



*Fédération
Aéronautique
Internationale*

112th Annual General Conference

Minutes of Working Sessions

**Held in Luxor (Egypt)
26th and 27th October 2018**

*Maison du Sport International
Av. de Rhodanie 54
CH-1007 Lausanne
(Switzerland)
Tél. +41 (0)21 345 10 70
Fax +41 (0)21 345 10 77
E-mail: sec@fai.org
Web: www.fai.org*

FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

Founded in 1905 - Honorary Patron: Dr. Bertrand Piccard

OFFICERS OF THE FAI 2018 / 2019

Presidents of Honour

Dr. C. Kepak (Czech Republic)
G.A. Lloyd (Australia)
O.A. Rautio (Finland)

E.J. Ness (Norway)
W. Weinreich (Germany)
P. Portmann (France)

J. Grubbström (Sweden)
F. Brink (Netherlands)

President

Robert HENDERSON

Executive Directors

Abdullah M. AL JAWINI
Alvaro DE ORLEANS-BORBÓN

Agust GUDMUNDSSON
Mary Anne STEVENS

Marina VIGORITO
Jean-Claude WEBER

Vice-Presidents

Australia – Terry CUBLEY
Austria - Michael FEINIG
Belgium – Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE
China – Jia BING
Chinese Taipei – Elsa MAI
Czech Rep. – Vladimir MACHULA
Finland – Petteri TARMA
France - Bruno DELOR
Germany – Wolfgang MÜTHER
Greece – Nikos MAKRAKIS
Hong Kong, China - Andy CHAU
Hungary – Laszlo MESZAROS
India – Rajiv Pratap RUDY
Indonesia – Chepy NASUTION
Ireland – Tom MCCORMACK
Japan - Hiroyasu HAGIO
Korea – Youngduck LEE
Latvia – Gints GAILIS

Lithuania - Mindaugas SINKEVICIUS
Luxemburg - Claude ESCHETTE
Mexico - Ing. José Peña
BUENROSTRO
Morocco – Si Mohamed HACHAMI
Netherlands – Ronald SCHNITKER
New Zealand - Elizabeth KING
Norway – Rolf LILAND
Portugal – Francisco José FIALHO
NUNES
Russia – Sergey ANANOV
Spain - Pedro Cabañero MARIMÓN
Thailand - Veerayuth DIDYASARIN
Turkey – Bertan NOGAYLAROĞLU
United Kingdom – Rob HUGHES
USA – Greg PRINCIPATO

Ex Officio

Aerobatics – Nick BUCKENHAM
Aeromodelling - Antonis
PAPADOPOULOS
Amateur-built & Experimental Aircraft -
Alfons HUBMANN
Astronautic Records – Anu OHJA
Ballooning – Mark SULLIVAN
General Aviation – Rodney BLOIS
Gliding - Eric MOZER
Hang Gliding & Paragliding –
Stephane MALBOS
Microlight & Paramotor – Wolfgang
LINTL
Parachuting – Gillian RAYNER
Rotorcraft – Jacques BERLO

Presidents of FAI Air Sport Commissions

A. PAPADOPOULOS (GRE) / CASI - Air Sport General
Commission
M. SULLIVAN (USA) / CIA - Ballooning
A. HUBMANN (SUI) / CIACA - Amateur Built & Experimental
Aircraft
A. PAPADOPOULOS (GRE) / CIAM - Aeromodelling
J. BERLO (BEL) / CIG - Rotorcraft

W. LINTL (GER) / CIMA – Microlight & Paramotor
N. BUCKENHAM (GBR) / CIVA - Aerobatics
S. MALBOS (FRA) / CIVL - Hang Gliding & Paragliding
R. BLOIS (GBR) / GAC - General Aviation
A. OHJA (GBR) / ICARE – Astro. Records
E. MOZER (USA) / IGC - Gliding
G. RAYNER (FRA) / IPC - Parachuting

Presidents of FAI Technical Commissions

P. DUVAL (FRA) / EnvC - Environment
Dr. R. GARRISON (USA) / CIMP - Medico-Physiological

HEADQUARTERS *(situation as of January 1st, 2019)*

Maison du Sport International – Avenue de Rhodanie 54, 1007 Lausanne, SWITZERLAND

Telephone + 41 (0)21 345 1070 / Telefax + 41 (0)21 345 1077 / E-mail : info@fai.org / Web : www.fai.org

Secretary General: Susanne SCHÖDEL

Communication Manager: Faustine CARRERA
Sports & Marketing Director: Markus HAGGENEY
Assistant Sports Manager: Annick HAUSER
IT Manager: Visa-Matti LEINIKKI
Finance Controller : Paola LOPEZ
Office & Accounting Manager : Cosette MAST

Members & Services / Anti-Doping Manager: Ségolène
ROUILLON
Competitions Manager: Christine ROUSSON

FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

112th ANNUAL GENERAL CONFERENCE

MINUTES

OF THE WORKING SESSIONS
HELD ON FRIDAY 26TH AND SATURDAY 27TH OCTOBER 2018
At Hotel Sonesta St Georges, Luxor (Egypt)

IN THE CHAIR..... Mr Frits BRINK, FAI President

**FAI ACTIVE MEMBERS
WITH VOTING RIGHTS**

HEADS OF DELEGATIONS

ALBANIA.....	Mr. Renis TERSHANA
AUSTRALIA	Mr. Grahame HILL
AUSTRIA.....	Mr. Manfred KUNSCHITZ
BELGIUM	Mr. Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE
CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF	Mr. Yang ZHUOYUE
CZECH REPUBLIC	Mr. Vladimir MACHULA
DENMARK	Mr. Dennis WERENSKIOLD
EGYPT.....	Mr. Samir RAOUF
FRANCE.....	Mr. Jean-Luc CHARRON
GERMANY	Mr. Wolfgang MÜTHER
INDONESIA	Col. Agung SASONGKOJATI
ITALY	Mr. Stefano BIANCHETTI
JAPAN.....	Mr. Hiroyasu HAGIO
KOSOVO	Mr. Shkelqim KRASNIQI
LATVIA.....	Mr. Gints GAILIS
LIBYA	Mr. Helal Ali DABNUN
LITHUANIA	Mr. Mindaugas SINKEVICIUS
LUXEMBOURG.....	Mr. Claude ESCHETTE
MOROCCO.....	Mr. Hachami SI MOHAMED

NETHERLANDS	Mr. Ronald SCHNITKER
NORWAY	Mr. John Eirik LAUPSA
PORTUGAL	Mr. Carlos TRIGO
RUSSIA	Mr. Sergey ANANOV
SAUDI ARABIA	Mr. Abdullah AL JAWINI
SERBIA	Mr. Zeljko OVUKA
SLOVAKIA	Mr. Pavol KAVKA
SOUTH AFRICA	Mr. Alan EVAN-HANES
SPAIN	Mr. Manuel ROCA VIAÑA
SWEDEN	Mr. Anders ÅKVIST
TAIPEI, CHINESE	Ms. Elsa MAI
TURKEY	Mr. Bekir AKYUZ
UNITED KINGDOM	Mr. Rob HUGUES
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.....	Mr. Greg PRINCIPATO

FAI ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

EGYPT

Mr. Hassan Ahmed ABDELMOEIN

FAI TEMPORARY MEMBERS

PALESTINE.....

Mr. Iyad ABBAS

FAI INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATE MEMBERS

None

PROXIES

Canada to USA
Cyprus to Spain
Greece to France
Hong Kong to China
Iceland to Norway
Kazakhstan to Chinese Taipei
Korea to Japan
New Zealand to Australia
Qatar to Indonesia
Slovenia to Italy
Switzerland to Austria
Vietnam to Netherlands

FAI EXECUTIVE BOARD

FAI President	Mr. Frits BRINK
FAI Executive Director (Finance)	Mr. Jean-Claude WEBER
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Agust GUDMUNDSSON
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Robert HENDERSON
FAI Executive Director	Mr. Bengt LINDGREN
FAI Executive Director	Mrs. Mary Anne STEVENS
FAI Secretary General	Ms Susanne SCHÖDEL

FAI AIR SPORT COMMISSIONS

Mr. Antonis PAPADOPOULOS.....	President, FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)
Mr. Mark SULLIVAN	President, FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)
Mr. Antonis PAPADOPOULOS.....	President, FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
Mr. David MONKS	Representative, FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)
Mr. Wolfgang LINTL	President, FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA)
Mr. Nick BUCKENHAM.....	President, FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)
Mr. Stephane MALBOS	President, FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
Mr. Rodney BLOIS	President, FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)
Mrs Marina VIGORITO	Representative, FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)
Mrs Gillian RAYNER.....	President, FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)

FAI TECHNICAL COMMISSIONS

Dr. Marja OSINGA	Representative of President, FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP)
Mr. Pierre DUVAL	President, FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC)

FAI REGIONAL VICE-PRESIDENTS

Mr. Tengku ABDILLAH	Regional Vice-President, East and South Asia
Capt. Ayed ALKASME	Regional Vice-President, Middle East and North Africa

FAI PRESIDENTS OF HONOUR

Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM	SWEDEN
---------------------------	--------

FAI COMPANIONS OF HONOUR

Mr. Michiel KASTELEIJN NETHERLANDS
Mr. Bernald SMITH UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FAI HEAD OFFICE

Mr. Markus HAGGENEY FAI Sports & Events Director
Mr. Visa-Matti LEINIKKI FAI IT Manager
Ms. Paola LOPEZ FAI Intern
Mrs. Segolene ROUILLON FAI Members and Services Manager

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE WERE RECEIVED FROM :

COMISSÃO DE AERODESPORTO BRASILEIRA - BRAZIL
DAEHANMINGOOK HANG GONG HWE - KOREA
FEDERACION MEXICANA DE AERONAUTICA, A.C. - MEXICO
ROYAL NEW ZEALAND AERO CLUB INC. - NEW ZEALAND
Catherine MAUNOURY, President, AERO CLUB DE FRANCE - FRANCE
Francisco NUNES, President, AERO CLUB DE PORTUGAL - PORTUGAL
Eric MOZER, President, FAI Gliding Commission – IGC
Max BISHOP, United Kingdom, Companion of Honour
Atul DEV, India, Companion of Honour
Tor JOHANNESSEN, Norway, Companion of Honour

SCRUTINEERS

The Conference unanimously agreed the appointment of the following scrutineers:

Michiel KASTELEIJN
Ray PEARSON

1. Opening

The FAI President, Mr Frits BRINK, welcomed the FAI members to the 2018 General Conference in Luxor, Egypt.

2. In Memoriam

The FAI General Conference stood in silent remembrance of all the air sport persons and friends who had died since the 111th General Conference:

- Prof Ioan N. RADU
- Contessa Maria CAPRONI
- Göran AX

- Bernd LANDSMANN
- Dr Wieslaw JASZCZYNSKI
- Dr. Čeněk KEPÁK
- Gradimir B. RANCIN - GRADA
- Josef BARTIK
- Karl STEFAN
- Michael ANTHIMOS
- Fred MARSH
- Colonel Thierry TOURNAY
- Reza C.KAMBEY
- Ardi KURNIAWAN
- Petra MANDAGI
- Fahmi RR
- Gleen MONONUTU
- Lee Dong JIN
- Franky KOWAS
- Hannelore HOHMANN

3. Voting system

There being no electronic voting system, Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI (FAI IT Manager) explained how the votes would be conducted. Votes would be taken by either a simple majority or an absolute majority. He noted that, in the case of an absolute majority vote, the vote of anyone choosing not to vote would in practice count as a vote against the motion.

When an item required a vote by secret ballot, ballot papers would be distributed. One country might receive more than one slip. For open yes/no votes, A4 papers had been distributed, marked with the number of votes. He asked the delegates to show them clearly when required.

4. Roll-Call of Delegations

The FAI Sports Director, Mr Markus HAGGENEY, conducted the roll call, and noted that they were well above the quorum requirement of 25%.

4.1. Apologies for absence

Those apologising for absence were as recorded above.

4.2. Verification of representatives' authority

The representatives' authority was verified as part of the registration process.

4.3. Announcement of proxies

Proxies were as recorded above.

4.4. Appointment of scrutineers

The scrutineers were unanimously appointed as recorded above.

4.5. Reminder of voting procedures

4.6. Adoption of Modifications to Agenda

The PRESIDENT noted that there was a proposed modification to the report of the Regional Vice-Presidents to be moved to day 2.

Mr LINTL asked if item 29 from Session 7 could be moved to between items 7 and 8.

Modifications of the agenda were adopted.

4.7. Call for items for Open Forum

No additional items to the section "Open Forum".

5. Minutes of the 111th FAI General Conference 2017

The President invited the General Conference to approve the minutes of the 111th General Conference 2016.

The FAI General Conference unanimously approved the Minutes of the 111th FAI General Conference held in Lausanne, Switzerland in 2017.

6. Report of the FAI President

The President presented his report (**ANNEX 1**).

7. FAI Membership

Mr Markus HAGGENEY (FAI Sports and Events Director) began by informing the Palestinian representatives that, as temporary members, they were welcome to attend but they did not have voting rights.

The total number of votes was 322. Absolute majority: 162. Qualified 2/3 majority: 215.

Total number of votes belonging to active members in the room: 282. Absolute majority: 142. Qualified 2/3 majority: 188.

The FAI Secretary General, Susanne SCHÖDEL, noted that the latest version of the Membership Report (**ANNEX 2**) was version 1.1 dated 12/10/2018, two weeks before the General Conference. Those members who had not paid their subscription fees by that date did not have voting rights at the General Conference.

7.1. Resignations, suspensions and expulsions

The Secretary General reported that Uruguay, Associate Member, had resigned in 2018.

The following active members had not paid their full membership fee by 12 October: Argentina, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Tunisia and Venezuela.

The Islamic Republic of Iran and the Philippines had paid in the meantime, but had no voting rights at the General Conference.

The following countries had not paid their penalties: Bulgaria, Chinese Taipei, Cuba and Peru.

From the Associate Members, two had not paid their membership fee in full: Armenia and Trinidad & Tobago. Brazil had not paid its penalties.

