



*Fédération  
Aéronautique  
Internationale*

---

# **109<sup>th</sup> Annual General Conference**

## **Minutes of Working Sessions**

**Held in Rotterdam (Netherlands)  
25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> September 2015**

*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](mailto:sec@fai.org)  
Web: [www.fai.org](http://www.fai.org)*

# FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

Founded in 1905 - Honorary Patron: Dr. Bertrand Piccard

## OFFICERS OF THE FAI 2015 / 2016

### Presidents of Honour

A. O. Dumas (Canada)  
Dr. C. Kepak (Czech Republic)  
G.A. Lloyd (Australia)

C.F. von Kann (USA)  
O.A. Rautio (Finland)  
Dr. H.P. Hirzel (Switzerland)

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

### President

John Grubbström

### Executive Directors

Frits BRINK  
Agust GUDMUNDSSON

Robert HENDERSON  
Niels-Christian LEVIN HANSEN

Alvaro de ORLEANS-BORBÓN  
Gillian RAYNER

### Vice-Presidents

Australia – Mike CLOSE  
Austria - Michael FEINIG  
Brazil – Flavio OLIVA  
Canada - Mary Anne STEVENS  
Chinese Taipei - Dr. Elsa L.C. MAI  
Czech Rep. – Vladimir MACHULA  
Finland – Petteri TARMA  
France - Bruno DELOR  
Germany – Wolfgang MÜTHER  
Hong Kong, China - Andy CHAU  
Ireland – Tom McCormack  
Italy - Giuseppe LEONI  
Japan - Hiroyasu HAGIO  
Korea – Youngduck LEE  
Luxemburg - Claude ESCHETTE  
Mexico-Ing. José Peña  
BUENROSTRO

New Zealand - Elizabeth KING  
Norway – Rolf LILAND  
Poland - Włodzimierz SKALIK  
Portugal – Francisco José FIALHO NUNES  
Russia - Vladimir IVANOV  
Spain - Pedro Cabañero MARIMÓN  
Sweden - Bengt LINDGREN  
Switzerland-Yves Joel BURKHARDT  
Thailand - Veerayuth DIDYASARIN  
United Kingdom – Rob HUGHES  
USA - Jonathan GAFFNEY

### *Ex Officio*

Aerobatics – Nick BUCKENHAM  
Aeromodelling - Antonis PAPADOPOULOS  
Amateur-built & Experimental Aircraft - Alfons HUBMANN  
Astronautic Records – Anu OHJA  
Ballooning - Jean-Claude WEBER  
General Aviation – Rodney BLOIS  
Gliding - Eric MOZER  
Hang Gliding & Paragliding – Stephane MALBOS  
Microlight & Paramotor – Wolfgang LINTL  
Parachuting - Graeme WINDSOR  
Rotorcraft - David HAMILTON

### Presidents of FAI Air Sport Commissions

G. WINDSOR (AUS) / CASI - Air Sport General Commission  
J-C. WEBER (LUX) / CIA - Ballooning  
A. HUBMANN (SUI) / CIACA - Amateur Built & Experimental Aircraft  
A. PAPADOPOULOS (GRE) / CIAM - Aeromodelling  
D. HAMILTON (GBR) / CIG - Rotorcraft  
W. LINTL (GER) / CIMA – Microlight & Paramotor

N. BUCKENHAM (GBR) / CIVA - Aerobatics  
A. GUDMUNDSSON (ISL) / CIVL - Hang Gliding & Paragliding  
J.P. DELMAS (FRA) / GAC - General Aviation  
Dr. S. SANZ FERNANDEZ DE CORDOBA (ESP) / ICARE – Astro. Records  
E. MOZER (USA) / IGC - Gliding  
G. WINDSOR (AUS) / IPC - Parachuting

### Presidents of FAI Technical Commissions

P. DUVAL (FRA) / EnvC - Environment  
Dr. J. KNÜPPEL (GER) / CIMP - Medico-Physiological

### HEADQUARTERS *(situation as of January 1st, 2016)*

Maison du Sport International – Avenue de Rhodanie 54, 1005 Lausanne, SWITZERLAND  
Telephone + 41 (0)21 345 1070 / Telefax + 41 (0)21 345 1077 / E-mail : [info@fai.org](mailto:info@fai.org) / Web : [www.fai.org](http://www.fai.org)

### Secretary General: Susanne SCHÖDEL

**Communication Manager:** Faustine CARRERA  
**Sports & Marketing Director:** Markus HAGGENEY  
**Assistant to Sports Manager:** Annick HAUSER  
**IT Manager:** Visa-Matti LEINIKKI  
**Office & Accounting Manager :** Cosette MAST  
**Members & Services / Anti-Doping Manager:** Ségolène ROUILLON

**Competitions Manager:** Christine ROUSSON  
**Team Assistant :** Milena SCHÖTZER

# FEDERATION AERONAUTIQUE INTERNATIONALE

## 109<sup>th</sup> ANNUAL GENERAL CONFERENCE

### MINUTES

OF THE WORKING SESSIONS  
HELD ON FRIDAY 25<sup>th</sup> AND SATURDAY 26<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2015  
AT SS ROTTERDAM, ROTTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

IN THE CHAIR..... Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM, FAI President

**FAI ACTIVE MEMBERS  
WITH VOTING RIGHTS**

**HEADS OF DELEGATIONS**

ALGERIA.....	Mr. Said AGROUM
AUSTRALIA .....	Mr. Mike CLOSE
AUSTRIA.....	Mr. Michael FEINIG
BELGIUM .....	Mr. Jo VAN De WOESTYNE
CANADA .....	Mrs. Mary Anne STEVENS
CHINA .....	Mr. Zhaofang HAN
CHINESE TAIPEI .....	Ms. Elsa L.C. MAI
CYPRUS.....	Mr. Demetrakis HADJIDEMETRIOU
CZECH REPUBLIC .....	Mr. Vladimir MACHULA
DENMARK .....	Mr. Hjalmar NIELSEN
EGYPT .....	Mr. Mohamed ZAMZAM
FINLAND .....	Mr. Petteri TARMA
FRANCE.....	Mr. Bruno DELOR
GERMANY .....	Mr. Wolfgang MÜTHER
HONG KONG .....	Mr. Andy CHAU
HUNGARY.....	Ms. Erzsébet VIZAKNAI
ICELAND.....	Mr. Matthias SVEINBJORNSSON
INDONESIA.....	Mr. Rafiudin NASUTION
ITALY .....	Mr. Antonio DENTINI

<b>JAPAN</b> .....	Mr. Hiroyasu HAGIO
<b>KOREA</b> .....	Mr. Young Duck LEE
<b>KOSOVO</b> .....	Mr. Fadil GERGURI
<b>LUXEMBOURG</b> .....	Mr. Carlo LECUIT
<b>NETHERLANDS</b> .....	Mr. Ronald SCHNITKER
<b>NORWAY</b> .....	Mr. John Eirik LAUPSA
<b>POLAND</b> .....	Mr. Wlodzimierz SKALIK
<b>RUSSIA</b> .....	Mrs. Khalide MAKAGONOVA
<b>SAUDI ARABIA</b> .....	Mr. Abdullah AL-JAWINI
<b>SERBIA</b> .....	Mr. Zeljko OVUKA
<b>SLOVAKIA</b> .....	Mr. Pavol KAVKA
<b>SOUTH AFRICA</b> .....	Mr. John GAILLARD
<b>SPAIN</b> .....	Mr. Manuel ROCA
<b>SWEDEN</b> .....	Mr. Bengt LINDGREN
<b>SWITZERLAND</b> .....	Mr. Yves BURKHARDT
<b>THAILAND</b> .....	Mr. Veerayuth DIDYASARIN
<b>UNITED ARAB EMIRATES</b> .....	Mr. Yousif ALHAMMADI
<b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> .....	Mr. Patrick NAEGELI
<b>UNITED STATES</b> .....	Mr. A.W. GREENFIELD

#### **FAI ASSOCIATE MEMBERS**

**EGYPT**..... Gen. Abd El Moein HASSAN

#### **FAI INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATE MEMBERS**

**ASIANIA** ..... Mr. Mubarak ALSUWAILEM |

**OSTIV** ..... Mr. Rolf RADESPIEL |

#### **PROXIES**

**Croatia to Germany**

**Greece to Cyprus**

**New Zealand to Australia**

#### **FAI EXECUTIVE BOARD**

FAI President ..... Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM |

FAI Executive Director ..... Mr. Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBON |

FAI Executive Director (Finance)..... Mr. Frits BRINK |

FAI Executive Director ..... Mr. Agust GUDMUNDSSON |

FAI Executive Director ..... Mr. Niels-Christian Levin HANSEN |

FAI Executive Director ..... Mr. Bob HENDERSON |

FAI Executive Director ..... Ms. Gillian RAYNER |

FAI Secretary General ..... Ms Susanne SCHÖDEL |

### **FAI AIR SPORT COMMISSIONS**

Mr. Jean-Claude WEBER .....	President, FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)
Mr. Alfons HUBMANN .....	President, FAI Amateur Built and Experimental Aircraft Commission (CIACA)
Mr. Antonis PAPADOPOULOS .....	President, FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
Mr. David HAMILTON .....	President, FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)
Mr. Wolfgang LINTL .....	Acting President, FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA)
Mr. Vladimir MACHULA .....	Representative, FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)
Mr. Stéphane MALBOS.....	President, FAI Hang Gliding & Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
Mr. Jean-Pierre DELMAS .....	President, FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)
Mr. Eric MOZER.....	President, FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)
Mr. Graeme WINDSOR.....	President, FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)

### **FAI TECHNICAL COMMISSIONS**

Dr. Jürgen KNÜPPEL.....	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
--------------------------	--

### **FAI PRESIDENTS OF HONOUR**

Mr. Pierre PORTMANN (SUI)

### **FAI COMPANIONS OF HONOUR**

Mr. Max BISHOP (GBR)  
Mr. Alfred-Pierre HERBERT (SUI)  
Mr. Bernald SMITH (USA)  
Mr. Robert CLIPSHAM (CAN)  
Mr. Bengt-Eric FONSELL (SWE)  
Mr. Michiel KASTELEIJN (NED)  
Mrs. KYUNG O Kim (KOR)

### **FAI HEAD OFFICE**

Mr. Eric BERTIN .....	FAI World Air Games Coordinator
Ms. Faustine CARRERA .....	FAI Communication Manager
Mr. Markus HAGGENEY.....	FAI Sports & Marketing Director
Ms. Annick HAUSER.....	FAI Assistant to Sports Director
Mr. Visa-Matti LEINIKKI .....	FAI IT Manager
Mrs. Segolene ROUILLON.....	FAI Members and Services Manager
Ms. Milena SCHÖTZER .....	FAI Intern

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE WERE RECEIVED FROM :**

Mr. Jiri DODAL..... FAI Vice-President  
M. Jose PENA BUENROSTRO..... President NAC Mexico

**SCRUTINEERS**

The Conference unanimously agreed the appointment of the following scrutineers:

Mr. Bengt-Erik FONSELL  
Mr. Rob HUGHES  
Mr. Michiel KASTELEIJN

**1. FAI President's introductory remarks**

The FAI President, Dr John GRUBBSTRÖM, gave a warm welcome to the FAI members. He thanked the Royal Netherlands Aeronautical Association (KNVvL) for their preparations, and hoped the members had enjoyed the new format of the conference week, which had featured the usual meetings as well as a number of seminars, including Women in the FAI, IT, Cultural Exchange, World Air Games and Anti-Doping.

He was very pleased to welcome new members Algeria and Kosovo.

**2. In Memoriam**

The FAI General Conference stood in silent memory of all the friends of the FAI who had died since the 108th General Conference in 2014, and especially of:

**Sheikh Rashid bin Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum**

Eldest son of Sheikh Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, Vice President and Prime Minister of the UAE and Ruler of Dubai, and brother of the Crown Prince of Dubai, His Highness Sheikh Hamdan bin Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, Patron of the FAI World Air Games Dubai 2015

**Mr. Tony AARTS**

Dutch Aeromodelling judge

**Mr. André LOZACH**

F3P and F3A Judge

**Mr. Praphon TECHAVIPARK**

CIAM Delegate for Thailand

**Mr. Vladimir ZABAVA**

President of the Joint Federation of SuperLight Aviation of Russia

**Mr. Dominique MEREUZE**

President of French Microlight Federation and President of French Council for Airports Federations

**Mr. Victor CHMAL**

Russian aerobatic pilot, World Champion in 1996

**Mr. Yuri TARASOV**  
ICARE delegate for Russia

### **3. Roll-Call of Delegations**

Mr Visa-Matti LEINIKKI (FAI IT Manager) announced that 39 countries, 9 Air Sport Commissions and OSTIV were currently represented in the room. Total votes: 331; absolute majority: 166; 2/3 majority: 221.

He read out the names of the countries present or represented in the room.

#### **3.1. Apologies for absence**

Those apologising for absence were as recorded above.

#### **3.2. Verification of representatives' authority**

The names of Heads of Delegations, Air Sport Commission representatives and FAI Officials were as recorded above.

#### **3.3. Announcement of proxies**

Proxies were as recorded above.

#### **3.4. Adoption of Modifications to Agenda**

The FAI President noted that the order of some Commission presentations might change.

The Russian NAC representative wished to raise a sensitive issue that had remained unresolved for several months between Russia and the Aeromodelling Commission. He would like to ask the Conference to include in the agenda the item "Why is it so difficult to come to an understanding between a NAC and an Air Sport Commission?" The FAI President agreed to add this item to the Open Forum, which would include a discussion on the selection of athletes for the World Air Games.

The Canadian NAC asked for clarification on how many active members were present, and confirmation that there was a quorum. The Secretary General, Ms Susanne SCHÖDEL, explained that quorum was reached if 25% of active members in good standing were present or represented were in the room. Exceptions to this included amendments to the statutes and voting on items not on the agenda, where 50% of active members in good standing were required. (FAI Statutes §1.4.2, 3.1.3, 3.6.1.3.2)

Mr LEINIKKI explained that there were 89 active members, 75 of whom were in good standing, which meant 25% quorum was 14 and 50% quorum was 38.

Agenda approved with one additional item.

