELOR noted that, with the clarification given by Mr Lindgren, there was no problem with the Statutes. They had an agenda item "Bidding process next WAG", so a motion could be proposed to decide how this decision should be taken.

Ms Alicia HIRZEL (Switzerland) thought that the item mentioned by Mr Henderson was saying that they were allowed to discuss the agenda item. But she believed there was a difference between discussing and voting. The paragraph mentioned by Mr Henderson was more about discussion than voting.

The Secretary General wondered what the decision would have been if they had done this two months before they had sent out the agenda, which was the statutory deadline for proposals to be made. They would probably have put exactly the same sentence. According to the event schedule it was not possible to follow the dates of the GC and adjust the opportunity of hosting the WAG to these scheduling needs. This was why the bidding process topic had been put on the agenda, so that they could report where they stood and ask the General Conference to delegate the decision to the EB.

The President could not see that they were in violation of the Statutes. They had the agenda item on the bidding process. They had heard a report on the bidding process and the GC was now invited to take a decision on the procedure going forward. This was not in violation of the Statutes, since the allocation of the WAG was a Sporting Code issue. He asked for the support of the GC to open the motion under 12.2.

Mr LEINIKKI noted that there were new countries in the room, whom he invited to collect their voting kits. There were now 338 votes in the room, giving an absolute majority requirement of 170 votes.

The General Conference was invited to vote on the motion: "That the discussion under 12.2 be reopened."

The FAI General Conference voted to reopen discussion under 12.2 by 301 votes for, 25 against and 10 abstentions.

The President asked if there was any discussion on the second motion: "That the General Conference take note of the 2 bidders for the next World Air Games and task the Executive Board to award the next World Air Games." There being none, voting was opened.

Approved by 232 votes for, 96 against and 19 abstentions.

3 From 111th FAI GC, Lausanne, Switzerland 2017

16.1. FAI World Air Games 2020

The President noted that the World Air Games 2020 would be very important for their organisation. There were three candidates: Malaysia, Albuquerque and Turkey. Site visits had been conducted a few weeks earlier.

Mr Markus HAGGENEY (FAI Sports and Events Director) referred to his slide presentation (ANNEX 8), and outlined the bid process. He noted that the Sportcal GSI Event Study had been very helpful in terms of evaluating the commercial impact. The FAI had organised site visits by representatives of the NACs and ASCs, and in this respect he urged the NAC representatives to ensure they had good delegates on the ASCs. As things stood, Albuquerque would base the WAG around its balloon event. As far as Turkey was concerned, there were no technical issues, however because they planned to organise the event all over the country, they would need to generate an atmosphere through an opening ceremony that would bring everyone together in one place, together with the media. This concept would also require more representatives from the NACs, which would lead to increased overheads. There were pros and cons to the formula, but it would be a logistical challenge.

Mr Bruno DELOR noted that they had conducted an evaluation workshop after the WAG in Dubai. It was very important that they go back to the conclusions from Dubai, to avoid making the same mistakes. Furthermore, the World Air Games had to be approved by the GC. The EB would be in a position to evaluate the bids in December, and would not want to wait until the next GC, so he wondered how this process would be handled.

Mr HAGGENEY agreed that the workshop had been very important, and they would be sure to read the conclusions again. They had learned a great deal from Dubai; cooperation had improved between all concerned, and they had daily contact. This was not a Head Office project, it was a project for the entire FAI community.

As far as the decision-making process was concerned, the President said they proposed to proceed as they had last year: if the GC agreed, it would authorise the EB to make the decision.

Mr Antonis PAPAPOULOS said that Dubai was a good lesson, and they would do better the next time. The actual events had been decided a long time after the agreement had been signed. He believed that all the ASCs were looking to assist the EB if requested. If they wanted to have the agreement of the GC they had to cooperate closely with them in terms of deciding the locations, events, numbers and duration well ahead of time. In Dubai, his commission had had three events involving 16 or 24 people, and he had struggled to persuade them all to participate.

The President noted that he had visited Turkey with Mr HAGGENEY, and invited the commission presidents to join them, although it had been at short notice. A decision had to be made soon, and it was very important to use the evaluation from Dubai. If possible, they should avoid waiting for the next GC to make a final decision. Once the decision was made, they would fill everyone in on progress, in full cooperation with the ASCs.

Mr HAGGENEY pointed out that this was a high-speed environment, and they were trying to take the opportunity quickly.

Mr MALBOS noted that after Dubai it had been decided to create a special event to show the spirit of their sports. This would be possible in Albuquerque but not in Turkey, where it would be just another event on the calendar. He wondered if it would be possible to negotiate a different concept with Turkey, in accordance with the special WAG concept they had agreed to. Mr HAGGENEY noted that the Turkish NAC was here today, and a wise organiser would listen to what his clients wanted.

Mr Vladimir MACHULA (Czech Republic) asked if more details of the agreements could be provided to the commissions and athletes as soon as they were known, to avoid the last-minute logistical problems they had seen in Dubai. Mr HAGGENEY replied that the contract for Dubai had been signed 17 months before the opening ceremony, whereas here they would have a 3-year lead time. DHL would be logistical consultants from very early on. Coming back to Mr MALBOS, President of CIVL, they had all seen the number of Cat 2 events in his

commission. Nevertheless, there were also many commissions that struggled to find organisers for big events, and would be happy to have major events on the horizon to keep people in the sport. The going-in position was different for each commission, and they had to recognise that, and make the best of the offers they had on the table.