From the Temporary Members, Paraguay had not paid its membership fee.

The General Conference was invited to take note that if these subscriptions were not paid by 31 December 2018, these members would be suspended.

As of 12 October 2018 two members had not paid their subscription fees for 2017 and 2018: DPR Korea and Montenegro.

The General Conference was invited to agree that, if the outstanding debts were not paid by 31 December 2018 their memberships would be terminated at the end of 2018.

7.2. Consideration of applications for admission of new FAI members

Two countries had applied for membership. The FAI warmly welcomed the Palestine Air Sports Federation, which had applied for Temporary Membership.

The FAI Executive Board had accepted the Palestine Air Sports Federation's application for FAI Temporary Membership with immediate effect and asked the General Conference for ratification.

Azerbaijan had applied for active membership in Class 10.

The FAI Executive Board had accepted the application of the Azərbaycan Dəqiqə Ve Ekstremal İdman Novləri Federasiyalari Assosiasiyasi for FAI Active Membership with immediate effect and asked the General Conference for ratification.

7.3. Re-approval of existing temporary members

The Secretary General noted that Temporary Membership was the entry point into the FAI. The tradition was that these memberships would be regularly renewed, with the goal of moving towards Associate or Active Membership. The General Conference was invited to accept the renewal of Temporary Membership for Laos and Paraguay.

A delegate asked how long Temporary Membership could continue to be renewed. Paraguay had apparently been doing this since 2003. The Secretary General replied that work was ongoing for these countries. However, South America in particular needed a stronger focus from the FAI. She hoped to have something more to report at the next General Conference.

7.4. Class change requests

The Secretary General reported that seven countries had applied for a change of class:

- Bahrain (Associate Membership to Active Membership Class 10 for 2018 + name change)
- Brazil (Aeromodelling – change from Associate fee of CHF 5100 to CHF 2652 for 2019. The first figure was based on an agreement made a number of years ago, but was not in line with the subscription scale.)
- Chinese Taipei (Active Membership Class 9 to Class 10 for 2019)
- Hungary (Active Membership Class 7 to Class 9 for 2018)
- South Africa (Active Membership Class 6 to Class 7 for 2019)
- Turkey (Active Membership Class 7 to Class 5 for 2018)

- Vietnam (Temporary Membership to Active Membership Class 10 for 2018)

The FAI Executive Board recommended that the General Conference approve this report as presented.

The General Conference unanimously approved the Membership Report.

The Secretary General noted that the Scale of Subscriptions, which would be discussed on Day 2, already incorporated these changes.

7.5. Report from the Regional Vice Presidents (South and East Asia; Middle East and North Africa)

Regional Vice-Presidents (Middle East and North Africa)

Mr Ayed ALKASME (Regional Vice-President, Middle East and North Africa) reported that there were 20 countries in the region, 14 of them as active members. One was suspended and six were prospects for FAI membership. There were some challenges. In the MENA region air sport was limited due to unavailability of air space and for security reasons. He could work with the NACs in the region to have more air space, which would help a great deal to increase awareness. A further challenge was an insufficient number of air sport competitors, and he was working with the NACs to offer more competitions in the Arab countries, and also to secure participation of their pilots in FAI events. Planned activities included a visit to the OCA in Kuwait, the first Arab flying rally in 2019 and a visit to Oman to encourage membership in the FAI. This year, visits had taken place to Morocco in preparation for the 2019 General Conference in Marrakesh, and Egypt to prepare for the 2018 GC in Luxor. It was a challenge in the MENA area to promote many air sports, because of restrictions and regulations. Drones could not be imported at all, and were banned from flying in most areas. Ballooning and gliding were also heavily restricted. Because of high landing fees and a lack of availability of fuel, general aviation was also a challenge.

Mrs Gillian RAYNER noted that he had not mentioned parachutes.

Mr ALKASME responded that parachuting was very active, and in fact all the air sports in the area had started from parachuting.

Mrs RAYNER pointed out that a parachuting World Cup was currently taking place in Bahrain, and it was very successful. It was also being live-streamed.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS asked about drone restrictions. He asked if there was a central organisation within the Arab countries that took care of the rules, or whether each country had its own regulations. He had experience negotiating with the authorities and could offer help.

Mr ALKASME thanked Mr PAPADOPOULOS for this offer. He did not believe there were any organisations –the authorities needed to be made more aware of the issues. Once the authorities had been paid a visit, given examples of what was happening in other countries, and been given a copy of the book about airspace this would help a lot.

Mrs VIGORITO wished to speak on behalf of IGC. She encouraged MENA delegates to attend the IGC Commission meeting, because that was the right place to discuss the challenges he had mentioned. They were very willing to help.

Mr ALKASME thanked Mrs VIGORITO. When he had attended the General Aviation Commission meeting for the first time in Cyprus, he had learned a lot. In fact, with apologies, he thought it was more useful for him than the GC, and was the right place to send people. In future they would send more people to commission meetings, and take the examples of what was happening in other countries. The Microlight and Paramotor Commission would be meeting in Riyadh in November, and he would send a representative.

Col. Agung SASONGKOJATI thought the regional federation would benefit from cooperating with Indonesia. Hundreds of people from the Middle East had their first experience of paragliding in Punja, Indonesia.

Mr ALKASME said that, as part of Asia, they would be part of the team at the Asian Games.

Mr Samir RAOUF said he had talked with Mr ALKASME several times, and in the past they had had some contact through the Arab League, which was now suspended for sport aviation. They should work together and invite the responsible officials in the Arab countries. Before air space, they had to give them infrastructure. Many Arab countries had no bases dedicated to sport aviation, so they had to tackle that first. Airspace came next. And they also needed a budget. Then they required the support of FAI members in training up the first generation of instructors. Once they had solved these challenges the region would be active.

Mr Tengku ABDILLAH (Regional Vice President, East and South Asia) explained that his region covered 18 countries, including 13 FAI members (12 active members and one temporary member). It was his job to try to encourage the five countries that were not yet FAI members to become involved, and Cambodia looked set to join next year. The most popular sports in the region were paragliding, paramotor, parachuting and hot air ballooning. He had been working with CIVL to try to encourage more cross-country paragliding, and hoped to stage a workshop in the region in 2019. Aeromodelling and drone racing were very popular. The first FAI World Drone Race Championship would take place in Shenzhen, China, where most drone manufacturers were also based. The paragliding accuracy and cross-country events at the Asian Games were also a major event. Looking ahead to the 2020 Asian Beach Games, he would be working closely with the Air Sport Federation of China. In terms of strategy, he was urging the regional NACs to register with their NOCs. This was vital for them to participate in multi-sports events, because invitations were issued by the NOCs. He was also encouraging the NACs to host more international sports competitions, focusing firstly on drone racing. He was in contact with the Airsport Federation of Asia to bring more air sports activities to Asia, and to give assistance to the smaller nations where funding was a problem. The AFA was trying to secure global sponsorship for all events held in the region. Sponsorship was a problem, because many air sports activities were virtually invisible to the public, which led potential sponsors to assume there was no audience. Having a global sponsor would open the way for more sponsorship further down the chain.

The President thanked the Regional Vice-Presidents, who were doing a great job. Being an ambassador in those parts of the world was very important and they were starting to see the results. He hoped that, in Asia, the AFA would be able to represent the FAI at major events such as the Asian Games, and in contacts with the OCA. He hoped also that the new countries would be active members of the Air Sports Commissions. The commissions could help by holding their annual meetings in these regions.

8. Election of FAI Vice-Presidents for 2018/2019

The Secretary General invited the delegates to vote on the list of Vice-Presidents (**ANNEX 3**).

The General Conference unanimously approved the list of persons nominated to serve as FAI Vice-Presidents for 2018–2019.

9. Presentation & Election of Active Members on Air Sport General Commission (CASI)

The principal representatives of each country were invited to make a short presentation. There were six candidate countries for five vacant positions.

The candidates were: Australia (Terry CUBLEY), Czech Republic (Dagmar VITOVCOVA), Russia (Sergey ANANOV), Serbia (Zeljko OVUKA), Spain (Juan Ramón ALVAREZ CARAMAZANA), USA (Art GREENFIELD).

Mr LEINIKKI announced that voting slips would be distributed. Nothing had been pre-printed, so they were asked to write the names of up to five countries on their ballot papers. The candidates should be listed on each slip.

The following countries were elected: Australia, Russia, Serbia, Spain, USA .

The President congratulated the new CASI delegates and thanked Czech Republic for standing.

10. Report of the FAI Secretary General

The FAI Secretary General, Susanne SCHÖDEL, presented her report (**ANNEX 4**).

Looking at the air sports statistics, the number of classes and events were increasing continuously, and ASCs and NACs should start thinking more carefully about what this meant for them, since their resources were not increasing in step.

The FAI was a very complex environment and had to continue working on a strategy to decrease the complexity and encourage more young people into air sports. The Secretary General was convinced that the way forward, rather than hosting 60 category 1 events, was to promote the FAI World Air Games, where all the air sports could come together.

11. Report on FAI Finances 2017–2018

The FAI Finance Director, Jean-Claude WEBER announced that he would be reporting on financial matters (**ANNEX 5**) under Statutes 4.2.2.3 and 6.2.1.4 as Executive Director of Finance, and for the Executive Board under Statutes 4.2.2.4 and 4.2.2.5. They were jointly responsible to the General Conference for all decisions made on financial and accountancy matters between General Conferences.

He drew the delegates' attention to the report of the Auditors to the General Conference on the financial statements 2017, prepared by BDO as required by Statute 7.5.1 (**ANNEX 5**).

He wished to thank the Secretary General, the FAI accounting manager, Cosette MAST, and the FAI Finance Controller, Paola LOPEZ.

Mr WEBER reported that the FAI's strategies and policies, as approved by the GC, were being adhered to. There were continued and increased efforts to improve the FAI's financial situation. There were many promising initiatives in progress, designed to improve the organisation's finances, raise its profile and market value, in addition to the primary objective to develop air sports for the benefit of the members and air sport persons. They were continuing to improve the effectiveness of Head Office operations and establish an efficient controlling system for financial operations. They had also identified a need to analyse how the FAI's income and expenditures were generated, and find acceptable ways and methods to fairly share financial burdens and benefits.

All the stakeholders, air sport commissions and FAI members would ultimately be asked to contribute, but he was convinced that they would all benefit from the current initiatives. These efforts nevertheless came at a price. During the 2019 budget presentation they would be asked to approve a strategic budget, including a 10% increase in the scale of subscriptions. While some might consider this exaggerated, it reflected a constant decrease in membership revenues since 2012. In 2017 alone, membership revenues had decreased by CHF 48,000. They would also be requesting support for some ambitious projects for the FAI. Without an increase, the Head Office's ability to meet the challenges would be severely impaired, and several projects could be negatively affected. A clear commitment to invest in the future was required, in order to guarantee that the FAI could achieve its goals.

They were looking at the membership structure. Internal discussions had begun with various stakeholders in order to find the most efficient way of offering a sound and fair subscription scheme to members. The General Conference would obviously be consulted and kept informed of progress.

The financial situation remained critical. Because of the decrease in membership subscriptions, many operations were not covered by income. Everyone was aware that the FAI needed to generate more revenues if they wished to avoid spiralling deficits and maintain and develop their current high quality level of service to the air sports community. Efforts to commercialise existing events had failed because of a lack of ability to consistently control the events in a way that made them interesting to commercial partners. In the past they had been lucky to land partnerships with Rolex and Breitling, for instance, but these were unfortunately no longer available.

The Secretary General and the Sports Marketing Director would be presenting various potential revenue-generating projects in relation to events, membership, sponsors and partners.

The Secretary General reported that they had been planning for some time to improve the way the FAI's finances were reported. After discussing the opportunities with the auditors, it had been decided to implement the new approach for 2017. They had spent some time thinking through how the FAI worked, in order to represent it in a better report. She appreciated the cooperation with Mr Weber and the way the process had been managed.

She referred the members to the Auditors' Report by BDO, which already incorporated the new structure. She explained the new structure with the help of a slide presentation.

The finance report now had three main areas: overall FAI activities (membership revenues, commercial revenues, marketing and communication expenses, operating expenses); FAI competition activities (everything governed by the Commissions, World Air Games, World Games participation, other events); and other activities (financial income, bank charges, exchange rate gains or losses).

She noted that income and expenses related to the World Air Games had been recorded in two different areas – competition activities and FAI activities. This would be changed in future to make it more consistent.

Membership and commercial revenues were higher than originally budgeted, and marketing and communication expenses were lower. Operating expenses had been slightly higher. Looking at the special resources dedicated by the ASCs for their specific events, rather than an expected overall loss of CHF 38,000, there had been a positive outcome of CHF 41,000, which had been allocated to special reserves. There was additional income of CHF 215,000, in parts related to the fact that the GC had been hosted in Lausanne. Usually the conference budget was managed by the host, which in 2017 was the FAI. She noted that, when the 2017 budget had been presented, they had not mentioned the sport development provision of CHF 28,000; this had been used over two years and had now been dissolved.

From the income and expenses table it was clear that income had been better than budgeted and expenses were at planned levels. Commercial incomes generated a better than expected outcome. Competition revenues included additional income through the Wuhan Fly-in Expo, an event with which the FAI was proud to be connected.

An additional item was FAI drone permissions. Some countries had questioned how much FAI had raised with it. It was a sporting licence limited to people competing in Category 2 events for drone racing, because in 2017 and 2018 drone racing was emerging in some countries that did not have the structure accommodate it. The total amount concerned was CHF 500.

As usual there were some currency exchange gains and losses, but they were carried by the FAI central budget, not by the commissions. In other income, FAI had the 2017 General Conference and the International Drone Conference and Expo. For the project Air Games Events Series, not all of the CHF 370,000 had been spent, as the HO had been cautious in terms of marketing and communication activities.

The sports development programmes item covered everything related to drones, including the drones conference. There was a deviation above budget in administrative expenses for 2017, because the EB had decided to allocate funds for the launch of a strategy process.