#### **3.5. Appointment of scrutineers**

Given that they had only one viewing screen rather than two, the Secretary General suggested that in any voting procedure the scrutineers join Mr LEINIKKI, watch the voting procedure on the screen, confirm that it had been conducted correctly and announce the results.

The scrutineers were as recorded above.

#### **3.6. Reminder of voting procedures**

Mr LEINIKKI explained that, unless otherwise stated, votes at the General Conference were passed by absolute majority (>50% of votes present), which was currently 166. They might use a simple majority, which meant more than 50% of votes cast. A qualified majority would be used for

statutory changes, which meant two-thirds of votes present in the room. Ahead of every vote, he would clarify what kind of vote it would be.

In addition to the active members, the international affiliate member OSTIV was entitled to vote with one vote and the Air Sport Commissions each had 4 votes. They could not vote on statute changes, establishing permanent or temporary bodies, presidents of honour, extraordinary General Conference, the dissolution of the FAI or cancellation of a championship.

Votes would be conducted by either an open ballot or a secret ballot. Secret ballots would always be conducted by electronic vote.

#### **4. Presentation of electronic voting system**

Mr LEINIKKI explained the use of the voting kits and invited delegates to practise with a test vote.

#### **5. Minutes of the 108<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference 2014**

**The FAI General Conference unanimously approved the Minutes** of the 108<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference Working Sessions held on 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> October 2014 in Pattaya (Thailand) as published with no comments.

#### **6. Report of the FAI President**

Dr John GRUBBSTRÖM, FAI President, presented his report (**ANNEX 1**) which was adopted by the FAI General Conference.

#### **7. Appointment of FAI Companion(s) of Honour**

The FAI President presented his nominations for Companions of Honour. The two persons had passionately dedicated their lives to air sports: Mr Max BISHOP, who had anchored the FAI Head Office and FAI sport development for a number of years and Mr Bob CLIPSHAM, FAI Executive Director and Finance Director for many years.

##### **Max BISHOP**

Mr. BISHOP is a glider pilot, known to all of you, certainly. He started in the FAI by being UK delegate to CIEA, the FAI Aviation and Space Education Commission. He is now one of its "Presidents of Honour", having been its President for many years. We know him all for having been Secretary General of the FAI for 17 years. Apart from the FAI, he held a regular commission on the RAF and his last appointment was commanding Biggin Hill. He is currently Vice President of the International World Games Association (IWGA) where the FAI has been active with Parachuting and Paragliding activities. His wife Angela is working for the team of Bertrand Piccard on the project Solar Impulse.

##### **Robert CLIPSHAM**

Mr. CLIPSHAM started in supporting aviation in Canada almost forty years ago, when he became a Director of the Great War Flying Museum in 1977. He was then President of this Museum. He was also Director and then President of Brampton Flying Club from 1977 to 1987, then Director of the Royal Canadian Flying Clubs Association which became the Aero Club of Canada from 1986 to



2000. His contribution to FAI dates back almost as far, to when he was the Canadian delegate to FAI beginning in 1981. Some of his roles have been:

- Canadian delegate to FAI from 1981 to 1992,
- FAI Vice-President for Canada from 1992 to 2000
- FAI Finance Committee member from 1995 to 2000
- FAI Environmental Commission member from 1995 to 2000
- FAI Executive Director, Finance from 2004 to 2014

He has made an exceptional contribution to the FAI and has continuously promoted sport aviation in all its facets in Canada. He holds a commercial pilot's license, single engine, land; and enjoys piloting WWI replica aircraft.

Mr BISHOP and Mr CLIPSHAM expressed their gratitude for the great honour being bestowed upon them.

**The two candidates for appointment as FAI Companions of Honour were unanimously approved by the General Conference.**

## **8. Situation of FAI Membership**

The FAI Secretary General explained the situation with respect to FAI Membership.

### **8.1. Suspensions, Resignations and Expulsions**

#### ***Resignations***

There were no resignations in 2015 to date.

#### ***Suspensions***

As of 11 September 2015 the following FAI Members had not paid their subscription fee for 2015 and thus had no vote at the general Conference. This was in accordance with the new rule that subscriptions had to have been deposited into the FAI bank account two weeks before the General Conference.

#### **ACTIVE MEMBERS**

- ALBANIA                                      Federata Shqiptare E Aeronautikes  
*Active Member Class 10*
- AZERBAIJAN                                      Azarbaycan Hava Va Ekstremal Idman Növlaci Federasiyasi  
*Active Member Class 10*
- BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA                      Vazduhoplovni Savez Bosne I Hercegovine  
*Active Member Class 10*
- BRAZIL    Comissão de Aerodesporto Brasileira  
*Active Member Class 5*
- COLOMBIA                                        Federación Colombiana de Deportes Aéreos "Fedeaereos"  
*Active Member Class 10*
- IRELAND    National Aero Club of Ireland  
*Active Member Class 9*
- KOREA    Central Aeronautic Association of DPR Korea  
*Active Member Class 10*

- KUWAIT                      Kuwait Science Club  
*Active Member Class 10*
- MALAYSIA                    Persekutuan Sukan Udara Malaysia  
*Active Member Class 10*
- MEXICO                      Federación Mexicana de Aeronáutica, A.C.  
*Active Member Class 9*
- MONTENEGRO                Vazduhoplovni Savez Crne Gore  
*Active Member Class 10*
- PERU                         Federación Peruana Aerodeportiva  
*Active Member Class 10*
- PORTUGAL                    Aero Club de Portugal  
*Active Member Class 9*
- UKRAINE                     Federation of Aeronautical Sports of Ukraine  
*Active Member Class 7*
- VENEZUELA                 Asociación Venezolana de los Deportes Aeronáuticos (A.V.D.A.)  
*Active Member Class 10*

#### **TEMPORARY MEMBERS**

- EL SALVADOR                Federación Salvadoreña de Paracaidismo y Aerodeportes

The FAI Conference was invited to note that, if subscriptions were not paid by 31 December 2015 these members would be suspended.

#### **Expulsions**

The following countries had already been suspended and their membership would be terminated if no payment was forthcoming by 31 December 2015.

- ARMENIA                    Nat. Committee of Aeromodelling and Spacemodelling Sports  
*Temporary member*
- IRAQ                         Al-Sokoor Aero Club  
*Temporary member*
- LIBYA                        Libyan Airsports Federation  
*Active Member Class 10*
- MOROCCO                    Fédération Royale Marocaine de l'Aviation Légère et Sportive  
*Active Member Class 10*
- PAKISTAN                    All Pakistan Aero Modelling & Ultralight Association  
*Active Member Class 9*
- URUGUAY                    Centro Uruguayo de Planeadores  
*Associate member*

## **8.2. Consideration of Applications for Admission of New FAI Members**

### **a. Fédération Algérienne des Sports Aériens (ALG)** *Application for Application for Active Member, Class 10*

Background: The Fédération Algérienne des Sports Aériens officially declared itself a candidate for FAI Active Membership in June 2015. Sufficient documentation, including statutes, had been received.

**The FAI General Conference accepted the application by the Fédération Algérienne des Sports Aériens for FAI Active Membership with immediate effect.**

**b. Aeronautical Federation of Kosovo (KOS)**

*Application for Application for Active Member, Class 10*

Background: The Aeronautical Federation of Kosovo officially declared itself a candidate for FAI Active Membership in March 2015. Sufficient documentation, including statutes, had been received.

**The FAI General Conference accepted the Aeronautical Federation of Kosovo's application for FAI Active Membership with immediate effect.**

Representatives of the Spanish and Serbian NACs wished to register their committees' opposition to the membership of Kosovo, which was not accepted as a country by Serbia or by the United Nations. The Serbian representative noted that, as many members of the General Conference did not recognise Kosovo as a country, he did not see how they could be accepted as a member, despite the fact that it had been recognised by the International Olympic Committee.

The Secretary General said that while the members' objections had been noted, the IOC had recognised Kosovo's National Olympic Committee, and since the FAI was recognised by the IOC, they followed this rule.

**8.3. Re-approval of Existing Temporary Members**

Many members were striving to become active members again. The General Conference was invited to renew the temporary membership of the following members, provided they paid their membership dues before 31 December 2015:

Armenia:	2006
El Salvador:	1998
Iraq	2010
Laos:	2013
Paraguay:	2003
Trinidad & Tobago:	2009
Vietnam:	2012

**The General Conference unanimously agreed to renew the Temporary Membership of all the above-mentioned members.**

**8.4. Other membership matters (for information)**

**a. Change of class**

The FAI Members listed below had requested the following changes of class. The changes were submitted for approval together with the approval of the Scale of Subscriptions 2016.

**France:** change from Class 2 to Class 3 for 2016

**Saudi Arabia:** change from Class 10 to Class 9 for 2016

**b. Incomplete/Pending Membership Applications**

The Members would be informed should these applications become relevant for a future decision by the General Conference.

- BOTSWANA Parachute Association of Botswana – *Application for Associate membership for Parachuting according to FAI Statutes 2.5.*
- GEORGIA Aeromodelling Sports Federation – *Application for Associate membership for Aeromodelling according to FAI Statutes 2.5.*

- NIGERIA Nigeria Parachuting and Aeronautics Federation – *Application for Active membership according to FAI Statutes 2.5.*
- USA United States Parachute Association (USPA) – *Application for Associate membership for Parachuting according to FAI Statutes 2.8.*

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) wished to make a motion regarding a working group to establish guidelines as to the responsibilities of a NAC, taking into consideration the problem when a NAC chose to delegate its sporting rights. Here, the USPA was trying to become a member, when there was already a NAC in the USA. There were other instances where a NAC had delegated its sporting power to different entities. His suggested membership for this working group would be four NACs, one Air Sport Commission and one observer from the Executive Board, and they should aim to present draft guidelines at the next GC in 2016. The guidelines would not be mandatory, but they would provide useful guidance for new countries and existing countries considering reorganisation.

The FAI President noted that the FAI Head Office and Executive Board were already working intensively on this issue. They were reviewing the FAI's structure, looking at the delegation of sporting powers, guidelines for NACs regarding their duties, members, responsibilities, delegation possibilities, handling of sporting licences etc. Whether it was appropriate to have a new working group on this issue was for the GC to take a view on.

Mr Lindgren's motion was seconded by CIAM (Aeromodelling Commission)

The FAI President asked Mr LINDGREN to put the motion in writing so that they could come back to the issue.

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (CIA President) believed that more ASCs were needed on this working group.

## **9. Election of FAI Vice-Presidents for 2015/2016**

New Zealand and Korea had both sent word that they had not received any correspondence regarding the request for nominations. Accordingly, it was proposed that the two nominees be included in the list of the FAI Vice-Presidents. For New Zealand, this was Liz King and for Korea, it was Lee Young Duck. There being no objections, these names were included in the list of FAI Vice-Presidents as provided.

**The list of persons nominated to serve as FAI Vice-Presidents for 2015/2016 for countries in good standing (ANNEX 2) was approved by the General Conference.**

The President noted that these Vice-Presidencies were important positions, as they were the FAI representatives in their location. It was also the Vice-Presidents' job to report to the FAI any issues they felt the Executive Board should take note of.

The Secretary General pointed out that the Companions of Honour could nominate a coordinator from their group to advise the Vice-Presidents on awards. This would be established over the next month, so the Companions of Honour would be involved in the next Awards voting round by FAI Vice-Presidents.

## **10. Presentation & Election of Active Members on Air Sport General Commission (CASI)**

### ***Presentation***

The FAI General Conference was invited to elect 5 Active Members to serve on CASI in accordance with FAI Statutes 5.2.3.2.7.1. and 5.2.3.2.8. The representatives of the following

countries, having served for 2 years on CASI, were required to stand down: Australia, Czech Republic, Germany, Spain and Switzerland.

The following countries still had one year of their two-year CASI term left to serve, and did not need to be re-elected in 2015: Canada, Italy, Russia, Sweden and the USA.

The following countries were standing for election to the vacant CASI positions: Australia, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Spain, Switzerland and UK.

The principle representatives of each country were invited to make a short presentation.

### ***Election***

Mr LEINIKKI explained the voting procedure, which would be by simple majority.

The Secretary General explained that two new voting members had been admitted since Roll Call, so the total votes were 334.

The representatives of Switzerland (92.1%), United Kingdom (76.4%), Hong Kong (70.8%), and Germany (63%) were duly elected after the first round. France (59.1%) was elected after the second round.

The full list of CASI Country Members for 2015/2016 was therefore as follows, listed alphabetically: Canada, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and USA.

## **11. Report of the FAI Secretary General**

The FAI Secretary General, Ms Susanne SCHÖDEL, presented her report (**ANNEX 3**), covering the topics of Membership Development, Air Sports Development and Administrative Matters.

She noted that, despite the multitude of air sports events, since the last the GC an attempt had been made by the Executive Board and the FAI Head Office to be more present at the events. There had therefore been an official FAI presence at 21 world or continental championships on four continents and in 16 countries. She hoped to maintain this frequency in the future as it was very useful to connect with local organisers and FAI officials and see what their needs were, and look at ways of improving collaborations between stakeholder and within the organisation.

The Head Office had followed Solar Impulse 2 diligently, and immediately after André Borschberg had landed in Hawaii, sent out a press release to note the achievement, which was in line with their policy of promoting achievements immediately after they had happened. Although the official ratification process would always take longer, it was vital to capture media interest immediately.

Finally, she noted that if the members sent the results of their championships to the FAI within 24 hours of the event, if it was in the correct format, it would be provided to the media as a pdf.

With regard to finance, the Secretary General wished to thank the Finance Advisory Group for their thorough review of the FAI's finances, which was helping to make matters clearer for the members. With respect to the FAI World Air Games, she acknowledged the considerable efforts being made by the host country and the FAI. It was planned to have a review process after the WAG in order to build on the lessons they had learned. Even though these were the 4<sup>th</sup> World Air Games, unfortunately the challenges were very different compared to those from past events like 2009 so only a few learnings could be applied.

The FAI Head Office was trying to speed up the processes for validating records and performances, but with their limited resources this was not always easy. The CIAM and CIA had been asked to have record claims reviewed by their own experts, and this had now been approved as a standard operating procedure by the Executive Board. The FAI was also re-establishing contact with the Guinness Book of World Records with a view to increasing the visibility of air sports achievements.