Dr HOENLE fully supported Mr MALBOS's comment. Mr MALBOS said he also supported Mr HAGGENEY's remarks. It was a global strategy, and they had to take a decision.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS asked if the EB would consult the ASCs before taking a decision or after. The President confirmed that they would be consulted before.

Mr MALBOS requested that they take a vote on granting the EB authority to take the decision on behalf of the General Conference.

Mr LEINIKKI reported that an absolute majority required 167 votes or more.

The General Conference agreed to delegate to the Executive Board the authority to decide on the host of the 2020 World Air Games, by 242 votes for, 64 votes against and 14 abstentions.

The President thanked the General Conference for their trust and said the EB would take the decision very seriously, after consultation with the Air Sports Commissions.

4 From 112th FAI GC, Luxor, Egypt 2018

15.1. FAI World Air Games 2020

See ANNEX 7.

The President noted that they had worked hard last year to secure an agreement with THK for the FAI World Air Games in Turkey. Preparations were going well; there had been some problems but these were now on the way to being resolved, with a slight delay. He had received a letter from the presidents of the ASCs, emphasising the importance of moving ahead with preparations. Straight after Shenzhen he would meet the new president of THK in Ankara, and then by December they would have a good idea of how close they were to being able to hold the event in 2020. He invited Mr Bekir AKYUZ, sports director of THK, to take the floor to report on the World Air Games 2020.

Mr Bekir AKYUZ introduced himself and thanked the FAI for having given him the opportunity to make this presentation. The first World Air Games had been organised by the THK in Turkey in 1997. After signing the organiser agreement in February 2018, several meetings had taken place. According to their concept, approximately 1160 participants and competitors, and 1153 crew, event officials and volunteers would participate. They were currently planning out the venues for the competitions and the opening and closing ceremonies. The opening ceremony on 4 September 2020 would take place in Ankara, and the closing ceremony would be on 13 September in Antalya.

With the help of a slide presentation, Mr AKYUZ outlined the preparations that had taken place so far, including the venue selection procedure, and the presentation of the new logo and mascot. He played a brief promotional video. The event website would be online in a couple of weeks, and by the end of December it was expected that everything would be in place, according to the organiser agreement.

The President thanked Mr AKYUZ for his presentation and said the FAI was thrilled by the content of the World Air Games concept.

The Secretary General added that at the CASI meeting initial conversations had taken place about the rules for the World Air Games 2020, and involvement from the NACs was also important.

Mr Sergey ANANOV noted that the rules for the World Air Games in 2020 were expected to be ready by the end of the year, so he took this opportunity to make one point that was very sensitive to him and other NACs with which he had spoken. He had discussed the selection process for athletes with various groups, and in his opinion the national delegations should be selected by national sporting authorities, which meant the NACs, not by the ASCs, as had been the case for previous games. The ASCs could of course give guidance on the selection of athletes for national delegations, such as international rankings, but the selection of athletes themselves should be in the hands of the NACs.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS noted that CASI was aware of the problems they had faced in Dubai. As Aristotle said: judgement came from experience, and experience came from bad judgement. They would take care of this issue.

Mr Vladimir MACHULA added his support to Mr ANANOV's point. This was a very serious issue, and the NACs had to be involved in selection very thoroughly, before anything else happened.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS noted that it had recently been announced that there would be a coordination committee for the World Air Games, which would be the top-level steering committee running the event. It would comprise representatives from the Turkish organisers and from the FAI

– the President, Secretary General, Sports Director, safety manager and probably the CASI President. It seemed that the balance within the group was not exactly what they had discussed. He proposed that they included one representative from the Air Sport Commissions and one from the NACs.

Mr Terry CUBLEY asked for some clarity. He saw a conflict between what the Air Sport Commissions wanted to do, which was to display the best of their sport, and the NAC expectation that there would be equal representation from the various NACs. How did they define the purpose?

Mr Markus HAGGENEY explained that he would say more about multi-sports activities shortly, and it would become clear that other International Federations were trying to do the same thing, putting their existing formats under an umbrella in order to achieve exactly what Mr CUBLEY had said. There was a fine line between showing their wonderful sports to the world in an attractive way, but there were ways of doing it. He was confident this would become clear during the presentation.

Mrs Marja OSINGA, acting president of the CIMP Medico-Physiological Commission, wished to say a few words about the medical symposium they were planning. In Dubai they had held a symposium on the aeronautical aspects, together with the organiser of the local World Air Games. It had been a success, and so the EB had agreed to doing the same thing again. Turkey had agreed to the proposal. The goal of the symposium would be to share knowledge between aeronautical experts, and perhaps pilots, on different fields of aviation medicine. Most aviation medical examiners dealt with commercial and professional pilots, who were in fact in a minority worldwide, given that there were far more sports pilots. It was important that they understood the needs and intricacies of sports pilots.

The President noted that this was an important initiative and had been a success in Dubai. He hoped they would achieve the success in Turkey.

EoD End of Document