The Secretary General wished to go into more detail on three projects. The first was the drone conference. The first edition had made a loss as expected, however, the FAI had marked its spot in the world of drones, in the drone industry and within the Olympic Movement. The EB had therefore decided to host a second edition in 2018, and by the end of the year would make a decision about 2019. She strongly urged everyone to participate. It was about safety, innovation and sport. A detailed report about the 2018 edition would be prepared, and distributed to the NACs.

The FAI had made an investment in hosting the General Conference in Switzerland in 2017. Positive points were the presence of the IOC President for the first time and the excellent quality of the conference. Nevertheless, if FAI were to hold the GC in Lausanne again, earlier planning would be necessary in order to recover the expenses.

The third project was air games events. The main items related to communication, media production and distribution. In 2017 the HO had talked to many hosts that were interested in air games, so there was a considerable list of interested potential hosts, particularly for drone events.

Finally, the HO had contacted all the major sports marketing agencies and asked if they would be interested in cooperating with the FAI. The EB had decided to partner with Lagardère Sports, specifically on drones.

Moving on to competition activities, all the FAI's competition activities would be aligned for 2018 and 2019 to ensure they were recorded in the same area. The World Air Games, World Games, World Championships, Continental Championships and Category 2 events would all be integrated in one area of the finance report, with their incomes and expenses. Reporting per air sport would nevertheless be maintained, including the use of reserves or allocation to reserves. This would, however, be more consistent and give a more complete picture of the FAI's activities.

As a final comment on competition activities, Head Office, Finance Director, the Executive Board and the Air Sports Commissions continued to improve reporting throughout the year. It was important to be able to understand what the commissions' big projects were, as it was an opportunity to create synergies and efficiencies.

Further discussions of selected items followed.

The President then asked to put this item to a vote. As there was no electronic system they would vote by show of hands.

The General Conference approved the 2017 Financial Report as presented with one vote against.

12. Discharge of the FAI Executive Board

The President invited the General Conference to discharge the FAI Executive Board of responsibility for the management of the FAI's affairs during the financial year 2017.

The General Conference agreed to discharge the FAI Executive Board of responsibility for the management of the FAI's financial affairs during the financial year 2017.

13. Open Forum / Proposals from NACs

Proposal by Dr Ronald Schnitker

Mr Ronald SCHNITKER reported that, at a meeting of the eight German-speaking countries a month before in Germany, they had discussed the problem of the decreasing number of air sport members,

and how to keep young people in air sports. He would present some statistics from the Netherlands and Belgium, which had been prepared by Ronald TERMAAT from the Dutch NAC and Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE, President of the Belgian NAC. The main question was: was there a future for aviation sports?

In the Netherlands, every year started and ended the same. There were always more members at the end of the year than at the beginning, but over the years there had been a two per cent decrease each year. He would focus on three air sports: paragliding, gliding and aeromodelling. He showed a slide with number of members per age group. Paragliding and aeromodelling were not expensive, and were relatively easy to do, but there were few young members. Glider pilots tended to start young, but there was a drop in membership between the ages of 20 and 45. They were getting older. In fact, 50% of members stopped within six years, 33% within three years and 10% within one year. The problem was not in finding young people but in keeping them.

Parachuting seemed to have no problem getting and keeping people across age groups, one possible reason being that you did not have to spend all day at an airfield. Exit interviews conducted over a 3-year period suggested that air sports flying was not particularly organised, compared with other sports. There were many rules but few events.

The Belgian NAC had recorded a decrease in the number of members. The closure of some airfields had led to a decline in the number of glider pilots. The sport was still organised in the same way as it had been 30 years ago, but the complexity had increased. There was less air space and more regulations. More non-aviation sports were available that offered a better balance between sport and private time. In air sports, after basic training, there was often little organised activity.

They should think about the product they were offering in these modern times. Time was limited for people who wanted to fly. It was perhaps time for a study group.

The President thought these statistics would be important for many NACs. A study group could be very useful in providing information to other NACs. The Executive Board would pick this up and look at some ideas.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS thanked Mr SCHNITKER for the presentation. He asked how the data had been collected, whether from local clubs and NACs or in general. He asked because his estimation as far as aeromodelling was concerned was somewhat different. The numbers of people and activities were similar, but most people focused their activities outside their club. These days, it was so easy to set up a Facebook group, so the local club was not needed. This was the main problem. They had to think how to keep the activity within their organisation.

Mr SCHNITKER replied that the data had been collected by the Secretary General. They knew exactly how many members there were at the beginning and end of the year for each air sport within the NAC. The other data from people leaving the sport was collected by asking them. They had sent out a form, and many had responded.

Air Space Manifesto

The President noted that at the last GC in Lausanne they had discussed the idea of a manifesto. A number of people in the Executive Board and NAC representatives had supported the idea raised by Ronald SCHNITKER from Netherlands, Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE from Belgium, and Andy CHAU from Hong Kong. The manifesto had been created with the help of Bob HENDERSON.

Mr SCHNITKER explained that this was a very important subject for the future of aviation sports. Air sports were challenging, educational and exciting. However unique they were, they shared one common feature: the use of air space. There were some strong competitors in terms of air space use, namely commercial air traffic and military aviation. The global demand for air space was significant. Due to the aggressive growth of military and commercial traffic in recent years, as well as the intensifying protection of natural resources, the authorities had imposed restrictions limiting air sports and recreational flying.

In Lausanne last year, he had raised this issue: who, in fact, was the owner of air space? Air sports had just as much right to use air space as commercial and military aviation. Because available air

space was a critical resource it should be conserved. He had pleaded for the FAI to intervene in securing the rights of air sports. In order to do so, the interests of this aviation sector must be addressed through international organisations like ICAO, EASA etc. so that air sports could take place in a balanced interaction with other recreational activities.

Therefore, the regulators and authorities responsible for air space management should observe the need for flexible use of air space for air sports. Unfortunately, there were a number of cases where restrictions had been implemented which had later proved to be unnecessary. It was common to find air space limited solely to the use of commercial or military aviation, thereby blocking air sports activities in these areas for no valid reason.

The FAI Executive Board had been invited to discuss this matter with international aviation organisations such as ICAO and EASA as a matter of urgency, and he had suggested drafting a manifesto. He had thus written a first draft of the manifesto, which had been submitted to the Board. Changes and improvements had been made, for which he thanked Jo VAN DE WOESTYNE, Andy CHAU, Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN and Bob HENDERSON. He was very satisfied with the result. He invited everyone present to sign the manifesto during the conference.

The issue of the constantly diminishing air space available for air sports had never been addressed before on such a global basis. Moreover, the subject of air sports rights had not been addressed in any international treaties, which was why he had taken the opportunity to write a small book on this issue, in association with a colleague in the Netherlands, Dick VAN HET KAAR. The issue of who owned the air space was laid down in the Chicago Convention, but the rights of air sports were not considered. The book also noted the increasing tendency of regulators and authorities to introduce additional formal licensing requirements for recreational aviators, often accompanied by significant cost increases, bureaucracy and time burdens. There was a strong need to simplify the relevant rules and regulations, and aviation regulators needed to accept that air sports needed special treatment in order to reduce costs and facilitate future growth.

One bright spot was that the European Aviation Safety Agency was working on a general aviation roadmap to introduce lighter and more efficient rules for general aviation, including air sports and recreational flying. All the delegates would receive a copy of the book.

He wished to present a copy of the book to some of the people who had encouraged him to write the manifesto and the book. He asked the President, Mr DE ORLEANS BORBÓN, Mr HENDERSON, Mr CHAU and Mr VAN DE WOESTYNE to step forward.

The President urged all the delegates to sign the manifesto (**ANNEX 6**) and hand copies to their national authorities. Mr SCHNITKER was a respected aviation lawyer and a pilot. He thought it was an important step that there be a manifesto with which to urge ICAO and member states to accommodate air sports in their regulations, in accordance with the intentions of the manifesto and the UNESCO charter. He was grateful to Mr SCHNITKER for his knowledge, and the book gave a very good overview of current legislation and the possibilities for the future.

A delegate thanked Mr SCHNITKER for this very significant and valuable gift to the air sports community.

The General Conference unanimously adopted the FAI Manifesto on Preserving Airspace Access for Air Sports.

Mr ANANOV thanked Mr SCHNITKER. However, he felt inspired to move from declarations and manifestos to actions. What was the next step? It reminded him of his idea of aeronautic mobility as a coming trend, which should be developed within the FAI. His suggestion for future discussion was to move towards practical steps and actions, such as founding an international council for aeronautic mobility, whose mission would be to discover and eliminate excessive regulations and unnecessary restrictions affecting private air travel; to remove regulatory changes to improve safety, flexibility, service and economy in private air travel; and to contact national and international regulatory bodies for the benefit of free air travel and recreational flight.

The President agreed that he would take this matter to the EB for discussion.

Mr Alan EVAN HANES said that in his limited experience, many regulators followed ICAO principles and wished to abide by ICAO audits. Unless the FAI involved itself in getting ICAO's support, they would not be able to break the barriers of mobility when it came to managing non-certified aircraft, which most members flew, as well as national pilots' licences, which did not have the same international acceptance. These two areas were key to gaining worldwide acceptance, even it meant the FAI creating its own auditors and inspectors, who could issue competitors with an FAI accredited licence that had been accepted by other countries. This would stop everyone having to re-certify, re-implement and re-look at everything again.

The Secretary General recalled that, recently, an article on how flight had changed, with new aircraft concepts and new technology, and was departing from the classic understanding of what planes were. This was an important topic to report to the next General Conference. The proposal from Mr ANANOV should be further developed considering the necessary resources, participants and workplan.

Mr Bob HENDERSON was mindful of the situation in Europe, where the Europe Air Sports had been fighting extremely hard for 25 years to protect the rights of sports pilots within the European environment. They had made some wonderful gains in terms of reducing restrictions on pilot licences and pilot medicals, reducing restrictions on maintenance and certification requirements, but it was a massive effort. The fact that resources were lacking to continue this kind of work had already been discussed.

The President noted that the past president of Europe Air Sports, David Roberts, was present and might like to say a few words.

Mr David ROBERTS congratulated the FAI and Mr SCHNITKER and others on this initiative. Although he had not read the document, he imagined it said most if not all the things that he would wish to see, in terms of air space for air sports. He nevertheless wished to emphasise that Europe Air Sports, within the European context, not just the European Union, had a vast knowledge and deep understanding of how difficult it was to bring about, not just changes in regulations, but changes in people's mindset. It was not a one-year or a five-year project, but a lifetime project. He invited the FAI to make its intentions known about what it wanted to achieve, but to be realistic about what was possible. It was hugely resource intensive. In the UK alone, they had fought over air space for many years. It was not a simple issue, and would not be resolved by making a resolution at a conference.

Mr HENDERSON said he thought in the near future FAI and EAS would have to work together.

Col. Agung SASONGKOJATI (Indonesia) noted that in his country they shared the air space with general aviation, which is why they had to be subject to the same regulations. This included a knowledge of radio telephony and medical checks, for instance. The problem lay not in preserving air space but in setting a minimum standard for their pilots. A pilot who was unfit should clearly not be allowed to fly, but a colour-blind pilot did not present a danger to the public.

14. FAI Strategy

The President explained that the FAI was looking into changing the way it worked, so as to better serve air sports. Every organisation that had been in existence for a long time should take the time to examine how it was working, what changes were taking place around them and how well they were prepared for the future. Last December the Executive Board had met specifically to discuss the big picture of air sports, the role of the FAI and whether it was fit for the future. During the workshop, the EB had concluded that air sports were in transformation, and the FAI was coming under pressure to successfully navigate the coming challenges. He handed over to Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS, who chaired the working group, to take them through the developments in this project.

Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS reported that at the end of the previous year the EB had begun to think about the big picture of air sports, and the role of the FAI, and to consider whether the FAI was fit for the future they faced. After that discussion they had come up with two assumptions about air sports: one, air sports were in transformation, and air sports were also under pressure. There was a shift

towards younger sports. Drone racing was a young sport, and when we started to have champions who were 7 years old, something very different was happening. There was also a geographic shift. There was tremendous growth in air sports in Asia and in the Arab countries. There was a lifestyle shift towards living in the moment, which contrasted with some air sports where it took some time to determine who the winner was. Not all audiences were willing to wait that long, so we had to take instant gratification into consideration. In addition, air sports were threatened by increasing regulation and air space restrictions. There was also increasing competition for the share of wallet and time.

The key challenges to the FAI to navigate this transformation were resources. Income from the NACs had remained static or declined for several years. FAI was trying to create income from other sources, but that took time, investment and more resources. Moreover, many of those people putting in time and effort were volunteers.

Volunteers had to be treated slightly differently from employees; if they were not treated properly they could simply leave. Another key challenge for the FAI was that the decision-making process within the FAI was fragmented, slow and often inconclusive. Conversations were repeated. Over recent years the EB felt there had been a lack of involvement by the NACs in what was going on in the FAI. There was a communication issue, clearly, but also a problem in actually getting the NACs involved in what was going on. On the other side, the air sports commissions might be very good at their own air sports and their own events, but less good at getting into other things in the FAI.

At their mid-year meeting in May in Istanbul a brainstorming session had taken place. There had been a great deal of frustration. People got involved in the FAI because they cared about air sport and wanted to share their passion, but were frustrated at not being able to move things forward. Information did not flow well through the FAI, and several people at the workshops had said that the inability to communicate was the FAI's biggest problem, along with a broken decision-making process combined with no follow-through.

The EB felt encouraged to continue the journey, and was hoping for the endorsement of the GC. Many air sports commissions and NAC representatives had taken part in a workshop in August, and she thanked those who had given their time. The discussions had been open and positive, and communication had not been a problem within these small groups. The WGs would work on developing some options and solutions, and bring some concrete proposals to the next GC.

Three key issues had emerged from the workshop in August: the role of the NACs, deeper involvement of the ASCs in decision making, and sporting licences. Three working groups had been set up to coordinate the analysis of the options. The EB was the steering committee of this process, and she was chair of the strategy working group whose members were Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN, Agust GUDMUNDSSON, David MONKS and Jean-Claude WEBER. There was also a working group on the role of the NACs, led by Bengt LINDGREN, and a working group on sporting licences led by Antonis PAPADOPOULOS.