She pointed out that the inconsistency of the FAI rules was making the FAI vulnerable, as had been seen from a number of appeals. The incorrect use of the FAI logo and brand, and non-compliance with rules had a negative effect on the FAI's values. Work therefore needed to be done, but in a positive way together with all the stakeholders concerned, such as was being done within the Air Sport Commissions with jury trainings.

**The General Conference took note of the Secretary General's report.**

The FAI President thanked the Secretary General for her hard and intelligent work at Head Office with her enthusiastic and always helpful team.

## **12. Recommendation of Museums**

Ms Gillian RAYNER (Executive Director) reported that the Education Expert Group had realised that very little follow-up had been done on those museums that had already been awarded recognition. They had approached the 29 museums on the list and received feedback from over half of them. Further work would be done to ensure that those that had not responded still complied with the FAI By-Laws. From the feedback, it was clear that some of them were no longer museums per se. The Expert Group therefore felt it would be a good idea to enlarge this programme to cover not just museums but also clubs, exhibitions and even websites. The proposal had been submitted to the Executive Board, and the By-Laws would be modified as necessary. A more catchy name for the category would also be considered, along with a renewal process.

There were four new candidates:

- Irish Aviation Foundation (IRL)
- Centro Studi dei Volo a Vela Alpino (ITA)
- Museum-Monument Francisco Sarabia (MEX)
- Anderson Abruzzo International Balloon Museum (USA)

Representatives of the organisations concerned were invited to give a brief presentation.

**The General Conference unanimously approved the acceptance of the above-mentioned organisations as FAI Recommended Museums.**

## **13. Commission Reports**

### ***FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM) – ANNEX 4+4b***

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS (CIAM President) gave his report, mentioning some highlights of the Commission's activities, including sporting events in 2014 and 2015, and cases for consideration.

In 2014 they had held 18 Cat 1 events and 300 Cat 2 events. In 2015 there had been 16 Cat 1 events and 350 Cat 2. The organisational effort involved was enormous, many volunteers were required from all the organisers as well as support for the local NACs and officials, and he thanked all those present for their support.

At its last plenary meeting CIAM had discussed the issue of drones, which would be further expanded in the Open Forum. He also mentioned that the CIAM had started in 2015 to use a live scoring system, which reduced paperwork, made the competitions more media-friendly and more enjoyable for spectators. Finally, the number of instances of unsporting behaviour had increased over the last two years and needed to be addressed; the issue had been discussed with the Executive Board.

### ***FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL) – ANNEX 5***

Mr Stéphane MALBOS (CIVL President) noted that he was hoping the FAI could make the Commission's life easier, by finding a way of sanctioning competitions with less paperwork and more automatic systems, as well as a physical and linear calendar to keep track of the 400 or so competitions staged every year. He thanked Messrs LEINIKKI and HAGGENEY at Head Office for their help with this.

As far as the WAG were concerned, the CIVL had found itself unprepared to act as a competition organiser, and because of the huge amount of work involved the Commission's other activities were suffering. It was nevertheless a good learning experience, and they would use it as a stepping stone to build the hang gliding and paragliding events that would fit the concept of multidisciplinary events that were as much shows as competitions. The Commission nevertheless fully supported the concept.

Sporting licences – without pilots to fly in their competitions the CIVL would not exist, and pilots without a sporting licence could not fly. He encouraged the NACs to make life easier for pilots who wanted to compete in international competitions, by making sporting licences cheap and available.

Finally, he thanked the FAI staff for their helpfulness and commitment, and for the software tools they had already made available. He also thanked the EB and other Commission Presidents.

### ***FAI Microlight and Paramotor Commission (CIMA) – ANNEX 6***

Mr Wolfgang LINTL (1<sup>st</sup> Vice-President of CIMA) explained that for personal reasons Mr MEREDITH-HARDY had been unable to fulfil his duties as President since the beginning of 2015, but with the help of the FAI Head Office, the Commission had coped.

He highlighted some important issues. There was a need for media- and public-friendly air sports, which was why in the last few years the format of Paramotor Slalom had been developed. He played a short video. Outside help was needed to maximise the potential and bring it to a wider audience. He would welcome better coordination with other ASCs, to maximise shared learning, such as the live scoring system developed by CIAM, and with other International Federations as well as the FAI. An obvious function of FAI Head Office was to ensure the Commissions did not all have to reinvent the wheel.

He thanked the FAI Head Office for their administrative support and looked forward to developing their relationship.

### ***FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA) – ANNEX 7***

Mr Vladimir MACHULA (CIVA representative) presented the report. He mentioned that cooperation between ASCs should be more coordinated, as they had been using an online scoring system since 2008.

### ***FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)***

Mr Jean-Pierre DELMAS (GAC President) reported that in 2015, they had had two events: a World Championship of Precision Flying to award a world title to the best-skilled pilot, and one long-range cross-country flight based in Hungary with flying legs in neighbouring countries. The GAC was continuing with its policy not only to select the best pilots in the world but to encourage private pilots, particularly in Europe, to cross borders. The GAC's policy was also to attract new competitors, and new competition organisers. An international cooperation was ongoing between experienced countries and less experienced countries. The next step was to make GAC competitions more attractive to the public and the press. The new format was ready, and would be used at the WAG in Dubai.

**Note from FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)**

Mr Graeme WINDSOR reported, for information, that following the election of the CASI delegates there had been a change. He thanked the retiring delegates, particularly Mike CLOSE (Australia), who had put in a great deal of work over the years, and Juan Ramon ALVAREZ CARAMAZANA (Spain). He had been returned as President of CASI, and thanked the delegates for their support.

1st Vice-President: Alicia HIRZEL (replacing Richard A.F. “Buzz” BENNETT); Arthur GREENFIELD; Antonis PAPADOPOULOS; Bengt LINDGREN. Secretary Marina VIGORITO GALETTO.

<b>14. Report from Finance Advisory Group</b>
---

Mr Frits BRINK (Executive Director – Finance) noted that he had greatly appreciated the help of Bob CLIPSHAM, who together with the EB had done a great job on the FAI's finances for many years. He also applauded work of the Secretary General to implement a more transparent way of presenting the organisation's finances.

A number of discussions had been held with the Finance Advisory Group, and he had agreed with the ASCs and the EB that an additional representative nominated by the Commissions should be included, and this would be going ahead.

Mr ANANOV reported on the work of the Finance Advisory Group (**ANNEX 9**). He noted that the decision to create a Financial Advisory Group had been made during the previous 2014 GC, after a heated discussion over the 2015 budget, with a view to creating greater transparency and better understanding. The group had begun its work, and its goals had been determined by the EB.

One outcome of the survey submitted to ASC Presidents was that the ASCs felt the budgeting process needed significant revision, with a view to implementing clearer procedures, a set of common guidelines and taking into account the Commissions' differences. Nevertheless, the ASC Presidents were largely satisfied with the FAI's 2015 budget.

However, it appeared from an analysis of financial flows for 2014 that the only money received by the ASCs from Head Office was directly related to sponsorship, which suggested that the FAI budget was primarily NAC-oriented. Only 2 ASCs had succeeded in balancing their budgets in 2013 and 2014 and none in 2015.

With respect to the 2014 financial results, Mr Ananov noted that as a result of an increase in the reserves of the FAI and ASCs, some expenditures had been increased above the budgeted levels. The Executive Board or Finance Director was in fact responsible for approving changes to the budgeted figures, depending on the sum, but it must be in line with expense approval procedures, and in many cases there was no evidence that a formal request had been made. If such decisions were made informally, this meant that between General Conferences there was no real control over expenditure. A comparative analysis of budget versus actual figures had been conducted, and the results were included in **ANNEX 16c**. By the end of 2014, surplus revenues put into unplanned provisions totalled CHF 238,000, and as he understood it, no surpluses were used to replenish the ASCs' reserves. Clearly the EB had the powers to take such decisions between GCs, but it was important that the process be transparent and democratic.

With respect to the 2015 budget, if the recommendations made at the last General Conference, namely to separate provisions from the income and expenditure, were implemented, a more accurate picture of the financial situation would emerge, and the FAI would report a profit, rather than a loss of some CHF 400,000.

He ended by thanking Alicia HIRZEL and Andy CHAU for their cooperation.

In answer to a question from the floor, Mr ANANOV explained that a provision was a decision by a body to save and allocate money for a specific purpose in the future.



## **15. Report on FAI Finances 2014–2015**

### **15.1. 2014 Financial Report (Balance Sheet and P&L Statement) and the report by the Auditors – ANNEX 10+10b**

Mr Frits BRINK (Executive Director – Finance) noted that discussions within the Advisory Group had been extremely helpful in helping him to gain a good view of the FAI's financial situation.

He asked if there were any questions or comments on the 2014 Financial Report (**ANNEX 10**).

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) had a question regarding the balances for the Air Sport Commissions. The 2013 page gave one figure, then there was a different figure for 2014. He wondered if it was good accounting procedure to change the outgoing balance to the incoming balance. Also, the auditor had not provided page numbers on the audit, making it difficult to follow. He would also like to know the difference between the two versions of the document, one from June and the other a little later.

The Secretary General pointed to the notes to the Financial Statement, 4) Statement of changes in special reserves, which concerned mainly the reserves of the ASCs, but also the WAG, Olympic Movement fund and World Grand Prix of Aviation. Note 1 stated that the opening balance of CIVL had been revised to CHF 5000, which should account for the difference. This change had taken place between the two audits.

Mr LINDGREN pointed out that some figures completely disappeared between one version and the next, making a difference of up to CHF 1,500.

The Secretary General noted that the second change was Note 2, the negative opening results of CANS and CIEA had been covered by Head Office, so they would no longer be shown in the ASC reserves.

Mr LINDGREN said that the usual way to do this was to put the reserves to zero for that year, then take it away the following year, otherwise it was impossible to follow. There was a note saying that something had been changed in the balance report, and the balance report must follow the rules. Normally, the outgoing balance from one year was the same as the incoming balance for the next year. It was impossible to follow what was happening here, because the notes got lost.

The Secretary General said she would note Mr LINDGREN's comments and consider how this could be changed for future years. Nevertheless, she trusted that the notes explained the discrepancies, in accordance with the statements of PWC, who had been working through the reserves issues for some years.

Regarding the audited statement that had been sent on a different date, the overall result did not change in the course of the final review, or on the comparison document that the Finance Advisory Group had sent. It had come to their attention that two expenses had not been correctly allocated, so they had been changed within the expenditure so that the results stayed the same. PWC had been asked if they agreed with the change, and they had, which is why the second version had been sent.

Mr LINDGREN asked if the second version had a different date. Both versions currently had the same date.

Mr BRINK confirmed that this was correct.

**The General Conference unanimously adopted the 2014 Financial Report (Balance Sheet and P&L Statement) and report by the Auditors.**

### **15.2. 2015: The financial situation at 30 June 2015**

Mr BRINK noted that as the General Conference was taking place a little earlier this year, the financial statements could only be provided as of 30 June 2015. Everything was nevertheless on track. As of 23 September 92.6% of subscriptions had been paid, roughly the same as in previous

years. An improvement in the 2015 budget was anticipated by the end of the year, given that at the end of 2014 provisions were made which were planned to be used in 2015.

### **15.3. Approval of Auditors for 2015/2016**

Ms Alicia HIRZEL (Switzerland) asked what remuneration PriceWaterhouseCoopers would expect to receive, to audit the 2015 figures.

The Secretary General replied that the final amount had not yet been negotiated for 2015, but it would be in the region of CHF 12,000.

Mr BRINK confirmed that the auditors for 2015 had already been appointed in 2014, and today they were being asked to decide for 2016.

Mr LINDGREN pointed out that the motion stated that auditors were to be approved for 2015 and 2016.

The Secretary General explained that in previous years the General Conference had always approved auditors for the current year and the next year. It was important to be sure that an auditor was in place for the next year before the end of the current calendar year, where there was not yet a decision from the GC. A discussion had taken place as to whether the GC should be asked to appoint an auditor for 2015, even though this had already been done at the last GC. They had also considered not appointing one for 2016, which raised the issue of having no one in place from January 2016. For these reasons, the GC was being asked to reconfirm 2015, and appoint an auditor for 2016, subject to a proposal to the next GC that this might be changed.

**Appointment of Auditors for 2015/2016 (PriceWaterhouseCoopers) unanimously approved by the General Conference.**

## **16. Discharge of FAI Executive Board**

**The General Conference unanimously discharged the FAI Executive Board of responsibility for the management of the FAI affairs during the financial year 2014.**

## **17. Reference currency for the FAI Scale of Subscriptions**

Mr BRINK noted that this agenda item had been proposed by France.

The issue was not a new one: looking at currency fluctuations over the last 10 years, sometimes there was a gain and sometimes there was a loss, and in a losing year it was natural to consider changing. However, under Swiss law the FAI was obliged to have Swiss francs as its base currency. All the business of Head Office was conducted in Swiss francs, but the Commissions worked in euros. He felt that a current exchange rate situation that was unfavourable for some was not a reason to change.

Mr Bruno DELOR (FRA) explained that the request did not just refer to the FAI Scale of Subscriptions but to all FAI currency operations. He knew that other international sports organisations based in Switzerland, such as the IOC, worked in US dollars. Currency losses over the last 10 years had all been in the same direction, and represented a greater than 50% increase in costs over that time. The Swiss franc was relevant to only one country, which meant that all the other FAI members were obliged to assume the associated currency risk. It might be more logical to take the US dollar or euros, which were true international currencies.

Mr BRINK agreed, but in his investigations he had looked further than ten years, which is when it became clear that currencies tended to swing in both directions. Moreover, over 80% of the FAI's expenditure was in Swiss francs. He did not know how this compared with other international sports organisations, but this alone meant that it was logical to keep Swiss francs as the FAI's base currency.

The President added that the comparison with the IOC was not quite fair. The IOC had remarkable reserves, income and salaries. Any conversion to US dollars, for instance, would probably result in even greater expense than currently paid.

Ms Alicia HIRZEL (Switzerland) explained that from 1 January 2015 the Swiss Code of Obligations had changed, and allowed for companies to produce their final figures in either Swiss francs or the currency they used most. It could be useful to discuss this with PWC, to identify how they would deal with this in the future.