She asked for the cooperation of the GC, their contribution where they had ideas, and their trust that they were looking for ways to keep the FAI on track, or perhaps correct course if needed. The working groups would share their work, and honestly seek feedback.

The first outcomes, principles and ideas for moving forward were as follows. Changes were being discussed in five distinct areas. 1) Refining or redefining the purpose of the FAI – they had discussed how much they cared about air sports people who were not competitors, and where they fit into the organisation. 2) The role of the NACs. 3) Involvement of the air sports commissions. 4) Sporting licences. 5) General issues.

With this process, it was hoped that everyone could recommit to the FAI as an organisation. They wanted it to be beneficial for all countries and all air sports; a place where countries could talk to each other, and offer and receive support; and where air sports could exchange innovative ideas and avoid reinventing wheels. It was about trying to work together towards a common goal. A framework had been created, taking into consideration much of the discussion from the workshop, which would be refined as they went along, and she welcomed feedback on it. The intention was to put it together into a refined purpose statement that everyone could support.

She introduced Mr Lindgren to talk about their work on the NACs.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN noted that Gillian RAYNER had led an investigation a couple of years ago involving all the NACs. In the workshops they had also discussed the NACs, what their role was, how they communicated with each other and how they interfered with each other. They had learned that the internal structure of the FAI was not very clear; it was not clear how decisions were made, and how new people or new NACs could get involved. It should be easier for people to understand how the FAI worked. Why should people attend board meetings or general conferences? They had concluded that a handbook was needed, to explain the central functions of the FAI, the air sport commissions, the GC and the EB. They also had to explain the dates and deadlines for submitting candidacies for various functions. Then there was the issue of the NACs and how they were structured. The common version, used by Italy, Norway and Germany, had everything under one roof. The corporate version (USA, Sweden and France) had separate national entities to deal with each air sport. Then there were the newcomers, which started out with one sport. Which model should they follow? A working group comprising himself, Ronald SCHNITKER and Antonis PAPAPOULOS would make a draft, which they would send to the air sports commissions and selected NACs. After the corrections were made the goal was to present the draft at the mid-year meeting, after which the handbook would be available to use.

Mrs STEVENS noted that ASC representatives had said they wanted to be more involved in the FAI's decision-making processes. There was unanimous agreement that this was a good idea. However, what did "more involved" actually mean? Some thought it meant more involvement in financial decisions, others thought it meant more involvement in sports events. Would it have an impact if the ASCs were deeply involved, and would this affect the involvement of the NACs? Should both the NACs and ASCs take a more active role, or should decision-making remain with the EB? There were several options as to how the ASCs could be more involved. One that had been discussed at the workshop was whether some or all of the ASC Presidents should be part of the EB, or if ASCs should appoint members to the EB. After more discussion there was also consideration of whether a new body should be created in the governance structure to bring in feedback and collaboration of the ASCs. There could be new formal consultation structures, or they could optimise the structures they already had. The aim of this discussion was to improve communication and come up with the most effective collaboration between the NACs, ASCs and EB. One consideration was size: how large was too large for an EB? Decision making was already slow. Currently, anyone joining the EB was expected to withdraw from their ASC or NAC and act for the benefit of the FAI as a whole. In that case, what would happen if they created an EB with representative members? The cost would depend on how big the EB was and how often it met. There were many factors to consider.

She handed over to Antonis PAPAPOULOS for a discussion of sporting licences.

Mr Antonis PAPAPOULOS noted that FAI had been talking about sporting licences for a long time. At the August meeting they had started out with many opinions of what a sporting licence was and why it was needed. He had chosen to be in this team because he was not ready to accept that the FAI could not find a solution. In fact, he had ended up alone in the working group, but he had exchanged ideas with many people. What he was about to present was not a decision but a trigger for discussion. First, what were sporting licences for, why were they needed and what was their current status? Other federations had a similar concept, so the FAI did not need to reinvent the wheel. The previous year, the GC had taken a decision to establish a task force, but it had not worked so well.

Sporting licences were useful for various reasons. First, by acquiring a sporting licence, the air sport person declared their acceptance of the FAI and NAC rules, and acceptance of the authority of the FAI and NAC to organise events and everything relating to air sports. The person was also declaring their nationality, and how they could participate in category 1 or category 2 events, make record attempts or earn awards, depending on the commission rules. The NAC and FAI benefited from the sporting licences because it gave them a unique ID for each individual, which was vital in managing events. Contact details could be checked in the FAI licence database. It was not easy to manage sporting licences fairly and consistently across countries; currently it was up to the NACs to issue or

register sporting licences, and some provided it free of charge while others charged a fee. The effect of this was that not all competitors had the same opportunities to participate in international competition. Currently, data management was static – once a person was entered into the database their contact information was rarely changed, which occasionally made it difficult to find people. The existing database contained a lot of obsolete data, which made it unreliable. Nevertheless, the FAI was not the only international sports federation that required sporting licences for participation in events, so he had been curious to see how other IFs managed this issue. The sailing federation issued a “sailor’s card”; FIFA used a blue card, which identified a player’s club. The orienteering federation used a similar system to the FAI, but with different levels granting different access. The idea presented at the workshop, and now to the GC, was that the new edition of the sporting licence would have different levels. The first level would be available for anyone who considered themselves an air sport person to register themselves with the FAI and submit their details. These people would be members of the “Air Sport Society”. This process would obviously require a well-designed database with the necessary resources to maintain it. The people concerned would input their own data and pay a small annual fee towards maintenance of the system. This sporting licence (if they decided to keep that name) would entitle holders to know more about the FAI and receive circulars and news, but would not give access to sports events, record attempts or badges.

In the next step, those interested in finding out more about competitions could express their interest through the database, the relevant NAC would be informed immediately and, once accepted, the person would become a level 2 licence holder, and entitled to participate in category 2 events only. Indeed, competitors in category 2 events were currently able to register themselves without NAC approval, so it made sense that the licences would work in the same way. The fees would be slightly higher. Finally, a competitor looking to participate in a category 1 event would be declared to the NAC and moved to level 3. The fee would be higher once again. For levels 2 and 3 there could be a fee waiver, which meant that the NAC would be able to take some money back from the FAI.

A system with different levels offered several benefits. It made the benefits of the FAI available to more people, even hobbyists. Having fixed prices would make it fairer to competitors, and they would still have the same opportunities. This was still just an idea, but he would welcome input from anyone willing to contribute to taking it further.

Mrs STEVENS noted that they had also discussed improving communications in all directions. The FAI was a matrix organisation, with the Air Sport Commissions and the NACs; the NACs sent delegates to the ASCs, and everyone voted for the EB. Everyone had to talk to everyone else. Over the next few months, the working groups and EB would look at what the organisational design of the FAI should be, and investigate ways to maximise the integration of the parts. It was probably designed perfectly for what it was intended to do in 1905, but it might now be time for a change.

As they were being developed, the options would be shared with the members and feedback would be welcomed. The aim was to have proposals ready for discussion at the next mid-year meeting, leading to proposals for consideration at the next General Conference. This was an ambitious time frame.

The President invited comments and questions on the procedure. The content was best left for discussion within the working groups.

Mr MACHULA had a question regarding the cost of this planning. For the World Air Games they had budgeted one million Swiss francs over three years.

Mrs STEVENS replied that it had been allocated in the budget. There was a cost to the workshop because they had used a facilitator, and there was a cost to the ASCs to come and participate in the workshop. It was not a huge amount, and it would be more than worthwhile if they could get the organisation functioning better, from a relatively small investment. All the members of the various working groups were volunteers.

Mr MACHULA responded that there would definitely be a cost because there was travel and meetings. He would be more convinced if he could see a slide with a projection of what this cost would be for next year and the coming years, in the nature of an investment plan, as he had already mentioned.

The Secretary General noted that the strategy work had taken place alongside meetings that the FAI had already organised. There had been one additional meeting in August. This was nevertheless not a budget that needed an investment plan for the coming year.

Mr ANANOV thanked them for the presentation. It was long-awaited and raised many issues and questions. As a NAC, two crucial issues had been raised, and he wished to express his concerns about the new sporting licence idea and NAC regulations.

Mrs STEVENS noted that this was not the time or place for that discussion. They were now discussing only the process. The content would come in the working groups, where his participation would be welcomed.

Mr Terry CUBLEY noted that in terms of the overall thrust of the strategy he was quite comfortable with where they had got to, provided there was a good opportunity for the membership to participate in that discussion. He had concerns about the proposal for the sporting licences. He did not believe the solution put forward responded to the issues raised, for the reason of the cost to the air sport persons and data management. It sounded like a desire to centralise the whole thing with the FAI, which meant more people working in the FAI, for which they would need to charge. At the moment the NAC was paying money to the FAI, so the payment made by the NAC would need to reduce. He was not convinced that it would actually result in a proper connection to what was going on. FAI would end up with a centralised system that was very costly, and NACs would lose some control. From a process perspective he thought that, before FAI spent more money, HO should have a sense check as to whether the GC thought it was worth focusing just on that solution, or whether they should look for other ones. He would like first to focus on whether they were headed in the right direction with the workshops. If the answer was yes then they should continue. If alternatives were proposed that that was a good way to change direction.

Mrs STEVENS clarified that this was one option, and the door was wide open to other options. If Mr Cubley or someone else from his NAC would like to volunteer to participate in the working group they would be very welcome.

Mr Cubley said he would be happy to join the working group.

Mr HACHAMI thought this was a step forward to making some important changes for the development of air sports all over the world. His proposal would be to create one large commission to consider these proposals. Perhaps four days before the next GC in Marrakesh they should prepare a practical proposal for submission. This would make financial sense because people would already be flying there, and it would only require an additional four days.

Mrs STEVENS said they looked forward to presenting their proposals in Marrakesh.

Mr Vladimir MACHULA said he had the feeling from the presentation that the NACs were considered to be evil.

Mrs STEVENS denied that this was her intention.

Mr MACHULA said that this was the impression he had received: that the NACs had to communicate more, the NACs had to do more, etc. This might be true, but they had to consider event organisation. Speaking for his own NAC, the FAI did little more than send invoices for sanction fees. There were no other services. This year his NAC had held four class one events, but there was not one mention of them on FAI social media or the FAI website. They had also hosted three world championships. That was the reality.

Mrs STEVENS replied that their intention was to improve things all round. But there was no intention to portray the NACs as evil. Everyone had to try to figure out how they could work together better.

The President said he thought the Czech delegate had given the perfect answer as to why it was necessary to continue with this project. He would be happy if Mr MACHULA would agree to participate in the working group discussions.

Mrs Elsa MAI said that her NAC serviced its pilots well. She also tried to communicate on many sporting licence issues, and her position was well known. The highest penalty that could be imposed on any pilot was to withdraw their FAI sporting licence.

Mrs STEVENS pointed out that they should not be discussing sporting licences now. She invited Mrs Mai to join Mr Papadopoulos' working group.

Mr Pavlo KAVKA (Slovakia) noted that the General Conference could make any decision it chose, but he urged them not to open a discussion about sporting licences or processes without having the details available. The manifesto was excellent: everything was written down, they could discuss it with their NACs. They needed more detail on money, systems, etc., in writing, in order to be able to discuss it properly and then vote.

Mrs STEVENS clarified that they were early on in the process. She did not expect a lot of discussion, but hoped that people would contribute to the ongoing work.

Mr Ray PEARSON asked how the process would be formatted to individuals, NACs etc. Would there be discussion groups to which anyone could contribute? How would people review or comment on the process?

Mrs STEVENS said they had not yet figured that out. They had some suggestions, but once a decision had been made they would send out a message to all the NACs and ASCs, and invite everyone to participate.

Mr MALBOS said that, as the person who had kicked the hornet's nest three years ago, he felt he should say a few words. He thought these two projects were incredibly important. They would be life-changing for the FAI, but they were very intricate programmes that required a great deal of thought. The working groups had to be open, so that anyone who wanted to contribute could do so. They were not hand-picked people. There had to be intermediate reports, not just one mid-year and another with the agenda. They were creating a new FAI, and they could not fail. The commissions were very conscious that they needed to bring in new NACs, because they found the sports people, organised competitions, sent national teams, trained pilots etc. But the NACs had to understand the problem the ASCs had running their competitions. Things could not continue as they were. They had to find a solution that met the needs of both the ASCs and the NACs.

The President thanked Mr MALBOS for his comment. He was happy to see that some of the ASC presidents had already asked the EB to decide on a process. He thanked Mrs Stevens and the working groups, and urged everyone present to participate in the discussions, give comments and suggest ideas for what they wanted.

15. FAI Multi Airsport Events

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.

15.2. FAI Air Games

The Secretary General gave a brief summary on the status of discussions on the FAI Air Games. There was a draft Air Games concept document, but it was not yet ready to be distributed. When the FAI had launched the Air Games Event Series in 2015/2016 the idea was to first promote the concept to sponsors, hosts, bidders and marketing agencies and, in parallel, discuss and further develop the concept in FAI. They had had many conversations, and it had been levered up to a degree, but it had proved to be difficult to achieve because many questions had come up, such as what was the actual sporting event format? Was it a group of competitors who went to all the events each year? Or one event per year? One event per continent? Would there be different competitors? What were the incentives for competitors? Who covered the costs? How much did it cost? Who were the officials who would run the event, and what would be the conditions for their participation?

These questions were similar to those for the World Air Games, but they showed that the FAI was not yet ready to launch such a global event series. The current Air Games concept was the idea of multi air sports discipline events with a regional scope, in between the regular World Air Games. Some event organisers indeed had expressed an interest in combining a competitive FAI event with an existing air sports event. Organisers of such events in the Philippines, Japan and Brazil had already expressed interest. Discussions were ongoing on such air games with a local reach, organised by existing local event organisers keen to expand their presentation of air sports activities.

A concept document had been drafted and provided to the ASCs in the summer. Discussions were ongoing, and there were some questions that still needed to be answered.

Mr Vladimir MACHULA noted that a significant budget had been spent but all was a nice document. As he had said in Rotterdam, where this had been proposed, it was impossible for the FAI to go ahead with this strategy. It was a huge waste of money even to contemplate. There had to be a completely different approach. He had done four events, not just in the Czech Republic, and he knew what he was talking about.

The Secretary General asked Mr MACHULA not to use numbers in an irresponsible way and that, secondly, from the start, the air games event series budget had included a communication budget, in order to promote selected category one events. In the past, there had been events in the Czech Republic which had been covered by funds from this air games budget. Thus, things had been achieved.

16. Multi Sports Events

16.1. Olympic Council of Asia

See **ANNEX 8**.

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON reminded the delegates that the Asian Games came under the umbrella of the Olympic Council of Asia (OCA). The FAI had concluded a MoU with the OCA, and they were now working on the next Asian Games. The FAI had participated in many multi-sport games over the years, where air sports were just one of many sports. The same applied to the World Games, the Asian Beach Games, etc. They were also looking strategically into how to ensure air sports were part of other multi-sports games. Up to now, in many cases it was the games organisers themselves that asked to include air sports, but the FAI needed to establish its own strategy, with a view to incorporating more air sports.

As far as the Asian Games were concerned, it was important to understand that air sport was just one of around 40 sports. The games were based on the Olympic Games format, and the FAI controlled nothing but its own sport. Although they were used to being able to decide everything, here they were limited by the games structure and organisation. To take one simple example, medals were separated into men's and women's events, which was a foreign concept in the FAI. Everyone involved, including pilots, team leaders, workers and volunteers, had to have an accreditation, which meant registering and being approved at least four months before the competition. Background

security checks were carried out on everyone. There were also restrictions on who was allowed in the landing zone, and who was permitted to take photos.

There had been many conflicts and problems during the preparations due to a lack of alignment with the stakeholders, which were the OCA and the Indonesian organisers. There was a lack of teamwork, which was a lesson they had to take seriously. Although there were no FAI officials running the show, FAI rules were used as much as possible. However, there had been some issues with some rules, which was another matter the FAI needed to look into for these and other multi-sports events.

As far as the competitors were concerned, they went home with Olympic-level medals, and air sports were treated differently as a result. The direct effects of this were clear to see, in that paragliding was attracting more government support, and possibilities were opening up. This had to be taken seriously, because it was helping the FAI, helping the pilots and helping to develop the sport.

Mr Stéphane MALBOS noted that he had been at the actual games, and had played a very difficult role, before, during and after the event. Many things had gone wrong. The issues had been discussed at length two days ago so he would not go back over them. He wished to read the conclusion of Elsa Mai, who had been the CIVL official for the Asian Games. She had said that the Asian Games were a big hat to wear, and if the FAI were to venture into multi-events they should go into them fully prepared, with full control, instead of being led by the nose as they had been at this Indonesian event. It was far from perfect, it had been bumpy and horrible, but they were learning from it. When they went into such big events they had to be strong, and defend the FAI values and roles, and the concept of fairness.

The President agreed that the issues had been discussed at length. He had been in contact before, during and after the games with the OCA, and later had held a meeting with the OCA Sports Director, to ensure the same situation did not arise again.

Mr GUDMUNDSSON added that this was not an FAI sanctioned event. Part of the bad result was that was that the pilots were not of an acceptable standard. There had been accidents, attributable in part to the experience levels of the pilots. If the FAI had been in charge they would not have been accepted. Many of the pilots had never flown a cross-country competition and yet they were competing at an Olympic level.

Mrs Elsa MAI added that the OCA had announced to the world that they were using FAI rules, but they were actually using their own rules. Everything had been changed. They wanted to use the FAI name and logo because the FAI had a good reputation and a good standard, but this had tarnished the FAI name. They had to put a stop to this and ensure the FAI had full control in the future.

Mr GUDMUNDSSON wished to make it clear that the FAI had told the OCA right after the games, and even during the games, that this was not how things should work, which was why they had agreed two weeks ago that in the future the air sports competition would be led by the FAI, under FAI rules.

The Secretary General added that the FAI was a member of the World Games Association, attended general assemblies and was involved in establishing the programme, selections and applications. This was very different to the other Olympic Movement events. The FAI was an IOC recognised federation but it was not a member of the OCA and had less influence over what went on. Nevertheless, the Charter of the OCA stated that the rules of events taking place in the Asian Games were based on the rules of the IFs. It was a question of how much they were able to influence the OCA, and it was far more difficult than, for example, the World Games. The FAI should be very strong when committing to these kinds of events.

16.2. The World Games 2021 in Birmingham, Alabama

See **ANNEX 9**.

The Sports Director explained that in the World Games context, the FAI was part of a multi-sport environment. He suggested that by being part of this environment the FAI benefited from seeing,

learning and creating connections with how other federations ran their sports. This was already a major asset. Multi-sports games were about more than merely participation, they were something from which the FAI could benefit greatly.

The federations of athletics, aquatics, cycling, golf, gymnastics, rowing and triathlon had recently agreed to host their World Championships together, as part of the European Championships, held in parallel in the UK and Germany. These were all rich, powerful Olympic federations with a substantial television following, and yet they had all identified a benefit in joining forces to work on something big, together.

He introduced Greg PYZALKA, who had worked as sports director for the World Games in Wrocław, Poland, and would be helping the FAI to deliver the World Drone Championships and other major events.

The Sports Director showed a video clip of air sports at the World Games. The IWGA had accepted the FAI's proposal to send skydivers and drone pilots to the next event, which was in 2021 in Birmingham, Alabama. The IWGA was committed to equal participation of men and women, which would be a challenge for the male-dominated sports of skydiving and drone racing. They had three years to achieve this goal. Moreover, given that the IWGA was so close to the Olympic movement, professional presentation was also important. The FAI had a great opportunity to use the World Games Plaza to present air sports, under the leadership of the US NAA.

Generally, the FAI was one of many sports organisations seeking to create new opportunities to present their sports to the world, all of which were competing for exposure and money. He briefly mentioned the World Urban Games, which was interested in developing air sports disciplines for presentation in a city environment, and presenting them in an appealing way. The FAI had proposed drone racing and indoor skydiving as possible events. In general, the FAI had a great deal to offer these multi-sports events because air sports were entertaining and exciting. He felt that having a great day on the airfield was the best thing they could do to develop their sport.

16.3. Indoor Skydiving / Olympic Project

Mrs Gillian RAYNER noted that Parachuting had been included in multi-sports events for many years, which suggested it was an attractive discipline, although it had never made it to the Olympic Games. When Paris had first bid for the 2024 Olympic Games the French Parachute Federation thought this might be an opportunity, and had lobbied for the discipline of indoor skydiving to be included. It was a young, dynamic and fast-growing discipline. There were currently 264 tunnels in operation around the world, including 50 in Asia. It was not weather-dependent, it was easy to film, and there was an existing wind tunnel in La Villette, the site of the Olympic Village. It was also possible to install mobile wind tunnels wherever the Organising Committee chose, within the Paris area. A MoU had been signed with iFly, owner and operator of the La Villette wind tunnel. They also had the support of the IPC, FAI EB, the French NOC and NAC, and the National Council of Air Sport Federations in France.

The SPORTS DIRECTOR explained that since Paris had been chosen as host they had upped their game, and had produced a video and brochures, and organised demonstration events. He showed a brief video.

The actual bidding process would take place over the next 6 to 8 months, and the FAI had to be ready. They needed maximum visibility for all indoor competitions. The chances of success were slim, but this was a unique opportunity to help put air sports on the IOC's radar. He thanked all the NACs that had given their support and encouragement, and who had written to their NOCs.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN wished to stress the importance of this opportunity. 75% of those present lived in cities, which up to now had been largely excluded from air sports. Indoor skydiving provided a valuable opportunity to penetrate cities with air sports.

The President thanked Ms RAYNER for her presentation. He asked for the General Conference to endorse this project.

17. Call for nominations for Election of the FAI President

The President asked if there were any nominations for the position of FAI President.

A delegate from Spain said he had nothing against the current President or the work he had done, but Spain believed that, in the event of any important election decision, the General Conference should have more than one choice, in the interests of democratic health. Therefore Spain wished to nominate another candidate for President: Mr Bob HENDERSON of New Zealand, who was currently serving on the Executive Board.

Mr Ronald SCHNITKER wished to note that Mr Frits BRINK was so excellent he needed no recommendation, no campaign. During his first term as President he had been always visible, available and caring about the FAI. He had used the opportunity to present the FAI and communicate with representatives of air sports events around the world. He was experienced, and still available and interested in preparing the FAI for the next decade. He recommended that everyone vote for Frits BRINK.

The President thanked them for their nominations. The candidates now had an opportunity to introduce themselves in alphabetical order by country, the Netherlands first, followed by New Zealand.

In September Mr Frits BRINK had sent a letter presenting his candidature for the position of FAI President for the coming four years. He was very much in favour of a four-year team, because this was common in many sports federations. The FAI was represented on many other organisations, such as SportAccord, and in contacts with the IOC, commercial partners, NACs and Air Sports Commissions, which was why he thought four years was a good solution. He was happy to stand again because a great deal could happen in the next two years. The FAI needed to make some big changes, not because what they had done previously was wrong, but because the world had changed, and they had to change the way their organisation was governed. This would not be achieved by choosing a new person, but by following up the decisions that had already been made, over the next two and possibly four years. The changes that had already been made included the FAI's Olympic aspirations, and its inclusion in the Asian Games. They had good contacts with the Olympic Council of Asia, and such personal contacts were an important part of how things worked in the sports world. He looked forward to working with the Executive Board over the next four years, after which time perhaps one of them would become the new president. If in four years' time someone came along who he thought could do a better job as President than he, he would stand down. In the meantime, however, he would be very happy to continue working for the FAI for the next four years, and would appreciate their votes.

Mr Bob HENDERSON noted that he had come with the intention of leaving the Executive Board feeling that he had contributed what he could to the organisation over the last 21 years. With great respect to Mr Brink, he believed that Spain had made a reasonable suggestion, which was to have a contested election. The Maori had a saying that the most important thing in the world was people. The FAI was at a crossroads. The organisation had tremendous opportunities and significant challenges. Resources were stretched. They had to start being very careful and be precise about how they moved forward, and make sure it could be resourced and did not just burn money. They had been using funds to invest, and to find out what they could and could not do. Not everything FAI did was successful. The FAI was the only organisation whose sports took place in the sky, and they were the experts. What they were not experts at was telling the rest of the world about that. They had to work together to make that happen, support each other, stop having circular arguments and move the organisation forward. The FAI could move forward, and could create a massive and wonderful aviation activity that they could all be proud of, and hand over to the next generation. The Maori had a simple lesson about strategic thinking; when they thought about changes, they thought about how they would impact the seventh generation – a 175-year horizon. What was decided tomorrow had to be right for the seventh generation.

18. Roll-Call of Delegations

The President opened the session by inviting all the delegates to stand for a moment in silent tribute to a Russian pilot who had died the previous day in an accident at the FAI World Paramotor Slalom Championships.

Mr Markus HAGGENEY conducted the roll call and confirmed the proxies for the second day of meetings.

19. Sports Development

19.1. Drone Sports in FAI

See ANNEX 10.

The Secretary General invited Mr Bruno DELOR to join her in presenting this item. There was excellent cooperation with FAI Head Office and the EB.

Mr Bruno DELOR presented his report with the help of a slide presentation. He explained the concept of the Drone Racing World Cup, which was a list of events registered on the calendar by FAI members. For 2018 they had more than 20 World Cup events, and entry was open to all competitors with a valid licence or FAI permission. Every placed competitor earned points. This year's winner was a 14-year-old who had entered the sport a year before, after starting out in e-gaming, which showed that it provided a good opportunity for the FAI. The number of participants had grown approximately 50% year-on-year, since the first edition in 2016, and it was clear that the majority did not know about the FAI or aeromodelling, and they were interested to find out. The number of juniors in the sport was very high, and increasing. With 12 of the 22 competitions won by juniors, and juniors taking six of the top eight places, the new issue was how to give seniors a chance. This was a new problem, and a good one to have.

He introduced the forthcoming World Drone Racing Championships, due to take place in Shenzhen, China, the following week. 130 competitors had registered from 34 countries for the inaugural event, which would be live-streamed. Each country had been given the opportunity to add one extra female competitor. Thirteen countries had therefore registered women, and there would be a women's world championship title.

When discussions had begun with Lagardère Sports the year before, the verdict had been that they had a good product but not a good package. In the meantime, therefore, the format had been changed completely. One World Championship each year was not enough – there had to be a more complete set of events in different areas of the world. That was why, for 2019, the World Championships would be combined with the World Cup. They would be named “Challenger” events, and every country would be able to register a Challenger World Cup Event on the calendar. They were also considering four Masters events, to attract the best in the world. At the end of the year there would be the World Championship Grand Final in Shenzhen. The best-placed World Cup competitors would be invited, and the NACs would be encouraged to select additional competitors in order to have a complete team to compete for the team rankings. This was the package that would be offered to potential partners. In all there would be 20 Challenger Events around the world.

The Secretary General noted that the partner brochure for 2019 events would be sent out to FAI members and interested host cities in the next few days.

She pointed out that this event series was a result of all the work they had done over the last few years on the world air games event series. It was one conclusion of the questions they had asked: how should air sports events be presented? Whom should FAI partner with? What resources were needed? What role should the FAI play? It was a complex organisation that involved cooperation between the municipality of Shenzhen, the Chinese NAC, the Kaisa Group and Lagardère Sports. They were also working with the Olympic Channel.

Next, she would present the situation in terms of possible external partners joining the FAI to help with resources. There was interest from potential investors, which required good preparation. She showed an extract from the presentation used in conversations with potential investors, giving insight into the FAI as the global governing body for air sports and drone racing, what drone racing was about and where they wanted to go. The aim was to have a global standardised platform for these events. Five critical success factors had been identified, and the respective roles of the partner and FAI had been set out. The partner and the FAI would come together to create a new company to manage drone racing events, with the FAI maintaining control over the important parts.

Conversations were ongoing with potential investors, and one in particular which managed a global portfolio of sports, media and entertainment venues. There was a business plan and a draft MoU under discussion. It had the support of the EB, and the GC would be kept informed of developments.