The FAI President of Honour, Mr. PORTMANN, wished to explain the reasoning behind the decision to make Swiss francs the currency of the FAI. Some were under the impression that the decision had been made when the FAI had moved to Switzerland. This was not the case. Thirty years or so back, when the FAI was based in France, an FAI treasurer had decided to make the change in view of the devaluation of the French Franc. If their reserves had been kept in French francs the FAI would be destitute today. Such matters could not be discussed merely on emotion. The Finance Director had given a very good reason. If they wanted to make sure they would not lose money, then they had to remain in the currency that accounted for the majority of their expenses. Also, they should not make comparisons with Olympic federations, the smallest of which received USD 5 million every four years.

The President thanked the French delegate for his question, which was an interesting one. Nevertheless, whatever they did had to be converted into CHF for auditing purposes. No changes would be made unless there was a very good reason to do so.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN (Executive Director) thought they should not confuse two issues: one was the monetary issue of having to pay subscriptions in CHF for countries working in a different currency, and the other was long-term question of whether they wanted to keep the organisation's costs always in Swiss francs. There were two answers to each of these questions. Members could purchase Swiss francs in advance if they were concerned the exchange would be more costly at the time they had to pay their subscription, or they could ask the FAI to buy or sell a futures contract for euros or dollars, which would remove the risk for that year. For the other question, the Swiss franc was a fairly stable currency so the net result was that even if the currency went up, the costs remained stable, so it averaged out. In the long run, he considered the best policy was not to get burned with currency transactions.

## **18. Report on the World Air Games 2015**

H.E. Mr Yousif AL HAMMADI, Vice-President of the United Arab Emirates Aerosports Federation, began by announcing his delegation's sadness and shock at the death of the eldest son of Sheikh Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, Vice President and Prime Minister of the UAE and Ruler of Dubai. Sheikh Rashid bin Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, who had died at the age of 34, was a much loved and respected sport visionary and enthusiast. The entire country was in mourning, and the UAE delegation here today shared the sadness of the country's leadership and of His Highness Sheikh Hamdan bin Rashid Al Maktoum, the Crown Prince of Dubai, Patron of the World Air Games and the brother of the late Sheikh Rashid.

Mr AL HAMMADI explained the significance and symbolism of the falcon, whose qualities of survival, training, honour, sportsmanship, discipline underpinned Dubai's approach to hosting the first ever World Air Games in December 2015.

The Emirates Aerosports Federation believed that it had achieved a great deal, and intended to do even more. Although they had experienced some challenges in their preparations, it was their culture to turn challenges into opportunities. They had taken the flame from Lausanne to Spain and on to the rest of the world. He reported that Dubai was ready to host the FAI World Air Games in December 2015 and would rise to the occasion, making them an unforgettable experience for all participants. Preparation of the competition sites and details of the opening ceremony were all on track. The Aeromedical Conference was an integral part of the World Air Games and would be

staged from 3–5 December 2015 at the Meydan Hotel in Dubai. The programme would examine contemporary issues related to medicine in aviation and extreme sports. He thanked the FAI for its confidence in the UAE. The WAG opening ceremony would take place on 3 December at the Skydive Dubai Marina, the day after the UAE's national day and during the peak time of the championships. He thanked his team, the organising committee and the FAI for their hard work to ensure the success of the event.

He made a presentation to the NAC of the Netherlands and invited Dr Ronald SCHNITKER to the stage.

The FAI President thanked H.E. Al Hammadi for his reassuring words.

The President noted that the road to the World Air Games had been a bumpy one, and levels of success had varied, in terms of both the idea of the WAG, and financially. Nevertheless things had improved, with a much better bid document, and he was extremely pleased that they had concluded a contract with Dubai. Cooperation had always been very positive, although the cultural differences had sometimes made communication a challenge. The local organisers were putting in tremendous work to cover every aspect of the logistics, media and finance. If the WAG were successful this raised wonderful opportunities for the future in terms of interesting future hosts and sponsors. The main aim was to have a safe and exciting event.

Referring to his report (**ANNEX 12**), he noted that all in-country costs for participants were covered by the local organisers.

The President introduced the WAG coordinator, Mr Eric BERTIN, who was working very hard. A recent workshop had been held on the WAG, and it had been very positive. Many issues, including the complex transportation issues, had been resolved and the situation now seemed to be under control.

Mr Eric BERTIN thanked everyone for their patience. He was sure they would have a fantastic event because their host was very keen to welcome all the air sports community, and would do everything possible for them.

The President noted that during a visit by the Dubai organisers to Lausanne a flame ceremony accompanied by an extensive air sports demonstration had been staged at short notice. A video of the event was shown.

## **19. FAI Sports and Branding Strategy; Air Games Event Series Proposal**

### **(ANNEX 13+13b)**

Mr Niels-Christian LEVIN HANSEN (Executive Director) said that FAI was at a crossroads: they could continue the way they had been going, which was not bad, but there was room for improvement and possibilities for development, to stage better events and attract sponsors. His proposal was to take a different path, developing and refining what they already had, increasing the attraction of air sports to sponsors, organisers and competitors.

This was a long-term proposal, with a strategy defined up to 2020, although the project would take longer. It would require investment in terms of finance, manpower and experience. The Secretary General and the Sports and Marketing Director had put in a great deal of work, as well as Executive Director Frits Brink and himself. The Executive Board had also been monitoring developments.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) said he was confused as to who would own the events. Would they be owned by the organising NAC, or would they be owned by the FAI, who would then pay the organiser? They could not rely on local organisers to take the financial risk without any potential upside. This had to be built into the strategy. He also wondered if this was what the NACs wanted. It was difficult to find organisers for some events, and it could be even more of a problem with multi-sports events, which meant working with even more national federations. He also felt that the

GC had somewhat been taken hostage with this proposal, which had not been widely discussed over the year, and they should take a step back and give the concept more consideration. They appeared to be moving from sporting language into commercial language: no longer members but stakeholders. This was not healthy. A budget proposal had been presented, but it was unclear how the figures had been arrived at. It would have a major impact on reserves.

Mr LEVIN HANSEN understood Mr LINDGREN'S concerns. The FAI would own the event, but in terms of specific execution of an event, it would be run centrally. The NACs would not be asked to pay for the event. He was also keenly aware that if it was going to work the concept would have to be sufficiently attractive to sponsors and host cities, not only to cover the costs but potentially generate a profit. Looking at the 5-year plan, there were specific milestones. If in 2016 they were unable to develop a product they would come back to the membership. Although he knew the destination he wanted to reach by 2020 he did not know the exact path they would take to get there. Part of what the GC were being asked to approve was to initiate the process and allocate resources to begin finalising the plans and bring more detail.

Mr BRINK noted that they would be discussing the 2016 budget later in the meeting. What they had here was a draft plan, not a final budget.

Mr Stéphane MALBOS (CIVL President) said that the CIVL had already discussed such an event, a smaller event run by a team of professionals, which they felt would give impetus to all their competitions. He was extremely happy to work on this project, which he did not feel would jeopardise the regular championships, and would be easier to manage. The WAGs would help to build up this project.

Mr Rolf RADESPIEL (OSTIV President) noted that the survey mentioned by Mr LEVIN HANSEN had thrown up some less pleasant perceptions of air sports, which had been somewhat glossed over. He felt it was important for the FAI to deal with negative concerns about risks and accidents. He recommended that while building this new approach to raise the FAI's profile, they must also implement concrete countermeasures to improve the negative characteristics.

Mr LEVIN HANSEN noted that another negative characteristic that had emerged was that air sports people were perceived as being privileged. Risk and danger were an attraction for some, but clearly could quickly become negative if they were translated into casualties. Formula 1 had had the same experience. Safety would definitely be a focus area as they proceeded with this strategy.

Mr Patrick NAEGELI (United Kingdom) agreed that the idea was a positive one; it was important for the FAI to continue to look for ways to grow all the air sport disciplines in a professional and media-friendly way. However, if the members were being asked to approve the plan, they needed more insight into the thinking. As presented, the plan suggested that FAI would incur expenditure of CHF 2.9 million over five years, while sponsorship income amounted to no more than CHF 2.3 million. Under what circumstances did they believe they would get real return on this investment, with a net difference of CHF 700,000? Second, it critically depended on the FAI's ability to engage the media and sponsorship, and they already knew how difficult it was to attract and retain sponsors. There was considerable risk, which recent experience demonstrated should not be taken lightly. How were they going to ensure they knew what the absolute limit of liability was in the early stages of the plan, when most of the costs started to become real, and long before they had a sense of what income was possible?

Mr LEVIN HANSEN noted that if this was easy someone would already have done it. They had looked at other organisations that had already succeeded with such a project, and which had created smaller tailor-made events in close cooperation with sponsors. One common denominator was to raise the level of professionalism, to put in place a team capable of doing the same thing each time, in each host city, and ensure that all commitments, whether to the competitors, host cities, sponsors or media, were delivered. It was possible.

Mr Frits BRINK (Executive Director) said they had to be clear on the status of what they were seeing now. Preliminary discussions with professionals had only just taken place, and everything had still to be worked out. The only guarantee was that, if they did nothing, the FAI would be out of

the game. Successful air shows were taking place, run by professionals, and the FAI should be part of that. They had to define their product and needed professionals to do so.

The Secretary General said she was 100% behind this initiative, which was the outcome of everything they had discussed with the ASCs, event organisers and FAI members. For her the word “stakeholder” had a positive connotation, synonymous with “owner” and in no way diminished the importance of an NAC.

In terms of the budget figures, they had taken revenue from the global sponsorship, where they currently had one partner, out of the calculation for this project. The Global Sponsorship line came to approx. CHF 2 million, investment came to CHF 2.6 million, and expenditure over 5 years came to CHF 2.8 million, which gave a positive result. Clearly, the members were not expected to approve a plan where expenditures were greater than revenues. It was important to note that this was the first time they had prepared a five-year outlook, to gain some understanding of where they were headed. Also, the members were not expected to decide on the five-year plan. They would begin with a first-year budget for 2016, and this would be reviewed by the next GC at the latest.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) pointed out that the draft budget stated allocations to ASCs and NACs would begin in 2018, and this was clearly unrealistic. It was an investment, but there was no way of knowing whether it was a good investment. The intentions were good but they needed more details if they were to make a reasoned decision. The first investment would be to conduct a better survey in 2016, but he would like a substantially better presentation of the concept beforehand. If they were asking for a carte blanche for the next 5 years this was not good. It would be better to take a good decision next year, they were in no rush, and invest the money when they really knew what they were getting into.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN felt it was vital to reflect on what was happening. Mr Lindgren's question was a good one: were they stakeholders or owners? As he saw it, the FAI Members are the bosses: their vote would decide whether or not the project went ahead. The FAI was considered the top provider of record holders and champions worldwide, and their integrity was not questioned. Red Bull had now built a business on the strength of the FAI's greatest aerobatic champions, and other groups were taking the FAI's know-how and making money from it. The FAI had spent a great deal of time and money producing the rules that made other people money; all of the aeroclubs and federations were investing year on year not only in their FAI subscription but in paying for their delegates to take part in the Commissions that made the rules. Mr Levin Hansen was suggesting that the FAI now make a serious effort to go down that route. It was complicated; it would change the way they thought, but unless they did it they would see more and more groups making money out of the knowledge the FAI Commissions generated. Making a new investment would always involve a certain amount of risk. If they did this, they might start going along a commercial route, clearly separating the rule-making from the exploitation. IPETA had a good product and had been commercialising it for one year now, and this could provide a good example for all the other air sports disciplines if they were successful. Air sports were such a closed community, events such as those being proposed could bring some much-needed publicity.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS (CIAM President) offered a different perspective: at the GC they often spoke about being a family, but between their annual meetings they all worked as individual organisations. He believed that this kind of event could reinforce the idea of being a family – a common project they could all work towards.

Mr LEVIN HANSEN noted that one of the Executive Board jobs was to present a vision. It was also their job to work with risks, be aware of the pitfalls and monitor them, and be able to adjust as they moved forward. Within the system they had created they had all the necessary tools to do both. The GC would be asked to approve only the budget for the next year, and as the years went on the figures would be carefully monitored and the necessary adjustments made to achieve success. He was confident that if they took this path, in five years they would look back on a different FAI, where the quality and outreach they could make to competitors, the public, and sponsors was vastly different from today. He hoped he had the members' support to take the first steps on this journey.

The President said he believed they had the right products, and needed to package them in an attractive way for potential organisers. It was an important step for the future of air sports and the next generation of air sport people.

## **20. Organiser Agreement**

The President noted that this issue had been presented in detail to the ASC Presidents and had their approval.

Mr Markus HAGGENEY (Sports and Marketing Director) presented his report (**ANNEX 14**) and said that the situation was in line with what they had promised last year. He apologised for the use of marketing terminology, but this was in line with the increasing need to see the events the FAI staged as a product.

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (CIA President) asked if Mr HAGGENEY could give an estimate as to when the new Organiser Agreement would be available, since the Commissions would have to decide about agreements in the near future.

Mr HAGGENEY replied that the process would be rolled out with “launch customers” and “launch commissions”, and the CIA would be one of those. As a matter of courtesy he would prefer to wait for feedback from the NACs, but would like to agree on a two-week maximum time window, and then begin roll-out, subject to the EB’s green light. He expected the new agreement to be in place in October.

The President confirmed that the old Organiser Agreement would remain in place until this time. Nevertheless, any upcoming bidders should read the Organiser Agreement before they registered their bids.

## **21. Partnership with Red Bull Air Race**

The President introduced a film and greeting from Erich Wolf, CEO of Red Bull Air Race Corporation, a major supporter, noting that they would not have this excellent partnership without the work of President of Honour Pierre PORTMANN and former Secretary General Max BISHOP.

## **22. Roll-Call of Delegations**

Roll call conducted on day 2 of the FAI General Conference.

Voting kits with a total of 333 votes had been distributed to the delegations: Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, PR China, Chinese Taipei, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hong Kong China, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, Korea, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States.

- Absolute majority: 167
- Two-thirds majority: 223

A delegate wished to clarify that Mr Stéphane Malbos, CIVL President, was at the doctor’s and CIVL Vice-President Zeljko OVUKA had the vote.

## 23. 2016 FAI Budget

### ANNEX 15

Mr Frits BRINK (Executive Director – Finance) pointed out that the only voting required today would be for the 2016 budget. If changes were needed on route then adjustments would be made to the 5-year outlook, and it was important to define how the risks would be monitored. There were a few points at which it would be possible to reassess the situation: the Finance Advisory Group meeting, ASC President's meeting, EB and NAC Presidents' meeting.

Mr Patrick NAEGELI (United Kingdom) had a number of significant issues with the budget as presented and had a specific proposal. First, there were significant uncertainties associated with the potential outturn of the proposed event series. There were significant potential expenditures attached to this programme, particularly in the early years. Despite this, it had been decided to include the first year's full expenditure on that programme in the 2016 budget, which the UK felt was extremely unwise. It would be far better to present the membership with the base budget excluding that programme, allowing the membership to vote on that, allowing them to consider separately the merits of the event series, given the associated costs. Looking at one year's expenditure of a five-year programme was not the right way to look at the programme itself; they should look at a budget of at least two years to be able to judge. It would not be possible to assess the progress of the programme at the beginning of 2016, and potentially by the end of 2016 they would have very little idea of whether they could still be confident that the forward projections for sponsorship income were realisable. Consequently the UK could not accept the budget as presented. Presenting a separate budget would enable the acceptance of the Members for the scale of the investment against the risk of the programme to be properly gauged. The UK had no desire to hinder the normal operations of the FAI by complicating the normal operating budget, but could not accept a budget that included a highly speculative component. Looking at the 5-year budget alongside the 2016 budget, the EB was asking the FAI Members to sanction the drawdown of reserves amounting to CHF 1.6 million over 3 years, and potentially even by 2020 the FAI's reserves would be down by CHF 1 million, even if all the sponsorship goals were realised.

The President noted that Mr NAEGELI was claiming that the FAI membership were being asked to accept a budget for three years, which was not the case.

Mr NAEGELI agreed that they were only voting on the budget for one year, but on the basis of the fact that much of the expenditure the membership were being asked to sanction in the first year, 2016, was associated with a multi-year programme, it was not practical to look solely at one year, with an expected deficit of CHF 700,000 in 2016, most of which was attached to the proposed event series. The UK would have two suggestions: first, to remove the event series so that it could be considered separately, and second, explain the CHF 300,000 deficit to the normal budget.

The President reminded the members that this was not a deficit but a use of provisions. If this was unacceptable, Mr NAEGELI was questioning the EB's entire strategy to develop and improve the FAI rather than merely administer.

The Secretary General said that the fact that the FAI had reserves of CHF 1.6 million that could be used was positive. Whether they should continue to accumulate reserves or make provisions to use the available amounts was a policy decision. They had reallocated some of the expenses that used to be in the operational budget into the air games series proposal, as they were interconnected, but all of these interfaces were shown in the proposal document, which included a detailed budget.

The President agreed that a major project had been incorporated into the budget, which included both operations and development. Ideas had been presented, costs had been estimated for the first year, and oversight strategies were in place with the Finance Advisory Group and Commission Presidents, who had seen the plan and accepted it. The process was completely transparent. If at any time the monitoring parties agreed that the project was leading nowhere, it would be terminated. No one was being forced to make a long-term commitment. The members were being asked to lend their support for a direction to go in, under sound supervision.



Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) thought this was a good budget. If they made an investment they had to have an investment or R&D budget, to develop things. Mr Levin Hansen had made a very good proposal, so they needed a development budget that could be tracked, with total costs and income. He supported the UK's proposal to split the operation from the development budget. The investment budget merited further discussion. By tracking it separately they could assess whether progress was going quickly enough, and if necessary put in additional money.

Mr ANANOV (Russia) noted that looking at the 2016 budget they saw the main trend was to cut operating expenses significantly and raise expenditure on marketing, merchandising etc. As he had mentioned previously, a budget deficit was permissible if there were significant reasons to expect it to improve it over the year, and indeed some interesting sponsor contracts were in the pipeline for 2016. Next, the membership should understand that they were being asked to support a long-term programme. If they decided to go ahead they had to invest. It would be possible to split the budgets, but he felt that combining them was a more integrative and realistic approach.

The President pointed out that the Research & Development budget was present in **ANNEX 13b**.

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER said he supported the proposal of UK and Sweden and considered this to be in line with the recommendation made by the Finance Advisory Group. Possibly not a separate budget but a separate section for this project, which he agreed was important for the future.

Mr BRINK said the budget had been presented in this way it had been considered the best way to ensure optimum transparency, and it had been the recommendation of the Financial Advisory Group. He had no objection to presenting the plan in the way suggested by the UK, as long as they made a decision to go ahead with the programme. Nevertheless, he felt that they should work towards an integrated budget in the future, as this was the way to ensure transparency across the organisation.

The President pointed out that the two budgets interlocked. If they separated the event series programme this would affect the costs for Head Office and other issues.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN noted that there were some discrepancies between the separate budget in **ANNEX 13b** and the general budget, which is why some doubts were being expressed now. Separating the two would make it possible to identify the real investment cost of the project, which was a good one. They could then discuss how to finance the project, which was the second step. The way the budget was currently presented was not transparent enough.

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS (Canada) thought it was odd that there were no totals on the 2016 budget, which meant that it was not clear there was a deficit of CHF 737,000, which was more than what was being allocated to the project. She was also concerned about the apparent use of the term "reserves" and "provisions" as though they were the same thing. Provisions were money set aside specifically for a particular activity; reserves were an emergency fund to be used in exceptional circumstances. If money was being moved out of reserves into provisions this had to be made very clear, and reserves could not be run down too low.

The PRESIDENT thanked her for this good point.

Mr Mike CLOSE (Australia) strongly supported the UK's proposal regarding getting visibility of the difference between the normal operating budget and the sporting activity development, which he strongly supported in principle. It was normal business practice, if you had a project that involved investment, to look at that as a separate budget item, and combine it subsequently, so as to have a clear differential view of normal operation and special investment.

The Secretary General noted that **ANNEX 13b** detailed the various different sources for the investment amounts. She would attempt to show the budget without the event series proposal, which would then be as presented in **ANNEX 13b**.

The President appreciated everyone's comments, but he felt the presentation of reserves and provisions was far more transparent now.

The Secretary General referred to Canada's point about there being a CHF 737,000 deficit. She asked for caution in this respect; there was a provision included in the CHF 737,000 which came

from the reserve constituted at the time the office at Maison du Sport International had been purchase, and also the WAG reserve, which was partly to be used for the air games proposal and partially for expected staff costs of the WAG for the coming years. They were there to be used for these cases. It was therefore not a deficit.

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (CIA President) noted that while he appreciated that the Commissions did not really contribute to the revenue as far as membership dues were concerned, they still contributed quite a lot. He was pleased to see that finally, after many years, the EB had come up with a project that would make real progress in air sports development. Although he understood that the members needed clarification, he felt they should trust the Treasurer, President and EB to handle the finances in the best way, even if some technical details had to be clarified, and lend their full support to the project. Additional technical details could be supplied if requested. He found the budget as presented to be quite clear, and he encouraged the Commissions to support the presented budget.

Mr Eric MOZER (IGC President) understood the arguments on both sides. As far as the Gliding Commission was concerned, they had put a great deal of resources into trying to develop a gliding event that could take part in this kind of series, and were on track to do so. They had also developed an event for the WAG. A series such as had been presented was vital for the future. He trusted this EB and felt this was a chance they needed to take.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN said they were here to approve the budget. The UK delegation had pointed out that some 20% of the budget was dedicated to a single line item, and had asked whether, by approving the whole budget, they were implicitly approving the beginning of a multi-year project, and had asked what the consequences of this were. He thought this was a sensible question. If so, they should implement a two-step process, first look at the air games series item and make sure everyone understood it and was happy with it, after which it would become an approved expense of the FAI, and part of the budget, and the budget as a whole could be approved. He asked if this was what the British delegation had in mind.

Mr NAEGELI agreed that this would be an appropriate way to proceed.

Mr BRINK said that if it was felt necessary for greater clarity and transparency to split the two budgets he did not have a problem with this. Nevertheless, it should be understood that some professionalism would be needed to conduct the programme, and this would require investment. Over the last year, with the Finance Advisory Group, they had tried to present the budget in a more transparent way. One of the first things they had considered was to make clear the difference between provisions and reserves, how they could be used and who should decide. This was an EB decision, which had to be confirmed by the GC. A plan had to be established, along with a procedure for monitoring the plan.

Ms Alicia HIRZEL (Switzerland) wished to echo the comments of the Mary Anne STEVENS. It was important, when looking at the provisions and reserves in the budget, that a link could be made to the reserves as presented in the audited statements. There were provisions in the final statement for 2014 of more than CHF 500,000. Would all of this be used up in the first year of the project?

The Secretary General commented on the new spreadsheet she had prepared, which had the operational budget without the air games series. She asked if this answered the question.

Ms HIRZEL indicated that it did not. She asked which note corresponded to the audited statements: the fund for development and innovation, or accrued expenses and provisions?

The Secretary General explained that the sports development provision made at the end of 2014, as stated in the audited PWC report, was to be used for the air games event proposal.

The complete **ANNEX 13b** was displayed on the screen for the delegates to see.

The President noted that the FAI had been struggling to promote its events. The time had come, with new technology, live tracking and live scoring, for the organisation to have its own saleable product which could be shared with the next generation and the broader public. The goal was not to make it into a business, but to promote and secure the future of air sports. The members had

received an overall operational budget, which incorporated the new project detailed in **ANNEX 13b**.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN wished to offer an explanation of the uncertainty in the room. When confronted with the opportunity to make an investment there was always fear. This was part of the research and innovation cycle: the FAI had conducted research for around 100 years, spending money to generate knowledge. Now they had an innovation opportunity: the opportunity to use that knowledge to produce money. This was risky, and there were no guarantees, except to study the issue and understand it. The members should keep things in perspective; total reserves accumulated over the years amounted to approximately CHF 3 million in total, to spend however they wished. The new proposal would use around one-sixth of this amount to make an investment in innovation, using their accumulated knowledge, to sell something. If the members did not feel they understood the investment sufficiently then they should not approve the budget, but nothing had been hidden.

Mr LINDGREN noted that, if they could agree that **ANNEX 13b** was a good way of proceeding, then they could also say that the ASCs were happy with it, and there would also be funding from them, otherwise nothing would happen, so they had to contribute some money, so that they did not use all their reserves. Nevertheless, if the members approved the documents as submitted today, there remained CHF 312,706 not accounted for. The CHF 475,000 investment had been explained.

The Secretary General explained that the air games proposal had been removed from the budget document and the amount in question was now CHF 216,000, made up of the provision made when the FAI had bought the MSI, provision set aside at the time of the first global sponsorship programme, which was intended for this purpose, the staff-related WAG reserve, and the transition phase from 2015–2017 which meant that projected excess of income over expenditures was included in this calculation.

Mr LINDGREN explained that the figures he was interested were in expenditure. He didn't mind how the programme was financed, but there was a loss.

The Secretary General pointed out again that they should not mistake a use of funds for a deficit. As a result of the previous year's discussions they had decided not to have use of provisions put into income and expenditure; it was now taken out and detailed in a separate section of the budget labelled "Use of funds". Provisions were there to be used. As far as Switzerland's comment was concerned, this was a cross-reference of those lines under the Use of Funds 3.0. The ASC reserve was mentioned in the PWC audited report note 4. The MSI Provision was noted under point 9, and the WAG reserve was mentioned under point 4. As far as cross-referencing provisions was concerned, as per note 6 in the PWC statement, this had to be discussed and clarified but she thought it was 3.3 and 3.5 in the budget proposal.

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (CIA) wished to return to Mr LINDGREN's comment about contributing funds from the Commissions. The Commissions did not disagree with that, but he wished to point out that it was all the Commissions' and the stakeholders' money; it was not really important where the money came from. The CIA was absolutely prepared to contribute if necessary to make this a success.

Mr DUVAL (EnvC) noted that the NACs were not against the investment, they merely wanted reassurance that the investment was being controlled in an efficient way, and that the money in the budget would be spent according to what was being said today. He proposed that the Finance Advisory Group be transformed into an investment budget committee, as was common in private companies, to monitor investments and report back to the NACs and ASCs.

Mr Eric MOZER noted that gliding had spent many resources to take advantage of the technology that had become available to try to facilitate internet presentation and other new concepts that potential sponsors might take forward. To ask the Commissions to contribute more was very difficult. Nevertheless they would contribute because they saw this as a very positive development. How it was presented in the budget was for this conference to decide.

Mr Graeme WINDSOR (IPC President) supported the comments of the CIA and to a certain extent Mr MOZER. Parachuting was happy to participate in this project, but this was a development phase. There was not just an expenditure line, there was also an income line, which could include funds directly from the air sports if the proposal developed that way. It might equally be fully self-funded from sponsorship. But if it was to succeed, and the contribution from the ASCs was necessary to make it succeed, of course the IPC would look favourably on being part of that.

Mr ANANOV (Russia) noted that the ASCs would contribute CHF 46,000 from their own reserves in 2016, according to the budget. If they extracted the CHF 475,000 from the budget there remained around CHF 300,000; if they split the budget, the budget for 2016 would not balance. They were now at a crossroads: they had to choose one way or another. If they did not start spending the provisions, and some of the reserves, they would not balance the budget for the year. If they took the challenge, and used the provisions and some of the reserves they could overcome this serious difficulty. Until they secured new sponsors the budget would be in deficit, but they were close to reshaping the sponsorship agreements. He felt they should start spending some of the reserves.

Mr NAEGELI wished to clarify that the UK was not in any way opposed to invest practically and sensibly in development opportunities for the air sports. Ultimately, the investment had to be rolled up into an integrated budget. The heart of the question was about the appetite and confidence the members had for this particular event programme. The FAI had approved a similar project in the past called FAME, but it had failed. The EB must recognise that the NACs needed to have confidence. Checks and controls were necessary in any investment programme, but the investment should be scaled to the risk associated with it. The way in which the event programme was currently presented incurred significant risk early on in the hope of a substantial upside later. They needed a much better balance between them. The UK did not disagree with the need to invest; they disagreed with whether the FAI was well set up to confidently deliver a programme like this, given recent failures.