The President thanked the Secretary General and Mr DELOR for their presentation.

Mr Greg PRINCIPATO thanked them for this interesting information. He agreed that the FAI needed to be at the forefront of drone racing. He had heard many words such as “maybe”, “possibly” and “potentially”. He asked for some reassurance that the FAI was not making decisions that it would go ahead and implement, regardless of whether the money came in, as perhaps had occurred in the past.

The Secretary General thanked Mr PRINCIPATO for his important comment. The HO saw two development paths. One, if they did not get any external investors on board and could not agree on a joint venture, they would organise Masters events according to the available resources. They would not commit to anything they could not manage. With Shenzhen they had already seen what it meant to manage such a large event, so it was clear what were the boundaries of what could be achieved. However, if they did come to an agreement, they would have resources, and that was a pre-condition to go into such a partnership.

A delegate from Morocco asked if the FAI had a strategy for making drone racing more acceptable across the world. For security reasons, drones had been banned in Morocco, and many countries saw drones as difficult to control.

Mr DELOR said that where drone racing was concerned it was relatively easy to convince the regulatory organisations. Drone racing happened below ten metres, which did not interfere with airspace. It was not difficult to install safety nets if necessary. Another issue was line of sight. In drone racing the drone was not always in line of sight, so competitors were now obliged to have a helper, which solved this problem. He thought that, because of their experience, there were enough guarantees now in the rules for any country that had problems to convince their regulatory organisation.

The Secretary General added that the FAI was very active in EASA, to represent the interests of aeromodelling and all air sports, and also in JARUS, the international network of Civil Aviation Authorities. Nevertheless, it was very important that the NACs maintain permanent contact with the civil aviation authority in their country, to explain what air sports were about and provide safety assistance. They could train drone pilots and educate them about safe flying. This was an asset for the NAC as well as a responsibility. And finally, the International Drones Conference brought all these people together to make presentations on what was happening in the world of drones, and to show what the FAI's and the NACs' interests were.

She noted that Indonesia was a good example of how to manage drones. She encouraged other NACs to take the same approach.

Col. Agung SASONGKOJATI explained that there were various international and national drone regulations, including those established by the FAA in the United States, which his country had adopted. Drones were defined as either commercial or recreational. Generally, the country's national civil aviation authority controlled commercial drones, and the recreational kind ought to be governed by the model aircraft community, which meant the NAC. He had made an offer to take this over in his country. He had established a certification process and instituted medical check-ups, and was

now responsible for awarding remote pilot licences. The aviation agency had then approached him to certify commercial pilots, with the result that the NAC now controlled 95% of drones in Indonesia.

Mr. Terry CUBLEY asked who was managing and underwriting the competition in Shenzhen. Was it an FAI activity or a CIAM activity, or was it a commercial activity in which the FAI was involved?

Second, he echoed some of the concerns expressed already. It was an excellent opportunity, but it sounded like they would sink a great deal of money in trying to set up as a commercial organisation. They needed some other organisation to do that, in which case how did they stop that commercial operation or an opposing one from taking it all over and ignoring the FAI?

The Secretary General responded to the first point by saying that the contract for Shenzhen had been signed by the FAI, the NAC, the Kaisa Group, which was operating the venue and providing logistics and infrastructure, and the municipality of Shenzhen. CIAM was an integral part of the FAI.

On the second point, there was an inherent danger that someone could come along and say "I'm going to make drone racing and I don't care about the FAI." They could not prevent that happening. However, they had good relations with some others working in the business, and knew how they were making progress. For instance, they would have a meeting in Shenzhen with the Drone Champions League to explore ways of cooperating. Regarding the entity to be set up, the condition was that the FAI would retain control of all the most important elements.

Mr Vladimir MACHULA noted that this year had seen many championships in a range of disciplines. However, looking at the FAI website and social media feeds, there was nothing but drone news and a few minor items on other sports. The drone conference should not be at the top of the news feed on the FAI website when there were gliding championships, aerobatic championships, etc. It was about sustainable growth: they could not kick out all the other sports and disciplines in order to prioritise something that was currently sexy for the media, if they wanted to be around for another 100 years. His second point was about the joint venture. They had already had a few joint ventures, and ideas for connecting with people who didn't really have much money. They said they would provide funds if they found someone, but they kept part of the money. This was not actual sponsorship, it was a venture with someone else who was promising to secure funds from media and other things. He would appreciate hearing more details, and having more cooperation rather than secret agreements.

The Secretary General replied that she also thought the gliding championships were very sexy, however the drone racing championships were about to start in three days' time. It was natural there should be a focus on that event at the moment. Mr MACHULA could be assured that in a month's time there would be other news about other important air sports events at the top of the list.

She had presented the communication plan, which showed the number of events the FAI was covering with attention. There were 60 championships per year, and it was impossible to cover them all.

As far as the joint venture was concerned, the potential investors FAI were talking to had the funds available to put money into a new company. They had a management team and they knew what they were doing. Discussions were still ongoing and it was not the right moment to go public with further information.

Mr David ROBERTS had a few comments, as an observer. 51% gave them equity control and also implied 51% of the capital. They should be very careful about how the venture was financed, both at the equity level and the operational level, because they had seen a history of this in the past.

Second, although he had heard about controls, he had not heard anything about the financial risk boundaries that had been determined, beyond which they would not go. There had been some talk about process but not about financial risks and rewards.

Third, on projects like these, there should be very clear gates along the way, because unless those gates were fully open or fully working the project should be stopped.

Finally, he had an observation about the FAI as a brand. As Mr DELOR had said earlier, no one understood who the FAI was. Of course they did not, because they were not involved in air sports.

Other global sports organisations did not promote themselves as the IF. In the case of motor sports, they promoted themselves as Formula One, or golf, or tennis. One of the things they should look at, in developing the FAI presence in various air sports, was how the branding came across. FAI meant nothing to anyone outside this room. They would be pushing water uphill without a bucket, to get FAI accepted as the international brand.

The Secretary General said that she fully agreed with the first point. Regarding the second point, they could only move on if they had the funds secured, which was the case for Shenzhen, for example. She had reported for 2018 that they had received a significant amount to cover what the FAI contributed; it covered all the costs, and there was a sanction fee on top of that. That was the principle on which the agreement would proceed.

On the third point, it would depend on what kind of interest they received, for example, for the masters events. They were unlikely to go into a venue where there was no experience with drone racing or air sports, and no involvement with the NAC, or no capability to manage such events.

Fourth, about branding, there were different views within the FAI. Some believed it should be primarily the sport that should be put in front, and others thought they should mention the FAI. They had just had the question about the World Air Games. Did they promote the World Air Games 2020 or the FAI World Air Games 2020? Looking at the Formula One page, it had the FIA logo next to it. She thought that was the way to go. The FAI brand should be visible alongside the presentation of the sports events.

Mr DELOR noted that in the Shenzhen discussion they had easily secured more money and direct expenses because they were a volunteer system. They had to put a value on the time that everyone in the ASCs spent, and the volunteers' time, because there was a high value in that. Without that experience they could not run the event.

The President thanked everyone for their contributions. The delegates were free to discuss further with the Secretary General and Mr DELOR. The Executive Board asked the GC to endorse the project as it was now. They had a number of questions, but it would be good to know that the GC felt they were on the right track.

The General Conference unanimously endorsed the concept of seeking a partnership with a view to running a World Drone Racing Championship event series.

20. Technology Development

20.1. Partnership FAI - NOOSPHERE

The Sports Director gave a brief report on the FAI's technology development partnership. The aim of IT and technological development was to serve air sports and the Air Sports Commissions. In fact, the ASCs had many interesting IT projects. He would mention some of the projects currently being driven by FAI Head Office, and managed by the FAI IT Director and experts, plus two dedicated projects they were working on in connection with CIVL and Mr MALBOS. They were about to introduce a tool for managing FAI officials with online registration, which would give NACs better access and a better tool for submitting their data. As a new sporting licence management interface application they had a big tool to address the almost 700 events which CIAM and CRVL governed. They had an event management system developed by the FAI global technology partner, Noosphere, and they had application interfaces (APIs) for various dedicated purposes.

Up to now, officials had been registered on paper, which took up to two weeks to process. This process would now be optimised using a cloud-based system that also provided NACs with tools and features for approving, submitting, extending and nominating officials, so that the HO would have an up-to-date database that would be used first by CIAM but then made available to other commissions at a later stage.

In terms of sporting licence management, many improvements were being put in place by the Greek company that had been awarded the contract.

Mr MALBOS and his commission had come up with a way of managing the FAI calendar in a smarter way. The problem was that there were many events in the pipeline, and some events were blocking spots on the calendar that had not yet been approved. There had been a request to be able to enter them earlier, and this was a work in progress.

The e-Navigator was the brand name for the event management system that had begun with athlete registration, and had already become the backbone for data handling at the Drone Championships. It would have download sections, payment processing and would eventually be connected to the timing and scoring system. The judge forms would also be replaced with tablets, which made it easier for team managers to sign off on results. The system was currently focused on the needs of the World Drone Championships, but in fact it was over-designed for the needs of the commissions. They would look into adapting it after the Drone Championships.

He thanked the FAI Technology Director, CIAM who was their launch customer, and all the commissions who challenged the FAI on a daily basis to come up with good solutions for air sports.

The Sports Director explained that Noosphere was a company based in the Ukraine and the USA. They had been active in the community for several years, and had organised and hosted many aeromodelling events. Up to now, Noosphere had provided its services free of charge, as value-in-kind. The FAI paid by recognising the company's support as an FAI partner. The company was very strong in air sports and space activities. They had hundreds of engineers, some of whom worked in rocket activities. They were currently building a spaceport in Scotland, and had many aviation-related interests. It was a philanthropic value-in-kind relationship with the FAI, and they had a very good and productive working relationship.

The Sports Director said he was focusing on the company's output, and they were working together on an operational level. The cooperation there was perfect and the FAI appreciated the company's hard work.

21. Commission Reports

The President noted that the delegates had been given access to the written reports of the commissions. He asked the commission presidents if they had anything to add to their reports, and invited the delegates to put any questions they might have.

FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI) – ANNEX 11

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS (CASI President) had nothing to add to his written report. However, he would like to share some information on live streaming. He had recently attended an event as jury president in Germany. The organisation was excellent. Despite very difficult wind conditions they had managed to implement live streaming together with instant scoring, which had been appreciated by everyone who attended or who had watched from home. The only thing they needed to take care of was who would be the provider of live streaming. They had selected YouTube, which was a very stable platform, but unfortunately, because a radio had been audible on one of the recordings, the streaming had been automatically stopped because the music was copyrighted. They would have to be careful about such matters in the future.

Mr Hubertus von SAMSON had a question about drone permissions. The FAI had issued permissions directly to the sports people. He thought they should make it clear that some NACs still had the ability to issue these drone permissions directly. He understood that this should be in place for NACs that were not able to issue drone permissions, but Germany was able to issue them by itself, and that was how they would prefer to proceed. He asked if they could correct their processes if possible, perhaps with a note that any German sports persons who contacted the FAI for drone

permissions should be referred to their NAC. This was very important, otherwise it would weaken the process in the national aero clubs.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS wished to explain something about the history of this process. When the FAI had decided to introduce the system, they had been aware that not everyone present was the leader of their organisation. At the time, the drone community was moving more quickly than the FAI, and they had to be careful. Second, as was explained by the Secretary General and Mr DELOR, most of the people who were involved in this evolution in sport were outside the FAI community, and did not know about the structure. Third, they had to face the fact that, by that time, many organisations outside the FAI were claiming they were the top organisations and were planning to organise the first world championships. Putting all that together, they had to find a solution in a short period of time. Thus, they first had to establish a way for new people, who were not aware of the structure, to access FAI events. Then, they had to develop the culture within the NACs. That meant they had to create a place where all competitors could enter. This had been achieved, and looking at the extended report, there were not as many people using this method now. They would probably keep it going for one more year, just for some countries that were not yet ready, but the idea had proved to be very successful in showing people the right way to enter the competition. He believed that after the first world championship they would no longer have a problem, and no one would have any doubt who was the leader in this case.

FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA) – ANNEX 12

Nothing to add.

FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM) – ANNEX 13

Nothing to add.

FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG) – ANNEX 14

Mr David MONKS explained that he was representing the CIG President Dr. Jacques BERLO, who had sent his apologies. He had nothing to add, except to elaborate on what the commission had done this year in terms of additional competitions. In 2017 they had started a race series, which was two aircraft competing at the same time in an arena visible to the public. They had managed to get the distance between the action and the crowd to 75 metres. Helicopters were large, compared with drones, so people could see what was happening, and with the aid of audio-visual and a commentator, the result was quite spectacular. It had been turned into a category 2 event, of which they had had four this year, and hoped to stage six in 2019. He showed a brief video.

The commission hoped to showcase more of that style of flying at the World Air Games in 2020. Marketing was their Achilles heel, and was where they needed help as a commission. He appealed to any members that might have delegates who could join the commission and help to promote its activities, because that was the only way other countries could get involved. He thanked everyone for their assistance, Head Office, the EB and the membership.

FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA) – ANNEX 15

Nothing to add.

FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)

Nothing to add.

FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL) – ANNEX 16

Mr Stéphane MALBOS (CIVL President) noted that CIVL was lucky to have 300 competitions and the revenue that came with it, plus many volunteers, especially in IT. They were at a crossroads,

because the program they had invested in heavily over the last 15 to 20 years was now useless, so they needed to invest heavily in IT for the future. CIVL was supporting the FAI's IT project with funds and with workforce. The FAI was also at a crossroads, and they should work in the next year or two towards having a fair system. The other part of the problem was the decision-making process, which had not always worked. The commissions had not been sufficiently involved in decisions concerning sport. He believed they should not wait for the FAI project to come to a conclusion, but should start working on building the sport together now. They would have a new EB and a new CASI group, and it was time to work together now. They had the huge project of the World Air Games. As it was now, it did not work for many commissions, so he believed they had to sit down again and try to define what would work for the World Air Games. There would be many new ideas and it was frightening, but they should not be afraid; they should be confident that together, with their specific strengths, they could move forward positively.

FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)

Nothing to add.

FAI International Gliding Commission (IGC) – ANNEX 17

Nothing to add.

FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC) – ANNEX 18

Mrs Gillian RAYNER (IPC President) wished to show three short videos. Next year she would be coming to the GC with a proposal to change the name of the International Parachute Commission. They wanted something more modern, something that reflected the reality of their sport. They were aiming to call it World Skydiving.

There had been three highlights over the year. The first was records. They had introduced a new process for competition records, and it had proved successful but arduous. There had been around 80 records this year, which had generated a lot of work, and she thanked Head Office for their cooperation. The second highlight was increased media coverage. They had had live TV coverage of several competitions and great interest from national television networks in several competitions. They had also had more live streaming than in the past. The third highlight was a MoU with the company that had organised the FAI Swoop Freestyle World Championships. Two events had taken place this year, in Copenhagen and in San Diego. The American Civil Aviation Authority had now given ASport clearance to organise competitions anywhere in the US. Four locations were planned for 2019.

FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP)

Nothing to add.

FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC)

Nothing to add.

The President thanked all the commissions for their reports. He urged the members to join the commissions and help to support their activities.

22. FAI Budget 2019

22.1. Budget and scale of subscriptions for 2019

See ANNEX 19 and 20.

The Sports Director conducted a roll call and confirmed the proxies.

The Secretary General began by confirming what Mr Jean-Claude Weber had said, which was that the 2019 budget being presented was based on their experience from 2018. Additional income had been secured through the activities in Shenzhen, plus a commitment for the World Air Games 2020 regarding coverage of organisational costs. The budget document in the cloud had been updated after reviewing the documents, when an incorrect figure had been found in the use of the commissions' special reserves. The first budget sent out in August had an overall positive result of around CHF 10,000, and the updated version had a positive result of around CHF 79,000, because of this change.

Referring to the slide presentation, the Secretary General noted that the new reporting structure, which had been proposed originally by BDO, comprised three areas: FAI activities, FAI competition activities and other activities. As already mentioned, member subscriptions continued to decline. Clearly, HO would review the budget on the basis of committed income, and expenses would be planned accordingly. There was an ongoing process through the improved control structure, which would ensure that spending took place sensibly, and that they could build up the reserves again.

Looking at administration expenses, there were two areas where improvement was desirable. Ségolène ROUILLON was doing an excellent job keeping in contact with the NACs, but increased NAC communication and support would be good, as would a structure for helping the NACs liaise between themselves to facilitate development and help with best practices. As FAI central operations became more complex it would be helpful to have a Head of Administration to coordinate the activities of Head Office. This was all subject to budget and income developments, so they would go step by step, beginning with the team assistant.

The Secretary General went through the income and expenses in further detail, noting that this was a balanced budget that did not yet include any allocation to reserves, which is what she would like to achieve. There were no further plans to use existing reserves. A discussion on the proposed increase of the membership subscriptions followed, as well as on IT, events and reserves.

The President proposed that they proceed with a vote on the subscription fee.

Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI presented the numbers. According to the last roll call they had 33 active members present, 13 proxies and 10 Air Sport Commissions, giving a total number of 56 voters. The active members had 232 votes, proxies had 45 and the ASCs had 40, which gave a total of 317 votes in the room. An absolute majority was 159 and a two-thirds majority was 212. An absolute majority among active members was 139 and a two-thirds majority among active members was 185. He pointed out that, unless someone proposed otherwise, this was an open vote. He asked his colleagues to come and count the votes and the scrutineers to monitor that they were doing the correct thing. The voting would happen by showing panels with numbers.

The President asked for those in favour of the proposal to raise the subscription fee to raise their panels.

Mr Bruno DELOR asked for a secret ballot.

Mr LEINIKKI asked for ballot papers to be distributed.

Mr WEBER had some further comments to add, while the papers were being distributed. It was correct that since 2012 the revenue from subscription fees had decreased substantially, and it was also true that the negative trend had begun after the 2% increase. There was a relationship between the increase of fees and the decrease of revenue. Today, they had lost around CHF 80,000 in membership dues, which was a substantial sum. They needed to correct this and increase revenue. In fact, probably the biggest efforts currently being made by the EB and Head Office were to create revenue from sources other than members.

But it was important to note that they needed the members to contribute to this effort. This was what he would call a solidarity increase. It was easy to say it was too much if they considered their own NACs, but if members looked at what was really happening, on the scale of subscriptions, they would see that the biggest increases applied to the biggest NACs, but for the smaller NACs the increase

was not very big. The small NACs paid proportionally more dues than the big NACs. If they took the figures for the air sport persons in each country and divided it by the subscription fee, the amounts were very low – from around CHF 0.30 to 1.20 for the lower classes. So, it was also a question of solidarity, of making a point that the NACs were expected to contribute. He encouraged everyone to approve the increase, even if they felt it might not be justified for their own NAC.

Another point was that there was an ongoing effort to revise these fee structures. Within the next few years he hoped they would find a way to have a fairer subscription scheme structured according to need, taking into consideration what the NACs would expect to pay for their membership of FAI.

Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI announced the result of the vote. **There were 91 Yes votes and 226 No votes, so there was an absolute majority against the proposal.**

Mr WEBER noted that this was quite clear: contributions from members would not be increased. If they calculated the budget without this CHF 99,379 increase they ended up with a loss of CHF 19,827. If this was acceptable to the membership they had a budget on the table, without an increase in membership dues. There was a request for information regarding the competition revenues of one million. He could confirm that the majority of this money was already contracted and was not at risk. There was no risk in this figure. For that reason, it would be acceptable to approve a budget with a minor loss.

Mr Alan EVAN HANES noted that, while they had rejected a 10% increase, he thought it might be unacceptable to accept a 0% increase. Perhaps they should try to find a reasonable compromise, between what they could take back to their members, and what the FAI needed to do with what they wanted to achieve. At the same time, he implored the EB to desperately look at cutting costs in every way possible.

Mr CUBLEY noted that the General Conference had been presented with a surplus budget, so he did not think it reasonable to assume now that they would accept a budget with a deficit. The principle was that they wanted to see at least a balanced budget. He believed it was now incumbent on the EB to identify ways to achieve that. He suspected that would be through some cost reductions, which would have to be identified.

Mr WEBER considered the loss of CHF 20,000 to be within normal operational margins. Moreover, they were always trying to reduce costs, and increase revenues. He was not prepared to start a cost-cutting exercise on the budget now. They had the budget as proposed, and they would try to at least break even if not make a small surplus over the year.

Mr Terry CUBLEY noted that Mr WEBER had said they were reducing costs. From the 2018 budget to the 2019 budget there had been a CHF 75,000 increase in administrative costs, a CHF 10,000 increase in operating costs and CHF 16,000 in marketing costs. There were probably some opportunities to make cuts there. They did not have to stop anything, they just had to trim it a little.

Mr WEBER agreed that there might be some more opportunities to cut costs.

Mr Greg PRINCIPATO said he was opposed to the proposal to look for a compromise increase in the subscription. They could discuss numbers all day, but the vote had been very clear that no one was in favour of an increase in subscriptions, particularly without a link to any kind of specific strategy. Going forward, everyone realised that there was a whole strategic process ongoing, and perhaps later an increase linked with that would be appropriate. Second, in terms of the new deficit, he agreed that this was certainly manageable. One possibility was to perhaps approve the budget, contingent upon a balanced budget being presented to the next Executive Board meeting. The members could then be informed immediately what had been done and what changes had been made.

The President thanked everyone for their suggestions. He proposed they vote on the budget with a deficit of CHF 19,827, while bearing in mind the remarks made by the delegates. It would be good to see a proposal for a new, perhaps more democratic scale of subscriptions at the next General Conference. He suggested that a working group be formed from the EB and Head Office, with the Secretary General, to think about a new system. There were all kinds of examples in other

federations, although he was personally not in favour of the one country-one vote system used in football.

He asked if there were any objections to holding a vote on the new budget.

A delegate from Portugal proposed that they vote on the budget as presented, with the deficit, on condition that the EB at its next meeting approve a corrected budget showing a surplus.

The President confirmed that the General Conference was invited to approve the 2019 budget with the same subscription scale as 2018, subject to review of the minor deficit and a balanced budget being presented to the Executive Board meeting in December for approval and information to the members and Air Sports Commissions.

There were 317 Yes vote, 0 No votes and 0 Abstentions.

23. Election of FAI President

Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI announced the results of the roll call. Active members present: 33. Proxies: 13. Air Force Commissions: 10. Total number of voters: 56. Votes belonging to active members present: 232. Votes belonging to proxies: 45. Votes belonging to Air Sports Commission: 40. Total number of voters: 317. Absolute majority: 159. Two-thirds qualified majority: 212. Absolute majority of active members present or represented: 139. Two-thirds majority of active members present or represented: 185.

The President handed the floor to the deputy to the President, Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBON noted that FAI Statute 6.1.1 stated: "The President of FAI shall be elected for a four-year term by the General Conference from the following individuals" followed by a list of eligible candidates. That was clear. His problem was that he understood there was an understanding that the commissions did not vote on the first round. He saw no justification for this, because it was written in the procedures that an absolute majority was needed on the first round. The absolute majority was defined by being more than half of members present. In his opinion, an absolute majority was a number, not a description of who had the right to vote or not. He asked for the number of members present or represented.

Mr LEINIKKI confirmed that there were 46 members present or represented, who had 277 votes. The absolute majority for active members was 139.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON noted that in that case, on the first round, the candidate to be elected must have 139 votes or more. But that said nothing about the fact that commissions could not vote. An absolute majority was a number, not a description of who had the right to vote or not. He asked for clarification, otherwise he could not perform his task.

The Secretary General explained that the absolute majority was defined in the Preamble to the FAI Statutes, Terms and Definitions, on page 5. It was defined as more than half of votes belonging to members present or represented. That was what Mr DE ORLEANS BORBÓN was referring to. Members at the GC were the active members who had a voting right at the GC. The paragraph about the voting procedures for the FAI President said "The election shall be by secret ballot on the first round of voting. An absolute majority shall be required for election." That was where Mr DE ORLEANS BORBÓN's comment came from. However, in the Statutes under 3.6.1.4 it said: "Unless stated otherwise in the statutes or the bylaws, decisions of the General Conference shall be taken on an absolute majority vote of the active members and Air Sport Commissions present or represented." How was that interpreted? Was voting for the FAI President limited to the members, or was it the general rule that, unless explicitly stated otherwise, it was the members and the ASCs who voted?

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBON said that the General Conference was the entity designated as having the right to elect a President. In his opinion, commission presidents were part of the General Conference. Before depriving them of the right to vote he wanted to be very sure.

Mr Rob HUGHES noted that he used to work in the FAI office, and questions about rules like this had come up quite a lot. He had discussed this exact point with Mr Leinikki the day before. As a native English speaker, to him the Statutes said “by absolute majority” and then it was defined clearly as “members only”. However, he recognised that this was a 51%/49% interpretation, and in those situations they used to use common sense. If you were a commission serving under a President, he believed it was the correct thing that that commission should have a say in who the President was.

The Secretary General suggested that they look at the conference minutes from two years earlier to see how the voting had been done then. They should continue the procedure as they had done it in the past. Beyond that, it should be clarified.

Mr Stéphane MALBOS said a search for “absolute” in the PDF document brought up to the FAI Air Gold Medal which was also an absolute majority, and where the commissions had always voted. So commissions were part of the absolute majority.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBÓN was not in favour of deciding; he was in favour of following the orders of his bosses, and the boss was the General Conference. This was a very clear procedural question that might or might not have an impact on the elections. But much more than that, it had a very strong impact, he felt, on the way they conducted operations. The idea of leaving somebody out of the voting when it was written that the President was elected by the General Conference told him that the commissions were second-class citizens. He wanted to see this in writing. If they referred to the definition of an absolute majority, as an engineer he understood that this definition was a number: 139. It had nothing to do with who could or could not vote.

Mrs Gillian RAYNER noted that “absolute majority” meant more than half of votes belonging to members, but it did not define which members. They had associate members, temporary members, active members. It could also mean members of the General Conference.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBÓN thought that was clear. Looking further down, members were defined as FAI members, active and otherwise. What was lacking was a connection between the concept that the President was elected by the General Conference, and the fact that some people now present in the General Conference should not vote in the first round and then, strangely enough, they should then vote in the second round. For him, that was a complete misunderstanding. They could refer to the past, but a past error did not correct today’s error.

Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS noted that, with respect to her colleague, they might not agree, or feel that there should be a change to the statute, but for now she felt they were bound by the statutes as they were written. The definition of member was quite clear. The definition of absolute majority referred to more than half of the votes belonging to members present or represented. Therefore, she would argue that, for the first round, the air sport commissions were not included in the vote.

The Secretary General announced that they had found the reference from the 2016 minutes. It was mentioned there with respect to the voting process that, according to article 6.1.1.2 of the Statutes, this was an absolute majority vote for members only, not commission presidents, and that was how they had voted in 2016.

Mr. HACHAMI noted that if the commissions voted, as the commissions were derived from the members it would be in a way a double vote. Consequently, he thought that, the commissions should not vote.

The Secretary General thanked him for his comment. There was also a rule that said that there were sports commission votes and members’ votes. So in 2016, only active members present or represented had voted in the first round. If there was no disagreement. they would proceed with the first round vote for the FAI President, with an absolute majority of votes from members present or represented.

Mr DE ORLEANS BORBÓN understood there was no opposition from the floor on this interpretation. Personally, he did not agree, but that was irrelevant.

The Secretary General confirmed that this was a secret ballot, as defined in the Statutes. There were two candidates: Frits Brink and Bob Henderson. Members could vote for one of these candidates.

They should write the name of their preferred candidate on the voting slip. The other possibility was to abstain.

The ballot papers were distributed and collected.

The President noted that they had to wait for the result because one of the candidates was also a candidate for the Executive Board.

Before announcing the results, Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN asked the Secretary General to include in the minutes the request from the temporary chair to review the procedures concerning the FAI President's election. In his personal view it was very unclear and this was a serious issue.