The President said he basically agreed with much of what Mr NAEGELI was saying. FAME was still available, although it was currently dormant. Financial agreements that might seem risky for the FAI could instead be passed over to FAME, which could act as a kind of firewall.

Mr BRINK wished to make a proposal. A large majority agreed with setting up the programme, although there were insecurities about what was actually involved. The programme must be adequately monitored. He proposed they approve the operational budget, without the investment proposal.

The President said that part of the problem was that the income budget was conservative. In parallel with this they were actively seeking new contracts, but to be able to sign up new and exciting sponsors they needed to have a new and exciting plan. The FAI had to be more than an administrative office, it had to show it had exciting, saleable products that were media-friendly and attractive to young people.

Mr LEINIKKI announced that 333 votes were present; an absolute majority required 167 votes; a two-thirds majority required 223 votes. The FAI currently had 77 members in good standing, therefore the quorum of 50% was 39 or more and there were 40 active members present.

The President reminded the members that the Executive Board was asking for the support of the membership in its strategic decision for the future of the FAI.

Mr BRINK said he was very happy with the advice the members had offered, with a view to how they could take mutual responsibility for the years to come. Many of those present were keen to invest in the programme they had discussed, which was important for the future of the FAI. The input of the NACs, ASCs and Finance Advisory Group was needed to ensure the programme remained on the right track; they would report back to the next GC which, if necessary, could withdraw its support. If any of the NAC or ASC representatives had expertise that could be helpful, he would be delighted to welcome them on board.

The President confirmed that it was the consensus of the conference that if the budget for the event series was accepted as proposed, it would need careful monitoring. The members had elected the Executive Board to supervise the FAI's activities, but he was pleased to have an expanded Finance Advisory Group also, including representatives of the ASCs and NACs. The ASC Presidents were in favour of the proposal and was counting on the Executive Board to make it a success.

The proposals were put to an electronic vote.

A representative of the USA proposed that the new 1. Yes – 2. Abstain – 3. No voting order be displayed on the screen during the voting process, which was done.

**The General Conference approved the 2016 budget for the air games event series proposal as per Annex 13b, with the expanded Finance Advisory Group to monitor progress with 220 votes for, 71 against and 36 abstentions.**

**The General Conference approved the 2016 scale of subscriptions and the budget for 2016 as per Annexes 16 and 17 with 239 votes for, 48 votes against and 38 abstentions.**

The President said he had noted the members' concerns and assured them that the matter would be treated very seriously.

## **24. Special Session on Achievements**

A video on the Two Eagles balloon flight by Troy Bradley and Leonid Tiukhtyaev was shown.

Mr Sergey ANANOV, multiple world champion helicopter pilot and record holder, addressed the General Conference on his attempt to set a round-the-world helicopter speed record. He concluded his presentation by noting that, given his experience with rescue attempts, he proposed creating a special alarm service to be available to FAI associated air sport persons in the event of an emergency, 24/7. He knew how to organise such a service and wanted to use his knowledge to work on such a project, which he thought could be attractive to Breitling.

## **25. Presentation of Bids for 111<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference – 2017**

### ***Report by Mr Niels-Christian LEVIN HANSEN (Executive Director)***

Just one bid had been received for the 2017 General Conference, from Cairo, Egypt, and the Executive Board recommended that it be approved. Some countries currently had a travel advisory on travel to Egypt, but he noted that the conference was two years away, and the EB would monitor the situation and come back to the GC if the situation persisted.

Representatives from Egypt made a short presentation.

A delegate expressed his concern over the prohibitive cost of accommodation.

The representative of the Egyptian delegation noted that it was impossible to predict the effect of currency movements in two years' time, but he promised if they won the bid they would urge the hotels to reduce their prices. Moreover, Egypt Airlines was offering a 50% discount.

The President noted that the delegates were also free to book their own accommodation.

Another delegate said that he could not vote for this candidate because his foreign ministry had issued a travel warning for Cairo. As a representative of a world federation he also had concerns about the human rights situation in the country. He asked for a secret ballot.

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS (Canada) asked if specific dates had been proposed.

The Egyptian representative replied that the proposed date was the end of September, 2017.

The President pointed out that this was a non-political federation. The FAI Commissions did not have any political views on human rights other than those of the IOC.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN (Sweden) noted that the accommodation price quoted in the bid documents was different from the one mentioned in the presentation.

A delegate noted that the hotel website gave a current price of USD 155.

The Egyptian representative confirmed that the price was all-inclusive, as detailed in the bid document. The contract he had concluded with the hotel included the 2017 price. There was no profit to the organisers.

A delegate confirmed that most of the European Union countries had a warning against travel to Egypt.

Mr Jean-Claude WEBER (CIA) asked what the alternative would be, if they did not approve this bid, and what was the latest they could consider a bid to host the 2017 General Conference.

The President confirmed that there were two situations under discussion: one was in the event that the GC did not approve the bid; the other was in the event that the GC approved the bid but the political situation in Egypt worsened. In this case, the EB would continue to monitor the situation and would take the necessary measures. The EB had analysed the Egypt bid and considered it perfectly valid, which was why the EB recommended that the members accept it.

Mr Mike CLOSE (Australia) pointed out that depending on the level of alert in their country, delegates would not be able to get travel insurance. He asked how soon before the event the EB would be prepared to reconsider moving the General Conference.

The President confirmed that, as matters currently stood, the EB recommended Cairo as a host. Should the situation worsen they would act appropriately. It was impossible for the FAI to know what all the foreign ministries would recommend in 2017.

A delegate agreed that political issues should be kept out of FAI meetings. They had no idea what the situation would be in 2017. He believed they should support the recommendation, and solve the accommodation issues in the coming months.

A delegate from Spain suggested creating a protocol, as was in place for Commission meetings, which required a two-thirds vote in favour of moving away from Lausanne before outside bids were considered.

The Egyptian representative pointed out that it was impossible to predict how prices would change by 2017, but the price given in the bid document had been guaranteed by the hotel.

## **26. Arrangements for Future General Conferences**

### **26.1. Report on GC 2016**

Chepy NASUTION, from Indonesian NAC (Federasi Aero Sport Indonesia / FASI), reported on arrangements for the 2016 General Conference. He noted that, although the Conference dates were 13–15 October 2016, on the 12<sup>th</sup> there would be a bid to set a record for the number of simultaneous paraglider flights. 120 paragliders would fly in Bali to welcome the FAI GC. The conference would be hosted at the Westin Hotel, some 30 minutes from the airport. As far as security was concerned, the President of FASI is also Chief of staff of the Air Force, which meant special care would be taken of the FAI delegates. A brief video was shown.

### **26.2. Live coverage**

Not discussed.

### **26.3. Preliminary Bids for Future General Conferences (2018 onwards)**

The President pointed out that hosting a General Conference was a good way for NACs to celebrate an anniversary.

Interest was expressed by the NAC of:

- South Africa – Cape Town or Durban

## **27. Open Forum**

### ***Drones: Context and Consequences***

Report by Mr Bruno DELOR (CIAM) (**ANNEX 18**).

Mr DELOR noted that every country was affected by drone activities, which were a lasting consequence of the impact of technology on human activities.

### ***CIAM / RUS dispute over WAG qualification***

Mr ANANOV (Russia) wished to clear up a misunderstanding between the Russian NAC and the FAI Aeromodelling Commission. According to the WAG rules, CIAM had to choose the best athletes from each country on the basis of the international rankings or previous championship results. Russia had many good aeromodellists. CIAM had decided to use the national championship results, rather than the results of the 2014 World Cup, which had been won by a Russian. Thus the CIAM had chosen a candidate who was not Russia's best aeromodellist. Although some people in Russia had construed this as a deliberate attempt to reduce Russia's international standing, Mr ANANOV was convinced it was a simple mistake. Attempts by the President of the Russian NAC to discuss the issue with Mr PAPADOPOULOS had received no response, which was why Mr ANANOV had now brought the issue to the General Conference. He now asked Mr PAPADOPOULOS to put in place the procedure for changing this decision.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS (CIAM) thanked the Russian delegation for bringing up this issue. A different opinion was an opportunity to discover whether the rules were appropriate or whether there were grounds for making a change in the future. He fully respected the concerns of the Russian delegation. When the WAG were announced at the last GC, along with the organising committee's decision to include the F2D event, CIAM had to decide which candidates to nominate. Because it had so many good competitors, CIAM had initially decided to organise trial events between April and June 2015. However, because competitors had to be registered by March this had not been possible. The countries eligible to send pilots to the WAG had been selected on the basis of the international rankings from the last two World Championships. The next step was to choose the candidates, and the CIAM had decided on national champions. Russia had many good competitors, which meant the national champion was of a high standard, perhaps even higher than the winner of the World Championships. If CIAM's decision was wrong there would have been many more complaints from other nations, and none had been received, whether for this class or any of the others. CIAM had followed the rules as they had been expressed, and he felt they should stick to that. If they substituted this one competitor it could cause many other problems with other countries and other disciplines.

Mr ANANOV replied that CIAM was not being asked to break the rules; Russia felt that the rules had been implemented wrongly. It made no sense for a NAC to have no influence on the choice of its national candidate. NACs were diminished to the role of peasants cultivating crops for the benefit of their overlords. There was no benefit to cultivating athletes within a national framework if the Commission could then decide to choose a weaker candidate. It was also stated in the rules that the candidate should be approved by the NAC. If the Russian NAC refused to approve the CIAM's choice of candidate it would be clearly highlighting CIAM's mistake.

Mr Stéphane MALBOS noted that this was an important point, because the WAG was a stepping stone to the world series. For invitational events such as the WAG, it had been decided that the invitations should be sent by the Commissions rather than the NACs. It was nevertheless important to define who should make the selections for the world event series.

Mr Graeme WINDSOR (CASI President) noted that the WAG were put in place at very short notice and the selection methods were established early on in the procedure, in line with the statutes, which stated that the ASCs had responsibility for all matters pertaining to their sport. He understood that the selection may not have been ideal for some NACs, given the short selection period, but he felt all the ASCs had done their best to produce a transparent open way of trying to select the best of the best. The procedure could certainly be re-examined for future competitions, but he did not believe it would be possible to change the criteria now for the 2015 WAG.

The President had taken note of the dilemma. The selection process for future multi-sport events would take this discussion into consideration for review with CASI. Russia had pressed strongly for a change to the current setup, and the organisers had strongly urged sticking to the rules. They would therefore stick to the rules, despite his concern about the situation.

Mr Pedro CABAÑERO MARIMÓN (Spain) pointed out that it was not always the Commissions who decided. In the General Aviation Commission the liaison officer had first asked which countries were interested in competing in Dubai; 18 countries had said yes. In the next stage, the Commission had asked those NACs to submit the names of their pilots.

Mr ANANOV emphasised again that he was not asking for a change to the rules, merely for the rules to be enforced. The rules stated that the best of the best should compete, and that the world ranking list or national championships should be used. CIAM had used national championships, when many countries did not even have a national championship. These were good rules, wrongly implemented. This mistake had a significant impact on Russia, which had lost the right to enter its best participant.

The President said that this issue was being taken seriously, although he saw no possibility to make a change for the upcoming WAG.

#### ***Report on Questionnaire sent to all NACs, Roland SCHNITKER***

Mr Roland SCHNITKER (Expert Group Regulation) was asking for the delegates' help with a check-box survey to find out about aviation sports regulation, in order to be able to exercise significant influence over the proposed rule-making plans by the EASA, ICAO and national aviation bodies. It was very important to find out how air sports were embedded in national regulations. Representatives of six German-speaking NACs had discussed in Amsterdam the many differences in national regulations, and identified significant practical problems. The Regulation Expert Group would like to find out what the situation was in other countries. The answers would be helpful in outlining the position of air sports in the world and, where possible, in securing and enhancing the legal position of air sports. Any issues not covered in the questionnaire could be added in the free space on the form.

#### ***Report by Group Captain Veerayuth DIDYASARIN on the formation of an Asian Air Sports Federation (ANNEX 19)***

Gp Capt DIDYASARIN reported on the plans to form a regional air sports federation to strengthen the sport, encompassing the zones of Middle East, Central Asia and East & South Asia, which currently had no official connection.

#### ***Report by Mr Bengt LINDGREN on membership issues***

Mr LINDGREN had proposed that a member working group be set up to report to the GC next year on how the air sports delegated their rights to other entities, and how this could be properly managed. The proposal was to produce a set of guidelines for this. The working group would



comprise 4 NACs, 4 ASCs and a member of the Statutes Working Group, plus an EB observer. The goal was to establish guidelines to avoid problems in the future. He proposed a vote on this.

The Secretary General noted that according to the FAI Statutes they had to first vote (2/3 majority of active members in good standing and ASCs) on whether the item should be added to the agenda.

Mr LEINIKKI proposed that they proceed with an electronic vote and double-check the figures afterwards with the scrutineers.

There were 334 votes present: 223 votes required for a two-thirds majority.

A vote was conducted, which was miscounted. Mr LEINIKKI apologised for not including the Air Sports Commissions' votes, and suggested they redo the vote.

**On the second vote, the General Conference rejected the motion to add Mr Lindgren's proposal to the agenda** by 188 votes for, 91 against and 20 abstentions.

## **28. Regional Management System**

### ***Report by Mr Niels-Christian LEVIN HANSEN (Executive Director)***

In the past year the Regional Vice-President for East & South Asia, Mr Tengku ABDILLAH, had been reappointed. The EB had reached out to the African and South American regions for nominations for regional vice-presidents, and sadly had to record that no nominations were received. He encouraged the delegates potential candidates among themselves, as the EB would be in contact again shortly to ask for nominations to these important positions.

Mr Agúst GUDMUNDSSON (Executive Director) added that this system had proven to be very effective in encouraging the NACs to work together and developing the sport in the region.

Mr Tengku ABDILLAH (FAI Regional Vice President – East & South Asia) presented his report (**ANNEX 20**). He noted that Macau was in the process of setting up an air sports federation, and there were also good prospects for Brunei.

The President thanked Mr ABDILLAH for his great efforts to promote air sports in East and South Asia.

## **29. Expert Systems**

The President noted that there were a number of expert groups on airspace, education, facilities, IT, navigation, new technology, regulation and safety. These specialists were passionate about air sports but also experts in various fields, and could be tasked with various different issues by the EB, Commissions or NACs. He urged the delegates to contact the expert groups by email whenever they had any questions on these areas.

## **30. FAI Anti-Doping Programme**

### ***Report by Mr Bob HENDERSON (Executive Director)***

Mr HENDERSON thanked Anti-Doping Manager Segolène ROUILLON, who was doing an excellent job coordinating testing and Therapeutic Use Exemptions (TUEs) and working on the programme behind the scenes. Out-of-competition testing now required only the person's home address, and competitors were contacted generally at national competitions or training events. In-competition testing was continuing, with an increase to the number of tests being conducted in accordance with the FAI's risk profile. It was believed that any substances used would likely be

short-acting, making testing close to or during a competition the best opportunity to catch cheats and to deter people from experimenting. He urged the members to ask their competitors to check on the relevant websites and apply for a TUE if taking any medication at all. Education was currently the main drive, by providing information to competitors and event organisers. They were also looking at getting anti-doping officials within a country to attend events in order to answer questions and provide information to participants.

The President noted that the FAI set a good example to other federations regarding how to run their anti-doping programmes.

A representative of Saudi Arabia said he looked forward to welcoming everyone in March 2016 to the Air Sports Safety Conference. He would welcome any recommendations regarding topics for discussion.

The President noted that Head Office was gradually developing the programme, and all those present were invited to give input.

### **31. Membership Survey**

Mrs Gillian RAYNER (Executive Director) presented her report (**ANNEX 21**).

Eighteen countries had so far responded to the membership survey, which would help to give FAI leadership an overview of how air sport was structured within its member countries. The FAI's membership structure had been in place for many years and had served the organisation well. However, in recent years certain issues had arisen that tended to show that the membership structure did not always fit the current environment. Mrs RAYNER presented the initial results of the survey, and looked forward to presenting the full conclusions in more detail at the next General Conference, perhaps with some suggestions for changes.

### **32. Commission Reports**

#### ***FAI Gliding Commission (IGC) – ANNEX 22***

Mr Eric MOZER (IGC President) reported on the activities of the Gliding Commission, noting that the first Pan-American gliding championships had recently taken place. He noted that the IGC had been asked by its stakeholders to simplify its sporting code (SC3), and this had been done, with special thanks Ross MACINTYRE of New Zealand and his team. Every 10 years the IGC decided to take stock of its situation, and set up a championship structure working group to ensure the IGC remained relevant going forward and continued to serve the needs of its members. A preliminary report would be delivered in October. He thanked Breitling for including the 6th FAI Sailplane Grand Prix Final in its 2015 series of events. Moving on to the World Air Games, Dubai was not known for its exceptional gliding conditions in December, but having accepted the challenge the IGC had come up with a unique event. A match racing test event had been successfully conducted in Varese. Finally, he thanked Professor Loek BOERMANS, who had been of great help to Dick Butler in his quest to build the world's highest-performance sailplane, the Concordia.

#### ***International Scientific and Technical Organisation for Soaring Flight (OSTIV) – ANNEX 23***

Prof. Loek BOERMANS (OSTIV former President) reported that an extraordinary OSTIV General Conference had taken place during which the NACs had elected a new board. The new president was Professor Rolf Radespiel, who had unfortunately had to leave just a few minutes before this presentation. He thanked the FAI and the IGC and all the institutions and volunteers that had helped him during his presidency over the last 19 years. He was very happy and had full confidence in the new Board and the new OSTIV President.

### ***FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA) – ANNEX 24***

Mr Jean-Claud WEBER (CIA President) noted that the CIA had held a number of fantastic events, and recorded a number of amazing performances, not least Troy Bradley's trans-Pacific flight. Nevertheless, he considered the competitors who continued to participate in CIA events over the years to be true heroes. The CIA Loggers programme was doing well; the investment had been fully recovered and they were starting to make a small profit. He noted that the CIA was not structured to organise its own logistics, so it would be helpful if the FAI could look into logistics solutions for the future. If the CIA's volunteers in that department were to give up the Commission would have major problems.

### ***FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC) – ANNEX 25***

Mr Graeme WINDSOR (IPC President) noted that the FAI website contained all the news about the IPC along with the Commission newsletter. There were many potential opportunities to host indoor competitions using wind tunnels, which also gave schoolchildren the chance to compete internationally.

### ***FAI Medico-Physiological Commission (CIMP) – ANNEX 26***

Dr Jürgen KNÜPPEL (CIMP President) announced the medical symposium in Dubai from 3–5 December, which would attract many high-profile doctors. He asked the delegates to send along their best medical people and any athletes who were interested. He noted the main problems the Commission was tackling: incomplete statistics for light aircraft accidents, the incidence of drone-related injuries and oxygen flexibility for mountain flying, which was an ongoing issue with EASA. With reference to the German Wings accident in March 2015, the EB had asked him to look at the issue of mental health in sport aviation pilots. CIMP's conclusions were that there should be a specialist Point of Contact within air sport, and provision of a "safe zone" of peer pilots for discussion.

The PRESIDENT reiterated Dr KNÜPPEL'S call for the NACs to send their national doctors to the medical symposium in Dubai.

<b>33. Commission Reports</b>
-------------------------------

### ***FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG) – ANNEX 27***

Mr David HAMILTON (CIG President) reported that, in view of a number of difficulties experienced by the Commission in 2015, work had begun on reviewing the rules and regulations. Over the coming year the Commission would be looking at a number of media-friendly events, and he hoped in 2016 to be able to report the results of this. He concluded with thanks to the Secretary General and her staff who had been so helpful throughout the year.

The President noted that he had had the pleasure of seeing some helicopter competitions, and looked forward to seeing the addition of search and rescue events.

### ***FAI Astronautic Records Commission (ICARE)***

The Secretary General forwarded the apologies of Mr Anu OJHA, who had been unable to attend the General Conference. ICARE had met in April 2015 in Lausanne and elected Mr OJHA as President and Mr Henrik ÅKERSTEDT as Vice President. ICARE was currently working hard on promoting records that could be achieved in space, and discussing the recognition of astronaut as well as stratonaut status.

### ***FAI Amateur-built and Experimental Aircraft Commission (CIACA) – ANNEX 28***

Mr Alfons HUBMANN (CIACA President) noted that CIACA was not a highly visible Commission, but one project was currently in the air – Solar Impulse. Nevertheless, only 30% of NACs had their own aircraft building commissions, and he counted on the members' support to improve this figure.

### ***FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI) – ANNEX 29***

Mr Graeme WINDSOR (CASI President) noted that the President had called on all the Air Sport Commissions to review their rules. He encouraged everyone to bring up any discrepancies within their ASC. CASI had recently dealt with seven appeals, which was a big load for a volunteer organisation, and which might have been prevented if the rules had been clearer. Nevertheless he wished to thank the volunteers who had provided some extremely sophisticated analyses. He also thanked Executive Board members Gill RAYNER and Agúst GUDMUNDSSON for their participation in CASI working groups, which was an excellent precedent.

Mr WINDSOR noted that he greatly enjoyed his work with CASI, but after nine years as President of the IPC he had decided to move on.

### ***FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC) – ANNEX 30***

Mr Pierre DUVAL (EnvC President) gave his report, accompanied by a background video. He noted that he had been pleased to hear that one of CIVA's targets was to develop a competition for electric light sport aeroplanes with aerobatic capacity, as this was their common target.

He was also happy to see Mr Eric RAYMOND, who had been working on this for years, at the GC. It was clear that even big companies such as Airbus believed in the future of electric flying, and were planning to train people in the coming years. The FAI had to be sure that on the sporting side they were also ready to do so. Electric flying was a highly complex and very difficult problem.

He concluded by thanking the new members of his team, who had given the Commission more resources with which to work.

## **34. Multisport Events**

### **ANNEX 31**

The President welcomed International World Games Association (IWGA) Senior Vice-President Max BISHOP, FAI Companion of Honour.

Mr Markus HAGGENEY (Sports and Marketing Director) thanked the members for their support for the new strategy. One of the upcoming events was the 2017 World Games in Poland, which was a perfect showcase for the three FAI disciplines selected – glider aerobatics, paramotoring and canopy piloting. He explained some of the details of FAI's participation in this event. He thanked the Polish NAC, which had committed to running national championships in all three disciplines in 2016, for their continued support.

Mr Eric MOZER noted that in 2021 the World Games would take place in Birmingham, Alabama, in the United States, and he asked what his Commission could do to ensure its sport was considered.

Mr Max BISHOP explained that the programme for the 2021 World Games would not be decided until after the 2017 Games, since one factor was an evaluation of the previous edition. There was no reason why different air sports events should not be included. He suggested Mr MOZER contact the organisers in Birmingham, who were already working full-time on the project.

### 35. Definition of Air Sports Persons

The President drew the General Conference's attention to the response prepared by the Executive Board on the question raised by France regarding the definition of an Air Sports Person (**ANNEX 32**).

A representative of France asked if it would be possible to add this definition to the FAI By-Laws, to avoid the issue being raised again in the future.

The President agreed that the Executive Board would add this definition to the By-Laws.

### 36. Amendments to Statutes

See **ANNEX 33**

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS (Chair of Statutes Working Group) thanked the members of the SWG for their dedication throughout the year. She noted that some of the changes might seem minor or technical while others spoke to the FAI's philosophical approach. She urged the GC to give them all due consideration as they were all important. Each proposal would be presented by the body that had made the proposal; the position of the EB and input from the SWG were available to help the members in their consideration. Each proposal would be voted on separately. 50% of active members in good standing must be present and a statute change required a two-thirds majority.

Mr LEINIKKI confirmed that 283 votes from active members in good standing were present; 189 votes were required for a two-thirds majority. Thirty-seven members (not including ASCs or OSTIV) were present; quorum required 36.

#### 36.1. Creation of "Committees"

Proposed by CIVL.

- Statutes 5.1.2.3; 5.1.2.5; 5.1.2.6; 5.1.3.1; 5.1.3.5; 5.4;
- By-Laws 3.5; 3.5.1; 3.5.2; 3.5.3

**The General Conference accepted the proposal** by 235 votes for, 16 against and 31 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT urged members to express their agreement or disagreement with the proposal, rather than abstaining.

#### 36.2. Move the Nile Gold Medal from By-Laws to FAI General Awards

Proposed by FAI Aviation and Space Education Commission, on the grounds that the group was now an Expert Group rather than a Commission.

- Current By-Law 7.12 in its entirety;
- Proposed Statute 10.10

**The General Conference accepted the proposal** by 253 votes for, 1 against and 29 abstentions.

#### 36.3. Proposal to clarify the responsibilities of the GAC and CIACA Air Sport Commissions

Proposed by the Executive Board with modifications by GAC and CIACA.

The proposal to vote on the amendment was duly proposed and seconded, and the motion passed.

- Statute 5.2.3.3.7.11

**The General Conference accepted the proposal** by 268 votes for, 12 against and 3 abstentions.

#### 36.4. FAI Executive Board Elections

Proposed by NAC Sweden.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN explained that, technically, it was possible to change the entire EB and President at the same time, which could affect the FAI's stability. The proposed change would also ensure that there were interesting elections at all FAI General Conferences, giving them all equivalent value.

Mrs Gill RAYNER (Executive Director) explained that the proposal was not endorsed by the EB, because they felt a change of EB membership every year made it difficult to ensure continuity. They would prefer to retain the current two-year cycle.

Mr Bob HENDERSON (Executive Director) appreciated the concept behind the proposal, but the EB inevitably went through a transition period of approximately six months, learning how to work together. In his experience, this would reduce the effective span of a two-year term to 3–4 months of productive work for the team as a whole. He felt this was poor investment in terms of the capabilities available within the FAI. He would support keeping the current two-year process.

Mr Frits BRINK (Executive Director) thought it might be useful to set up a working group to look thoroughly into the issue of Executive Board terms and structure, to report back to the next GC. There might be another way of addressing the Swedish NAC's concerns while maintaining continuity on the Board.

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON (Executive Director) noted that the EB had reviewed the proposal and there were many aspects to consider. The suggested change would make it difficult to build a team.

The SECRETARY GENERAL noted that she was a non-voting member of the EB and her job was to carry forward projects with the EB. It was crucial to have continuity when working with the EB and defining the FAI's roles and objectives. Changing three board members every year would make it far more difficult.

The PRESIDENT felt this was a case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it". He had appreciated being able to work with one team that had all been elected at the same time, as he did not believe it was a good idea to have an "A team" and a "B team" within the Board.

Mrs RAYNER concluded by saying that the Executive Board recommended that this proposed statute change be rejected.

- Statute 6.2.1.1

**The General Conference rejected the proposal** by 83 votes for, 179 votes against and 20 abstentions.

The President thanked NAC Sweden for putting forward the proposal and looking for ways to improve the situation.

#### 36.5. FAI Executive Board terms

Proposed by NAC Sweden.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN noted that this was simply a change of wording to make this section consistent with the section on election of the FAI President.

Mrs Gill RAYNER reported that the Executive Board did not feel this change was necessary.

Mr Stéphane MALBOS noted that according to the new text, if there was an Extraordinary GC and Directors did not complete their first term, they could not be re-elected, which was contrary to the desired effect. The new version raised more problems.

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS reported that the Statutes Working Group had also concluded that this change was not necessary.

- Statute 6.2.1.2

**The General Conference rejected the proposal** by 54 votes for, 208 votes against and 18 abstentions.

### **36.6. Advisory Group on Women in Airsports**

Mrs Gill RAYNER noted that there were two proposals: one by NAC Sweden and the other by the EB. The two parties had been able to discuss the matter over the last few days.

Mr Bengt LINDGREN presented his report, pointing out that the FAI Executive Board's desire to bring more women into air sports was exactly in line with the wishes of the Swedish government. He wished particularly to thank Gill Rayner and Mary Anne Stevens for their help in drafting the proposal.

Mrs Gill RAYNER noted that the important points were to see to the setting up of a permanent working group, to come into line with the Olympic Charter. The proposal had the full support of the EB.

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS noted that the Swedish NAC's proposal had been rejected by the General Conference in 2015. The EB had made a simpler proposal so the proposal under consideration today was a compromise. Financial considerations had been dropped. The amendment needed first to be proposed and seconded, before proceeding to a vote on the content of the proposal.