The scrutineers returned the votes. The required absolute majority was 139. Frits BRINK had 108 votes, and Bob HENDERSON had 173 votes. The new FAI President, for the next four years was Bob HENDERSON.

24. Presentation of Candidates to serve on FAI Executive Board

The Secretary General announced that candidates for the FAI Executive Board could be introduced by the heads of delegation or the candidates themselves, in alphabetical order of the country. Each country would have a maximum of three minutes, including any questions. The time limit would be strictly applied.

The General Conference heard presentations from:

Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS (Canada)

Mr Samir RAOUF (Egypt)

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN (Spain)

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON (Iceland)

Ms Marina VIGORITO (Italy)

Mr Shkëlqim KRASNIQI (Kosovo)

Mr Abdullah Mansour AL JAWINI (Saudi Arabia)

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (Luxembourg)

Mr Frits BRINK (Netherlands)

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden)

25. Election of Executive Directors to serve on FAI Executive Board

The Secretary General announced that this was a secret ballot. Delegates could write the names of up to six candidates on their voting slips. They could also write fewer than six, or they could abstain.

Mr LEINIKKI noted that this was a simple majority vote, so the majority of votes cast was the deciding factor.

The Secretary General noted that the candidates' names and countries would be displayed on the screen. Delegates could write either the name or the country on their voting slips.

After the first round of voting, Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI announced the results. Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS (Canada), Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN (Spain), Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON (Iceland), Ms Marina VIGORITO (Italy) and Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (Luxembourg) received the necessary majority and are elected. For the remaining candidates, Egypt: 43 - Kosovo: 8 - Saudi Arabia: 67 - Netherlands: 91 - Sweden: 112. None of the candidates received a majority so they

would proceed to a second round of voting with the four candidates who had received the most votes. The second round would be between Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Netherlands and Sweden. Delegates could write one name only on the slip.

The Secretary General announced that, after the second round of votes, Egypt had 6 votes, Saudi Arabia had 101, Netherlands 93 and Sweden 121. Now they would proceed to a third round with the remaining three candidates, which were Saudi Arabia, the Netherlands and Sweden, unless one of the candidates wished to withdraw. In the next round, the members were invited to vote between Saudi Arabia, the Netherlands or Sweden.

The Secretary General announced that the voting was as follows: Saudi Arabia 156, Netherlands 53, Sweden 112. Again there was no majority so they would proceed to the final round of voting. The candidates were Saudi Arabia and Sweden.

The President announced the results of the final vote: Abdullah AL JAWINI (Saudi Arabia) 233, Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) 88. Mr AL JAWINI was elected.

Elected:

Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS (Canada)

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN (Spain)

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON (Iceland)

Ms Marina VIGORITO (Italy)

Mr Abdullah Mansour AL JAWINI (Saudi Arabia)

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (Luxembourg)

26. Arrangements for General Conferences

26.1. Status of FAI GC 2019

Mr Mohammed Si HACHAMI, President of the Moroccan Air Sports Federation, took the podium with his colleagues, Ms Nadia FEDDAH, chair of the federation's communication commission, and Colonel Mohamed BOURZIANE, the federation vice-president. He thanked the General Conference for the trust and confidence they had shown in the Kingdom of Morocco. He showed a video and summarised some of the preparations being made.

In reply to a question from the floor, he confirmed that the conference dates were 21 to 27 October 2019.

The Secretary General noted that they might have to discuss the dates because there was an overlap with some events.

Mr HACHAMI responded that the dates had now been fixed and were now out of his control.

The Secretary General said she understood this, but she wanted to point out that there was an overlap with the military sports games and the European hot air balloon championship.

26.2. Plans for 114th FAI General Conference 2020

The Secretary General welcomed the delegation from Wuhan, China.

The representative of Wuhan presented Wuhan's bid to host the 2020 FAI General Conference.

The President thanked the delegation for their presentation. He noted that he had visited the city, which was fantastic, and there was good cooperation in place with the government. He wished them the best of luck with their bid.

26.3. Future process for awarding FAI GC

The President noted that it was sometimes difficult to guarantee good organisation for the General Conference. Aero clubs sometimes had difficulty doing everything properly, which was natural because it was not something they did regularly. He had visited Morocco some months ago, well ahead of the General Conference. They had visited Egypt a couple of months earlier, and as everyone had seen, some technical matters in particular were not in place, although the hosts were doing their best to make the event as pleasant as possible. The EB thought that it would be wise, in the future, to inform the General Conference which was their preferred host, ahead of the vote. Moreover, the FAI would be more involved with organisational matters such as registration, payments, flights, etc., so that the hosts did not have to reinvent the wheel each time. FAI Head Office would work closely with the host city and the organising committee to ensure everything worked as well as possible. They had begun to implement this kind of cooperation for Morocco.

The Executive Board had already looked at the bids for 2020. There were two bids, from Wuhan in China and from India. Because of the information the Executive Board had received, there was a preference for the General Conference 2020 to be awarded to Wuhan, and he asked the members to take this into consideration.

27. FAI Anti-Doping Programme

Mr Bob HENDERSON began by thanking the members for their support and for putting their faith in him. He realised he would need to work very hard as FAI President, and he would be looking for support.

He wished to talk about the anti-doping testing programme, with the aid of a slide presentation (**ANNEX 21**). The FAI anti-doping programme was managed by Ségolène ROUILLON, with his assistance from a political level. The 2018 testing programme had comprised eight out-of-competition tests and in-competition tests conducted at nine events. He pointed out that national anti-doping organisations (NADOs) were also authorised to conduct testing, and competitors should be made aware of this. In fact, the FAI had received notification that there might be a positive result from one FAI event.

In 2017 WADA had informed the FAI that it would no longer test for alcohol. The FAI and some other federations had expressed concerns. WADA did not see alcohol as a performance issue, but for the FAI it was about safety, in the same way as dehydration and fatigue were safety issues. Some proposals had been submitted to the board, but there was a concern that asking FAI officials to conduct breath tests on competitors could create difficulties and leave them open to legal challenges. Ms ROUILLON was now preparing educational materials that would be available to the members. Part of what they were doing was to ask officials at events to keep their eyes and ears open for anyone who was unfit to fly. This included symptoms such as dehydration and lack of sleep, and would include anyone who looked as if they were “bouncing off the walls”. Alcohol was part of this. There was a duty of care not to let such people fly, because they might harm themselves or others. It was possible for event officials to handle this kind of issue sensitively, without resorting to breath testing, as had happened at a gliding event several years ago.

He and Mrs ROUILLON had worked hard on building up a good relationship with WADA's European director, who was based in the building next door. Good face-to-face contact gave them the opportunity to argue that the risk in air sports came in competition, because any substances someone might be interested in taking were short-acting. At the moment the FAI was being required to prove it conducted out-of-competition testing. He was not worried about air sports persons taking steroids, but in fact these drugs caused great physical and psychological damage, which was part of the reason why WADA came down so hard on them. They were making good progress on explaining the risks in aviation to WADA, but every positive test that came back made it harder for them to argue their case.

At a competition earlier in the year, a competitor had sent an e-mail claiming that they had seen another competitor using a banned drug. This information had been passed on to the relevant air sport commission to be investigated. WADA had a speak up programme, but it involved lawyers. Ms Rouillon would be looking at the WADA programme, and whistle-blower programmes in other sports, to see how these matters were handled. The problem with these claims is that they could be malicious.

Mr HENDERSON showed a letter he had received from an athlete, after they had been sent a formal letter informing that he had missed an out-of-competition test. This person clearly did not understand why the FAI had an anti-doping programme, so there was a clear failure to provide information. Athletes selected for out-of-competition testing were informed by letter and were sent an information pack. He asked the members to send a message that athletes should cooperate, because that was the way to change the playing ground for everyone.

28. Amendments to Statutes

Mr Ronald SCHNITKER explained that the Statutes Working Group comprised Marina VIGORITO, Sigrid BERNER, Andy CHAU, Art GREENFIELD and himself. They were in regular contact with Mary Anne STEVENS in the Executive Board. He thanked the group for their input and cooperation, and Mrs Stevens for her advice, comments and help.

The SWG had been tasked with examining a number of proposals for changes to the statutes and by-laws (**ANNEX 22a and 22b**)

1. Louis Bleriot Medal

Proposed changes accepted.

2. The Sabiha Gökcen Medal

Proposed changes accepted.

3. Inclusion of the World Anti-Doping Code in the FAI Constitution

Proposed changes accepted.

The President thanked Mr SCHNITKER and the Statutes Working Group for their excellent work.

29. Appointment of FAI Companion(s) of Honour

The President explained that Companions of Honour were voted for life by the General Conference or the FAI President, subject to ratification by the GC. He had received three proposals: Prince SULTAN bin Salman Al Saud, from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Mme LEE Sang-Mi from China and Captain Veerayuth DIDYASARIN from Thailand. The FAI would be proud to accept all three as Companions of Honour. Prince SULTAN had made a considerable contribution to aviation sports in his country; Mrs LEE had played a very important role in the Chinese Aero Club, and in youth developments in China; Captain DIDYASARIN was unable to be present for personal reasons, but he was highly deserving of the award.

Mr Wolfgang LINTL said he was unhappy with the procedure. It was not necessary for the nominee in question to be present in order to be presented with the award. Moreover, although he agreed that Prince Sultan was a brilliant aviator, he did not understand what he had contributed to the FAI, to earn him this award.

Mr. DE ORLEANS BORBON explained that Prince Sultan had essentially founded air sport in Saudi Arabia, by securing the transfer of a military airfield from the state and initiating activities there. This was a major contribution to the FAI.

The President agreed that this was an unusual agenda sequence, but he asked for the understanding of the GC. The change had been made for protocol reasons.

A NAC representative noted that not all of the NACs had been consulted, and the nomination had come as a surprise to them.

The President pointed out that he had consulted people on the matter of procedure only. The appointment of Companions of Honour was generally considered to be a privilege of the President. Nevertheless, he agreed that this should not be the ordinary way of doing things.

He asked the General Conference to ratify these nominations.

The FAI General Conference agreed to the appointment of Prince SULTAN bin Salman Al Saud, Mme LEE Sang-Mi and Captain Veerayuth DIDYASARIN as FAI Companions of Honour.

Mrs LEE Sang-Mi was presented with her award, and spoke briefly on the development of air sports in China.

The President noted that air sports in China were growing considerably. There might be grounds for introducing a new class of membership to accommodate the huge number of new members.

30. Vote on Award of 114th FAI General Conference 2020

The President noted that there were two bids to host the FAI General Conference in 2020, one from Wuhan in China and one from India. The delegates had heard the presentation from Wuhan. There was no delegation from India. The Wuhan bid document was excellent, and the Executive Board had expressed a preference for this candidate.

The President asked if there were any objections to awarding the General Conference 2020 to Wuhan. There were no objections. He congratulated the delegation from Wuhan in the People's Republic of China on their very good bid. He wished them all the best in their preparations.

31. Any Other Business

Statutes Working Group

The President noted that as Ms VIGORITO had been elected to the Executive Board she would leave the Statutes Working Group. In his final task as President, he proposed replacing her with Stéphane MALBOS, who was an excellent advisor. This had been agreed with the chair of the SWG.

The General Conference agreed to the appointment of Mr Stéphane MALBOS to the Statutes Working Group, to replace Ms Marina VIGORITO.

Closing

The President wished to say a few final words. He congratulated the new Executive Board members, and wished them all the best. He congratulated Bob Henderson on being elected the new President of the FAI. He hoped the team would work together and continue with the changes their organisation really needed, for the benefit of all air sports people.

He thanked all the candidates who were available to put their names on the list. He was sorry that Bengt Lindgren would not be on the Executive Board because he had done an awful lot of work, particularly with drones. He hoped the FAI could still benefit from his knowledge and availability.

He gave the microphone to the new President.

Mr Bob HENDERSON noted that Frits BRINK had served the FAI for many years in a number of roles, most recently as President for the last two years. He had overseen the start of significant change, development, initiative and potential growth for the organisation. He had taken a great deal

of risk on his shoulders and today, with what they had seen in drone sports and parachuting, they were seeing the beginnings of that opportunity and growth.

Mr BRINK had taken the responsibility upon himself to take the FAI in that direction, building on everything he had done previously with the Board. He had made a tremendous contribution to the FAI.

Mr HENDERSON said it was his pleasure and his honour to ask the delegates, by acclamation, to induct Frits BRINK as a President of Honour of the FAI. His first task would be to be FAI ambassador to the drone conference in Shenzhen.

The General Conference made Mr Frits BRINK FAI President of Honour by acclamation.

Mr Frits BRINK handed Mr Bob HENDERSON the President's pin.

Mr Frits BRINK closed the General Conference.

32. Annexes

1. Report by the FAI President
2. Membership report
3. List of FAI Vice-Presidents for 2017-2018
4. Presentation by Secretary General
5. Financial Statement 2017 and Auditor's report
6. Air Space Manifesto
7. Presentation on FAI World Air Games 2020
8. Presentation on Asian Games
9. Presentation on World Games 2021
10. Presentation on Drones sport in FAI
11. Report by the President of the FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)
12. Report by the President of the FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)
13. Report by the President of the FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
14. Report by the President of the FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)
15. Report by the President of the FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA)
16. Report by the President of the FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
17. Report by the President of the FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)
18. Report by the President of the FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)
19. Scale of Subscriptions 2019
20. FAI 2019 Budget
21. Presentation on FAI Anti-Doping Program
22.
 - a. Amendments to Statutes - Proposed Statutes changes
 - b. Amendments to Statutes - Presentation

Additional documents are annexed as follows:

23. Calendar of FAI Meetings 2019
24. List of Delegates of Commissions
25. International Calendar of Sporting Events 2019-2022

- 26.** List of FAI Award Winners for 2018
- 27.** List of Participants at the General Conference
- 28.** List of Companions of Honour
- 29.** List of FAI Members
- 30.** List of FAI Championships Winners for 2018

Minutes approved by Mr Frits BRINK, FAI President chairing the meeting on 27 February 2019.