Mr Alvaro DE ORLEANS BORBÓN expressed his enthusiasm for this proposal, which would help the FAI to capture talent from the other 50% of the population.

Sweden proposed a motion to amend the proposal, which was seconded by Italy. The motion was rejected by 169 votes for, 86 votes against and 16 abstentions.

The President regretted that the motion had not passed and trusted that the issue would be brought back to the table.

### **36.7. Conflicts of Interest for Executive Directors**

Proposed by the Executive Board.

Mrs Gill RAYNER explained that the current statute was very restrictive. The three incoming EB members had realised that by virtue of their status as FAI Executive Directors they could no longer participate in any FAI event, in any capacity. In 2008 a new, even stricter, statute had been proposed and rejected, on the grounds that the GC wanted a Board that was active and close to air sport activities. The EB felt that the original purpose of the statute was to protect the integrity of the FAI's decision-making process, and also to avoid personal gain. The EB proposal ensured there was no conflict of interests in anything political, so that at any FAI meeting they could not represent a NAC or ASC, but meant that EB members could participate in FAI sporting events, whether as competitors, stewards, judges or jury members. In discussion with the Statutes Working Group they had wanted to make it completely clear that in order to avoid any potential conflict, the EB member concerned would withdraw from any discussion and declare a conflict of interests. She strongly urged the General Conference to give this proposal their full consideration.

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON felt it was vital for the FAI to have capable people on the Board who understood the activities of the sport, and who were connected to the sport. He noted that the word "relinquish" was not an easy word for non-native English speakers to understand, and further pointed out that it was not always necessary for Board members to remove themselves from discussions.

Ms Mary Anne STEVENS pointed out that this was again an amended proposal, which would require a motion, a second and a vote on the amendment (to be passed by absolute majority) before voting on the proposal.

Canada proposed a motion to amend the proposal, which was seconded by Italy. The motion was passed with 235 votes for, 37 votes against and 11 abstentions.

Mr DELOR (France) completely supported the proposal, except for a doubt regarding the interpretation of “board of an FAI Member”. Different countries had different organisational structures. France had two levels of board: a steering committee and a bureau, in addition to various sub-structures.

The Secretary General explained that this definition was related to representation at the FAI General Conference. She thought that sub-structures would not be relevant to GC voting rights.

Mr Agust GUDMUNDSSON noted this amendment concerned voting powers at the GC. If there was a delegation of sporting powers he was sure the responsibility and legal status would follow the delegation of sporting powers. He therefore thought it was not a problem.

- Statute 6.2.1.7

**The General Conference accepted the proposal** by 222 votes for, 34 votes against and 5 abstentions.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS (CIAM President) recalled one contentious issue at the last General Conference had been the issue of members in good standing. The FAI President had said the problem would be passed to the SWG with a view to submitting a recommendation to this GC. However, he had seen a current list of countries not in good standing, and some of them would be participating in the WAG. He thought it would be a pity if one of these countries were to win a medal, having been “not in good standing” just a few days before.

Mrs Mary Anne STEVENS said that the SWG had devoted quite some time to the issue and had written a report to explain the current situation. The statutes listed many rights and obligations of members, however the focus seemed to be solely on the financial obligations. There had been a general recognition that members who were late in paying their dues should not be allowed to continue indefinitely to exercise all the rights of membership, and a consensus around balancing the timely collection of dues with the potential consequences for individual athletes. There was also the aspect of rendering sporting licences invalid or rendering an event invalid, and there were no clear solutions. These were not questions that could be answered by the SWG, since they concerned how the FAI wished to pursue these matters and what implications they wanted for non-payment of dues. She would hesitate to continue to use the phrase “(not) in good standing”, since this involved a great deal more than just financial obligations. The SWG had left it to the EB to decide what the next step should be.

### **37. Election Statutes Working Group**

The President said the Statutes Working Group and its Chair, Mary Anne STEVENS, had done an excellent job, and all had contributed with their various fields of expertise. He therefore proposed that they be re-elected for a further two-year term.

Germany noted that Mr Gunther BERTRAM was no longer part of the German delegation.

The President pointed out that Mr BERTRAM’S knowledge and contribution were appreciated by him personally, which was why he had been nominated to the working group.

**The General Conference unanimously approved the re-election of the Statutes Working Group.**



### **38. Green Airsport Initiative**

Mr Pierre DUVAL commented on his report (**ANNEX 30**), noting that the major issue as far as air sports were concerned was how to comply with environmental standards while on the ground, and with social responsibility towards the people affected. The Environment Commission had therefore been working on the standards that could be applied and the services and support that could implement these standards for the 50–60 major FAI Category 1 events that took place each year. The proposal was to develop a Green Air Sport Event Standard based on ISO 20121, with bronze, silver and gold levels of compliance.

### **39. Vote on Award of 111<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference – 2017**

The proposal to award the 111<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference in 2017 to Cairo, Egypt, was put to an electronic vote. The representatives from NAC Egypt had specifically asked to have the vote at this time. As there were 300 votes in the room, 151 votes were required for an absolute majority.

**The FAI General Conference rejected the proposal to hold the 111<sup>th</sup> General Conference of the FAI in 2017 in Egypt** with 145 votes for, 116 votes against and 39 abstentions.

The President noted that all those present had been aware of this bid, and there was no viable alternative bid. Anyone intending to vote against the proposal was invited to assist the EB in finding alternatives. The EB would now re-evaluate the situation.

On behalf of the Executive Board, the President expressed his gratitude to Egypt for presenting a bid for the third time. He was disappointed that the resolution had not passed, despite having the support of the Executive Board.

**The General Conference gave the Executive Board the mandate to investigate and recommend an alternative host for the 2017 General Conference.**

A representative of Egypt requested a re-vote, since the presentation had taken place at a different time than that scheduled, and the United States had not been present for the original vote.

Mary Anne STEVENS (Chair of the Statutes Working Group) pointed out that this item was on the agenda, but a vote had already taken place. She therefore felt it was for the President to decide whether or not to redo the vote.

The President agreed that this was a serious issue. In view of the fact that the vote had not taken place at the scheduled time, he asked the General Conference if they agreed to a revote. There being some objections, he put the proposal to an electronic vote (2/3 majority).

There were 330 votes in the room, including the ASCs; 221 votes were required for a two-thirds majority.

**The General Conference rejected the proposal to re-vote on the host city for the 2017 General Conference** with 188 votes for, 121 against and 21 abstentions.

The Egyptian Ambassador to The Hague joined the conference. The President thanked the Ambassador for taking the time to address the conference, and for Egypt's bid to host the 117<sup>th</sup> FAI General Conference. He expressed his regret that it had not succeeded, but hoped the FAI would come to Egypt in the next few years.

As an enthusiastic aviator, the Ambassador looked forward to welcoming the FAI to Egypt in the future. If there was an opportunity to review the decision he would welcome it. Nevertheless, he wished to point out that a number of international forums had taken place in Egypt this year, and the security situation was quite stable.

#### **40. Harmonisation of Sporting Codes, Rules and Regulations**

The President noted that it had become clear that not all judges, stewards and juries had practices that were consistent with the internal regulations and rules, Commission regulations, general section or by-laws and statutes. The Commissions had been asked to review their competition rules, internal regulations, handbooks, etc. to see if everything was consistent and in line with actual practices.

The Secretary General noted that in the coming months and years the Executive Board would review the ASCs' sporting codes and international regulations one by one, and analyse their connection to the FAI Constitution (Statutes and By-Laws). External support would be needed for this process, but the EB was also supporting the Commissions in their work with jury training, especially since the Commissions had all established a very well thought-through system for training their juries. There was nevertheless an opportunity to look at jury responsibilities in connection with the General Section of the sporting code.

Mr Bob HENDERSON referred to his presentation (**ANNEX 34**), which outlined how he proposed to modernise the FAI's existing documents and harmonise them. In addition to the existing Statutes, By-Laws and Sporting Codes, he proposed adding a new "Honours, Awards and Badges" document. He asked the General Conference to endorse the work that had been done so far and submit the draft documents to the SWG for review. The intention would be to provide a full suite of documents for approval at the 2016 General Conference.

Mr Antonis PAPADOPOULOS (CIAM President) had noted the proposal to move awards to a separate document, and wondered if this would be the case for records also. The General Section was mainly for sporting events, and it might be a good idea to move records to a different document. He also wondered if this review also provided a good opportunity to establish disciplinary rules and a disciplinary panel.

Mr HENDERSON agreed that this was definitely something to be considered. Moving the records was a good idea, and probably easy to do. On the disciplinary side, the wording of the section on penalties and processes for managing a member in violation had been revised, and placed in a single chapter. It might be worth looking at expanding the definitions in this section and providing greater clarity.

Mr PAPADOPOULOS replied that he was not referring to just a separate chapter. Sometimes events hosted by the FAI were subject to the internal regulations of the relevant NAC, and others were subject to different ASC rules. Certain disciplinary measures, such as doping sanctions, had to be consistent across the whole of the FAI.

Mr HENDERSON noted that there was now a doping review panel, which should deal with such inconsistencies, but it was certainly a good idea to ensure that other disciplinary issues were given consistent treatment.

**The General Conference unanimously approved the Constitutional Review.**

#### **41. Any Other Business**

##### ***Breitling limited-edition watches***

The Secretary General noted that Breitling had made a proposal to produce a limited-edition watch bearing the FAI logo. Information would be sent to the NACs and ASCs after the Conference, with details of specifications, pricing and delivery dates, and if there was enough interest Breitling would look into beginning production. The watch could be purchased for personal use, or perhaps as part of NAC recognition for special achievements.

### ***FAI World Air Games***

The Secretary General noted that in the workshop they had discussed the question of how Dubai or local organising committee offered support for accompanying persons. This had not yet been resolved, but the organisers had committed to providing information within the next few days, and this would be passed on to the members within the next week.

The NACs had been provided with a booklet with detailed information about their goals and tasks leading up to the competition. At the workshop it had become clear that there were some bugs in the registration system; these were now being looked at and the system should be fully operational within the next few days, so the NACs would be able to complete their checklists.

There was a VIP programme scheduled for 4 and 5 December, and Mr Markus HAGGENEY would be able to provide information on invitations for this programme at the end of the conference. If any NACs had contacts with sponsors that might be interested they were warmly invited to discuss the opportunities to be part of the VIP programme with Mr HAGGENEY.

### ***Recognised Air Sports Performance category***

The Secretary General noted that the decisions of each Executive Board meeting were now distributed to the ASC Presidents and other FAI members, in order to keep them up to date with EB decisions. One decision earlier in the year had been to introduce a category of recognised air sports performances. The idea behind this was to recognise air sports achievements not provided for in the sporting codes. She showed a short video from an athlete from South Tyrol, Armin SENONER, a mountaineer, paraglider pilot and skydiver, who had set a new speed record for Alpine speed paragliding.

### ***Closing***

The President felt this had been an excellent conference from the point of view that there had been very good dialogue and an open atmosphere. They had also had the pleasure of electing two very well-deserved Companions of Honour. The members had taken the bold decision to support the Executive Board's strategy to develop a multi-sport event series. He thanked the members for their continuing trust in himself as President and in the Executive Board, and he confirmed that the members would have the opportunity to monitor the project as it developed.

He thanked the KNVvL for their excellent arrangements and closed the FAI General Conference.

<b>Annexes</b>
----------------

1. Report by the FAI President
- 1b. Presentation by the FAI President
2. List of Vice-Presidents for 2015-2016
3. Report by the FAI Secretary General
- 3b. Presentation by the FAI Secretary General
4. Report by the President of the FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
- 4b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Aeromodelling Commission (CIAM)
5. Report by the President of the FAI Hang Gliding and Paragliding Commission (CIVL)
6. Report by the President of the FAI Microlight Commission (CIMA)
- 6b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Microlight Commission (CIMA)
7. Report by the President of the FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)
- 7b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Aerobatics Commission (CIVA)
8. Report by the President of the FAI General Aviation Commission (GAC)
9. Report by Finance Advisory Group
10. Situation 2014-2015 - Financial report by the Executive Director (Finance)
11. 2015 Financial Statements and Auditor's Report
12. FAI World Air Games
13. FAI Sports and Branding Strategy - *Not available to public – transmitted on request*
- 13b. Proposal for FAI Air Games Event Series - *Not available to public – transmitted on request*
14. FAI Organiser Agreement
15. FAI Budget 2016 - Financial report by the Executive Director (Finance)
16. Budget for 2016
- 16b. FAI Finances Principles
- 16c. Overview 2014-2020 - *Not available to public – transmitted on request*
17. Scale of Subscriptions for 2015
18. Report on drones
19. Report on formation of Asian Air Sports
20. RVP East and South Asia – Report
21. Report on Membership survey
22. Report by the President of the FAI Gliding Commission (IGC)
23. Report by the President of OSTIV
24. Report by the President of the FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)
- 24b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Ballooning Commission (CIA)
25. Report by the President of the FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)
- 25b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Parachuting Commission (IPC)
26. FAI Technical Commission – CIMP / Medico-Physiological - Presentation
- 26b. FAI Technical Commission – CIMP / Medico-Physiological - Report
27. Report by the President of the FAI Rotorcraft Commission (CIG)
28. Report by the President of the FAI Amateur-Built and Experimental Aircraft Commission (CIACA)
- 28b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Amateur-Built and Experimental Aircraft Commission (CIACA)
29. Report by the President of the FAI Air Sport General Commission (CASI)
30. FAI Technical Commission – EnvC / Environmental – Report
- 30b. Presentation by the President of the FAI Environmental Commission (EnvC)

- 31.** Multi Sports Events
- 32.** Definition of Air Sports Person
- 33.** Amendments to Statutes and By-Laws – Proposals
- 33b.** Amendments to Statutes and By-Laws – Presentation
- 34.** Harmonisation Sporting Codes-Rules-Regulations

*Additional documents are annexed as follows :*

- 35.** Calendar of FAI Meetings 2016
- 36.** List of Delegates of Commissions
- 37.** International Calendar of Sporting Events 2016-2019
- 38.** List of FAI Award Winners for 2015
- 39.** List of Participants at the General Conference
- 40.** List of Companions of Honour
- 41.** List of FAI Members
- 42.** List of FAI Championships Winners for 2015

Minutes approved by Dr. John GRUBBSTRÖM, FAI President on 15 January 2016.